

**Bangor University**

## **DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY**

### **The Temporality of Narcissistic Leadership**

Ong, Chin Wei

*Award date:*  
2015

*Awarding institution:*  
Bangor University

[Link to publication](#)

#### **General rights**

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

#### **Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

THE TEMPORALITY OF NARCISSISTIC  
LEADERSHIP

Chin Wei Ong



PRIFYSGOL  
**BANGOR**  
UNIVERSITY

# The Temporality of Narcissistic Leadership

by

Chin Wei Ong

Thesis

*Submitted to Bangor University*

*for the degree of*

Doctor of Philosophy

School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences

2015

# Contents

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	IV
AUTHOR’S DECLARATION AND CONSENT .....	VI
THESIS ABSTRACT .....	IX
CHAPTER 1 - GENERAL INTRODUCTION.....	1
<b>NARCISSISM.....</b>	<b>2</b>
BACKGROUND	2
SCULPTING NARCISSUS: SELF-REGULATION TO CONSTRUCT AND TO MAINTAIN SELF-CONCEPT	3
SCULPTING NARCISSUS: THE TWO FACES OF NARCISSISM	5
<b>LEADERSHIP .....</b>	<b>6</b>
DETERMINING AN EMERGING LEADER AND AN EFFECTIVE LEADER	6
LEADERSHIP TEMPORALITY	7
<b>THE DEMISE OF NARCISSUS: NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP AND ITS DURABILITY .....</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>EXPLANATORY MECHANISMS OF THE TEMPORALITY OF NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP .....</b>	<b>9</b>
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	10
<b>EVOLUTIONARY BASIS OF LEADERSHIP, NARCISSISM AND NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP.....</b>	<b>12</b>
EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES OF LEADERSHIP	12
EVOLUTIONARY THEORIES OF NARCISSISM	15
<b>THESIS STRUCTURE .....</b>	<b>18</b>
CHAPTER 2	18
CHAPTER 3	19
CHAPTER 4	19
CHAPTER 5	20
CHAPTER 2 - NARCISSISTS AS INSPIRATIONAL LEADERS: IN FOR THE LONG HAUL?...	21
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>22</b>
PRESENT RESEARCH	23
<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>25</b>
<b>DISCUSSION.....</b>	<b>26</b>

CHAPTER 3 – THE LEADER SHIP IS SINKING: A TEMPORAL INVESTIGATION OF NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP .....	29
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>30</b>
<b>NARCISSISM AND LEADERSHIP .....</b>	<b>32</b>
<b>IS NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP DURABLE? .....</b>	<b>33</b>
TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP AS A MECHANISM	35
PRESENT RESEARCH	37
<b>STUDY 1 .....</b>	<b>37</b>
METHOD	37
RESULTS	41
<b>TABLE 1 .....</b>	<b>43</b>
DISCUSSION	44
<b>STUDY 2 .....</b>	<b>46</b>
METHOD	46
RESULTS	47
DISCUSSION	47
<b>TABLE 2 .....</b>	<b>49</b>
<b>GENERAL DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>50</b>
FUTURE RESEARCH AND APPLIED IMPLICATIONS	52
LIMITATIONS	55
CONCLUSION	56
CHAPTER 4 – THE LEADER SHIP IS DESTINED TO SINK: AN EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVE ON THE DECLINE OF THE NARCISSISTIC LEADER.....	57
<b>ABSTRACT .....</b>	<b>58</b>
EVOLUTIONARY PERSPECTIVES OF LEADERSHIP	60
<b>METHOD.....</b>	<b>66</b>
<b>RESULTS .....</b>	<b>71</b>
<b>TABLE 3 .....</b>	<b>74</b>
<b>DISCUSSION .....</b>	<b>76</b>
<b>FUTURE RESEARCH AND THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>79</b>
LIMITATIONS	85
CONCLUSION	85
CHAPTER 5 – GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	87

<b>SUMMARY OF THESIS .....</b>	<b>87</b>
<b>THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS .....</b>	<b>89</b>
NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP DOES NOT LAST LONG	89
NARCISSISTS’ PREFERENCE FOR SHORT-TERM SELF-ENHANCEMENT COULD BE INNATE	91
NARCISSISM AND TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP	94
THE TEMPORALITY OF NARCISSISTIC LEADERSHIP IS A PRODUCT OF EVOLUTION	98
<b>APPLIED IMPLICATIONS.....</b>	<b>100</b>
HELPING NARCISSISTIC LEADERS BECOME MORE “TEMPORALLY RESILIENT”	100
RETHINKING THE LEADER SELECTION PROCESS – LEVELING THE NARCISSISM BIAS	104
<b>STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THE THESIS.....</b>	<b>106</b>
STRENGTHS	106
LIMITATIONS	107
<b>FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS.....</b>	<b>109</b>
PROXIMAL FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS	109
GENERIC FUTURE RESEARCH DIRECTIONS	111
<b>CONCLUSION.....</b>	<b>112</b>
<b>PERSONAL REFLECTION .....</b>	<b>114</b>
<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>116</b>
<b>APPENDIX A: PILOT STUDY - MALE VERSION OF VIGNETTE, SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONNAIRES .....</b>	<b>142</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: PILOT STUDY - FEMALE VERSION OF VIGNETTE, SCENARIOS AND QUESTIONNAIRES.....</b>	<b>148</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: STUDY 1 - TEAM INFORMATION SHEET - WEEK 1.....</b>	<b>154</b>
<b>APPENDIX D: STUDY 1 - DEMOGRAPHICS, NPI AND HSNS – WEEK 1 .....</b>	<b>157</b>
<b>APPENDIX E: STUDY 2 - PEER-RATED LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE – WEEKS 2, 4, 8, 11.....</b>	<b>163</b>
<b>APPENDIX F: STUDY 1 - PEER-RATED TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERSHIP QUESTIONNAIRE – WEEKS 2, 4, 8, 11... </b>	<b>167</b>
<b>APPENDIX G: CONVERGENCE PLOTS OF IMPUTED VARIABLES IN STUDY 3.....</b>	<b>172</b>
<b>APPENDIX H: STUDY 3 - TEAM INFORMATION SHEET - WEEK 1 .....</b>	<b>189</b>
<b>APPENDIX I: STUDY 3 - DEMOGRAPHICS, NPI-16 AND HSNS - WEEK 1 .....</b>	<b>191</b>
<b>APPENDIX J: STUDY 3 - PEER-RATED LEADERSHIP (PART 3), PRESTIGE AND DOMINANCE (PART 4) QUESTIONNAIRES - WEEKS 2, 4, 7, 10.....</b>	<b>195</b>

## Acknowledgements

One's personality is constantly updated and modified as a consequence of the social relations one is engaged in, so perhaps the people around me could be blamed for the narcissistic self-views I currently adopt (Caveat: certain sections might lack scientific rigour).

In the academic context, I “blame” my supervisors Ross, Tim and Calum - incredibly intelligent and eloquent, yet so humble and sincere gentlemen. They have been ever-present throughout my PhD journey, not just talking research but also talking about life (Tim's karaoke singer analogy will stay with me for a long time!). They have challenged me with high expectations but have constantly expressed full confidence in my ability to achieve these goals, even when I have often doubted myself. They have been outstanding mentors, offering support and guidance throughout my PhD. It has been my good fortune, and an absolute honour being under their tutelage. Thanks for being great supervisors, and great role models. I would be extremely happy if I can emulate just a fraction of the men each of you are in my lifetime.

In the wider Bangor circle, I “blame” Chelsey, Tommie, Samantha, Harry R, Gabriella, Sanabel and Kostas, the wonderful people who have graced the best office in SSHES, G112. I am going to miss our ramblings about football, coffee, Arabic tea, cool bands, more football and of course... our obsession for decorating G112 for Christmas, Halloween and the World Cup! Caoimhe, my partner-in-crime in Reichel, it was a pleasure “wardening” with you, and sharing your love for football with me, which included many nights of catching Champions League and World Cup matches together. I promise what happened at the Etihad will stay at the Etihad! Harry M, for all the intriguing discussions about narcissism and telling me all the cool things I have never come across before. Sorry, if I was a bit too gung-ho with the driving on our American adventure - I guess it is a small “reward” for taking us to Summit Hill Road! Andrea, Chrno, Bing, Chu, Tracy, Lai Ying, Melody, Sijing, Charlene, Trevor, Kirthana,

Lenice and Mei for accepting me as a friend despite being an “oldie”, and for making Bangor feel like Singapore/Malaysia whenever there are meet-ups. It has been a privilege to witness all of you grow and develop into better people. Last but not least, I would like to extend a special thanks to James Hardy, who I will always remember as the person who convinced me to come to Bangor. Thanks for personally speaking to me when I attended the Open Day in 2007, for taking time to show me Bangor personally in your car, for encouraging me to apply for the MSc bursary, for entrusting an entire module to me, and for encouraging me and giving me the opportunity to pursue my dream. I owe you too much!

At home in Singapore, I “blame” my family. I am indebted to them for their unrequited love and support. Life has been so smooth for me prior and during the PhD, and I know this did not happen by chance. Thank you for your tolerance, every little gesture of kindness, and every ounce of sacrifice over the years. I “blame” my buddies Youqin, King Yaw, Edwin, Kar Wing, Wilson, Jiahui and Dechao, thanks for your friendship, which has not faded a single bit despite the geographical distance. Chee Yong, thanks for always looking out for me like a brother. I cherish our time together in SSP and hopefully we will have more in the future.



## Author's Declaration and Consent

### Details of the Work

I hereby agree to deposit the following item in the digital repository maintained by Bangor University and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University.

**Author Name:** ...Chin Wei Ong.....

**Title:** ...The Temporality of Narcissistic Leadership.....

**Supervisor/Department:** ..Drs. Ross Roberts, Calum Athur and Prof. Tim Woodman.

**Funding body (if any):**

..NA.....

**Qualification/Degree obtained:** ...PhD.....

This item is a product of my own research endeavours and is covered by the agreement below in which the item is referred to as "the Work". It is identical in content to that deposited in the Library, subject to point 4 below.

### Non-exclusive Rights

Rights granted to the digital repository through this agreement are entirely non-exclusive. I am free to publish the Work in its present version or future versions elsewhere.

I agree that Bangor University may electronically store, copy or translate the Work to any approved medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility. Bangor University is not under any obligation to reproduce or display the Work in the same formats or resolutions in which it was originally deposited.

### Bangor University Digital Repository

I understand that work deposited in the digital repository will be accessible to a wide variety of people and institutions, including automated agents and search engines via the World Wide Web.

I understand that once the Work is deposited, the item and its metadata may be incorporated into public access catalogues or services, national databases of electronic theses and dissertations such as the British Library's EThOS or any service provided by the National Library of Wales.

I understand that the Work may be made available via the National Library of Wales Online Electronic Theses Service under the declared terms and conditions of use (<http://www.llgc.org.uk/index.php?id=4676>). I agree that as part of this service the National Library of Wales may electronically store, copy or convert the Work to any approved medium or format for the purpose of future preservation and accessibility. The National Library of Wales is not under any obligation to reproduce or display the Work in the same formats or resolutions in which it was originally deposited.

**Statement 1:**

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degree and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree unless as agreed by the University for approved dual awards.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

**Statement 2:**

This thesis is the result of my own investigations, except where otherwise stated. Where correction services have been used, the extent and nature of the correction is clearly marked in a footnote(s).

All other sources are acknowledged by footnotes and/or a bibliography.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

**Statement 3:**

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, for inter-library loan and for electronic storage (subject to any constraints as defined in statement 4), and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

**NB:** Candidates on whose behalf a bar on access has been approved by the Academic Registry should use the following version of **Statement 3:**

**Statement 3 (bar):**

I hereby give consent for my thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying, for inter-library loans and for electronic storage (subject to any constraints as defined in statement 4), after expiry of a bar on access.

Signed ..... (candidate)

Date .....

**Statement 4:**

Choose **one** of the following options

a) I agree to deposit an electronic copy of my thesis (the Work) in the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University and where necessary have gained the required permissions for the use of third party material.	
b) I agree to deposit an electronic copy of my thesis (the Work) in the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University when the approved <b>bar on access</b> has been lifted.	
c) I agree to submit my thesis (the Work) electronically via Bangor University's e-submission system, however I <b>opt-out</b> of the electronic deposit to the Bangor University (BU) Institutional Digital Repository, the British Library ETHOS system, and/or in any other repository authorized for use by Bangor University, due to lack of permissions for use of third party material.	

*Options B should only be used if a bar on access has been approved by the University.*

**In addition to the above I also agree to the following:**

1. That I am the author or have the authority of the author(s) to make this agreement and do hereby give Bangor University the right to make available the Work in the way described above.
2. That the electronic copy of the Work deposited in the digital repository and covered by this agreement, is identical in content to the paper copy of the Work deposited in the Bangor University Library, subject to point 4 below.
3. That I have exercised reasonable care to ensure that the Work is original and, to the best of my knowledge, does not breach any laws - including those relating to defamation, libel and copyright.
4. That I have, in instances where the intellectual property of other authors or copyright holders is included in the Work, and where appropriate, gained explicit permission for the inclusion of that material in the Work, and in the electronic form of the Work as accessed through the open access digital repository, *or* that I have identified and removed that material for which adequate and appropriate permission has not been obtained and which will be inaccessible via the digital repository.
5. That Bangor University does not hold any obligation to take legal action on behalf of the Depositor, or other rights holders, in the event of a breach of intellectual property rights, or any other right, in the material deposited.
6. That I will indemnify and keep indemnified Bangor University and the National Library of Wales from and against any loss, liability, claim or damage, including without limitation any related legal fees and court costs (on a full indemnity bases), related to any breach by myself of any term of this agreement.

Signature: ..... Date : .....

## **Thesis Abstract**

Narcissists possess an inflated, overly-positive self-view, which they maintain and boost by taking advantage of opportunities for self-enhancement. Leadership is viewed by narcissists as a viable means towards achieving self-enhancement, which gives rise to their leader emergent tendencies. However, the characteristics of their personality suggest that their leadership qualities will decrease over time, although no evidence has previously existed supporting this hypothesised effect. The present thesis provides the first empirical evidence to support the theorised temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership - characterised by initial favourable follower perceptions that wane over time. Additionally, we explored the mechanisms that explain the temporal pattern of perceptions towards narcissistic leadership, specifically transformational leadership and evolutionary strategies towards gaining social status: prestige and dominance.

Chapter 1 introduces the relevant aspects of narcissism, leadership and evolutionary psychology, setting the scene for the thesis and presenting the questions pertaining to the temporality of narcissistic leadership that are examined in the subsequent empirical chapters. Chapter 2 (Pilot Study) examines the temporality of narcissistic leadership and the visionary component of transformational leadership through two hypothetical temporal scenarios. The results provide preliminary evidence that narcissistic leadership is perceived favourably for a short duration but not for a long duration, and also suggest that inspirational motivation, a visionary component of transformational leadership, mediates the perceptions of narcissists as effective leaders in the short-term but not over the long-term.

In Chapter 3 (Studies 1 and 2), we describe two longitudinal round-robin studies, utilising group members with varying levels of acquaintance, that provide the first empirical

evidence that the temporality of narcissistic leadership is characterised by initial positive follower perceptions that wane over time. We also demonstrate that transformational leadership mediates the relationship between narcissism and leadership early on but not later, suggesting that follower perceptions of narcissistic leaders across time is dependent on narcissistic leaders' demonstration of appropriate transformational leadership behaviours.

Chapter 4 (Study 3) provides an evolutionary perspective on the temporality of narcissistic leadership. Utilising a longitudinal, round-robin experimental design similar to the studies in Chapter 3, the results confirm that narcissistic leaders are perceived favourably by followers initially but not over time. Additionally, both evolutionary strategies to gaining social status - prestige and dominance - explain narcissists' initial success as leaders. However, immediately after leader emergence, only dominance is effective in helping narcissists remain as favourable leaders, but the beneficial effects of dominance dissipate over time.

In Chapter 5, we present a summary of the thesis; the theoretical and applied implications of these findings; strengths and limitations of the thesis; as well as future research directions. The findings from this thesis provide the first empirical evidence that narcissists are likely to be favourably perceived as leaders, but only in the short-term. This honeymoon effect of narcissistic leadership is characterised by narcissists' initial success in exhibiting transformational leader behaviours, and their subsequent failure to demonstrate appropriate transformational leader behaviours over time. From an evolutionary perspective, both dominance and prestigious strategies explain followers' initial positive perceptions of narcissists as leaders. However, dominance strategies seem to allow narcissistic leaders to enjoy that honeymoon effect for a longer period than prestigious strategies. Nevertheless, persisting with dominance strategies over prestigious strategies beyond the initial phase of leadership culminates in the curtailment of followers' perceptions of narcissistic leaders.

## Chapter 1 – General Introduction

**“The history of the world is but the biography of great men.”**

- Thomas Carlyle (Lecture 1 – The Hero as Divinity, p. 27, 1840)

Thomas Carlyle, one of the most acclaimed thinkers of the Victorian era and chief instigator of the “Great Man” Theory, believed that the destiny of humankind as a species fell on the shoulders of great men, who were intelligent, charismatic, influential and powerful. In doing so, Carlyle could have possibly prophesised at that time the subsequent rampant “culture of narcissism” (Lasch, 1991) that we observe in modern society – a society in which everyone wants to be great. Today, more people than ever are paying more attention to writing their “autobiographies” of greatness, even when the content is not all that “great”. Often within these potentially rather narcissistic autobiographies there exists a common chapter on leadership and how it is a viable path towards “greatness”. However, whether narcissists actually achieve greatness through leadership is less straightforward - due to the dynamic interaction between narcissism, leadership and the social world, and the changes this interaction undergoes as a function of time (e.g., Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Thus, the aim of the current thesis is to unravel the changes in narcissistic leadership that develop over time, and to examine the potential mechanisms that are responsible for any such changes. This introduction will address the temporality of narcissistic leadership by first presenting a broad overview of the relevant narcissism and leadership literatures, followed by an appraisal of the temporal relationship between narcissism and leadership. Next, the introduction will cover the mechanisms that might explain the temporality of narcissistic leadership, namely, transformational leadership and evolutionary strategies of gaining social status.

## Narcissism

### Background

The term “Narcissism” is derived from Ovid’s tale of Narcissus falling in love with his own reflection to the detriment of his true/real self, which caused him to perish. Although Ovid’s tale of Narcissus being obsessed by his image is void of any psychological examination, it is significant not merely for where the term “narcissism” is derived from, but more importantly for the constructive themes (e.g., unrequited self-love) that resonated with later interpretations of narcissism as a personality trait. The early moulding of narcissism as a personality trait was perhaps most notable in the field of psychoanalysis, where narcissism was initially theorised as a universal process within normal psycho-sexual human development (Freud, 1905/1957), but was subsequently developed as a self-regulatory personality process, more specifically as a module of self-preservation (Freud, 1914/1957; Rank, 1914/1971). According to Freud (1914/1957) this module of self-preservation operates dynamically by consistently obscuring information and feelings that would diminish the sense of self. Both Freud and Rank believed that this self-preservation is achieved through exhibiting grandiosity as a defence against vulnerability of the self. A narcissistic individual engaged in self-preservation would demonstrate high independence, extraversion, low likelihood of being intimidated, aggression and aversions to love or close relationships (Freud, 1931/1959; Levy, Ellison, & Reynoso, 2011). Freud found that these characteristics combined to create “personalities” that impress, can be relied upon and can readily assume leadership positions, especially when radical shifts from the status quo are sought after by would-be followers. Further, the extent to which narcissists are willing to construct their grandiose selves for the purposes of self-preservation seems to be boundless. For instance, Kohut (1985, p. 198) likened Freud’s construction of the narcissistic self to an admired omnipotent model:

“Certain types of narcissistically fixated persons (even bordering on the paranoid)...display an apparently unshakeable self-confidence and voice their opinions with absolute certainty...Such individuals’ maintenance of their self-esteem depends on the incessant use of certain mental functions...they are continually judging others – usually pointing up the moral flaws in other people’s personality and behaviour – and, without shame or hesitation, they set themselves up as the guides and leaders and gods of those who are in need of guidance, of leadership, and as a target for their reverence.”

These psychoanalytical perspectives suggest that narcissists regulate their self-image through portrayals of grandiosity, which are often boundless, in turn leading to their rise into leadership positions.

#### **Sculpting Narcissus: Self-regulation to construct and to maintain self-concept**

The pioneering work in psychoanalysis has contributed significantly to current understandings of narcissism as a personality construct. Indeed, contemporary definitions of narcissism include reference to relevant psychoanalytic concepts, particularly narcissists’ motivation towards self-preservation that is achieved through grandiose displays. Narcissists are described as individuals who possess inflated, overly-positive and predominantly agentic self-views, who pervasively employ self-regulatory strategies in order to maintain or enhance these self-views, and who have interpersonal relationships that lack empathy and emotional intimacy (Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). This definition captures various aspects of personality, resulting in narcissism being situated at the “nexus of personality”, where examinations of the self, self-regulation and relationships are interconnected and can be approached concurrently (p. 61, Campbell et al., 2006).

The Dynamic Self-Regulatory Processing Model (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Morf, Torchetti, & Schürch, 2011) and The Extended Agency Model (Campbell et al., 2006;



Campbell & Foster, 2007) are two prominent self-regulatory models that have admirably integrated all the bridging elements of narcissism to explain the dynamic nature of the construct. Although both models possess components and theorising that distinguishes one from the other, a key similarity between them is their focus on self-regulatory processes. Narcissists engage in these self-regulatory processes to maintain or enhance their grandiose self-views, through intrapersonal (or intrapsychic) and interpersonal strategies (Campbell et al., 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Intrapersonal strategies employed by narcissists include fantasising about personal achievement, heroism, power and self-adulation (Raskin & Novacek, 1991), displaying overconfidence even in the face of failure (Campbell, Goodie, & Foster, 2004; Lakey, Rose, Campbell, & Goodie, 2008), distorting, disregarding or being overly-defensive of negative feedback (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998) and self-handicapping (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Interpersonal self-regulatory strategies include showing off and dominating conversations (Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Paulhus, 1998), amassing and flaunting material goods (Cisek, Hart, & Sedikides, 2008; Vazire, Neumann, Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2008), performing better when others are watching (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002; Woodman, Roberts, Hardy, Callow, & Rogers, 2011), having a preference for famous partners (Campbell, 1999) and asserting their power to gain leadership in leaderless groups (Brunell, Gentry, Campbell, Hoffman, Kuhnert, & DeMarree, 2008). Although the definition of narcissism seems to focus on agentic self-enhancement as the predominant aim in narcissistic self-regulation, the engagement in the various intrapersonal and interpersonal self-regulatory strategies is context-dependent. More precisely, the employment of self-regulatory strategies is dependent on the appraisal of whether a specific context affords narcissists opportunities for self-enhancement or if threats to positive self-construction are present (Morf et al., 2011; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Engaging in self-

regulation that is context contingent suggests that narcissists might be more attracted and better suited to temporal contexts that they construe as self-enhancing, relative to temporal contexts that are either not self-enhancing or present threats to narcissists' positive self-construction.

### **Sculpting Narcissus: The two faces of narcissism**

Narcissists' ability to appraise situations as an opportunity - threat appraisal, and their subsequent engagement in self-regulatory strategies is likely a consequence of narcissistic grandiosity juxtaposed with a fragility of the self (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Similarly, work examining narcissism within broader personality models such as the Big Five, Interpersonal Circumplex and Five-Factor Model (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Paulhus & Williams, 2002) has also demonstrated a narcissistic personality construct comprising grandiose and vulnerable characteristics. For instance, narcissistic grandiosity is characterised by extraversion and disagreeableness (e.g., Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Paulhus & Williams, 2002), whereas narcissistic vulnerability is characterised by neuroticism and disagreeableness (e.g., Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Miller, Dir, Gentile, Wilson, Pryor, & Campbell, 2010).

It is evident in the literature that narcissism as a personality construct comprises two distinct dimensions: narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. However, the degree to which these two dimensions of narcissism operate independently of each other or conjointly remains unclear (Miller & Campbell, 2011). Thus, we have made it a point to consider and measure both narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability in this thesis. Nonetheless, the findings to date seem to imply that narcissistic grandiosity is the dominant facet of narcissism in the context of leadership. As such, we placed a greater focus on examining the relationship between narcissistic grandiosity and leadership in this thesis.

## Leadership

### **Determining an emerging leader and an effective leader**

Carlyle (1840) and his contemporaries' inquisition into the characteristics that made men great culminated in what is popularly known as the "Great Man" theory of leadership. The "Great Man" theory has influenced leadership researchers to approach leadership by examining the individual differences that makes one leader-like. Within the leadership literature, the "great man" approach has met with heavy criticism, including inconsistent findings that led to dismissals of its significance (Mann, 1959; Stogdill, 1948) and the propensity for leadership to be seen as an individual phenomenon, without considering the ecosystem where leadership occurs (Avolio, 2007; Lord & Dinh, 2014). Despite the criticisms surrounding inconsistent findings and an individual-centric approach, the focus on individual differences has generated some useful links between personality, intelligence, leadership style and evaluations of leadership and performance (cf. Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002; Judge, Colbert, & Ilies, 2004), especially after the distinction between how leaders are perceived and how teams performed was established (Lord, DeVader, & Alliger, 1986).

In a meta-analysis of the personality-leadership literature, Judge et al. (2002) sought to clear up any confusion that could arise from the muddling of leadership outcomes by distinguishing between leader emergence and leader effectiveness. Leader emergence refers to being perceived as leader-like (Judge et al., 2002), as an individual's quantity and quality of participation in a group (Mullen, Salas, & Driskell, 1989), or the influence exercised and social status attained in a group (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). One common characteristic across all the definitions of leader emergence is that it is based heavily on perceptions, usually those of observers or peers (Lord et al., 1986). Contrastingly, leader effectiveness refers to a leader's performance in influencing and guiding the activities of his/her unit towards achievement of

its goals (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Judge et al., 2002). Ratings of leader effectiveness can be derived from followers and superiors, which however, are only modestly correlated (Conway & Huffcutt, 1997). This weak correlation alludes to the variation in leader perceptions between superior and follower (e.g., Hooiberg & Choi, 2000), thereby emphasising the uniqueness of follower perceptions of leader effectiveness relative to superior perceptions (Hogan, 1994). Thus, greater consistency in leadership findings can be attributed to the creation of clearer conceptual boundaries of leader emergence and effectiveness alongside a greater use of follower perceptions, to measure more accurately leadership effectiveness.

### **Leadership temporality**

Besides being two conceptually different aspects of leadership, leader emergence and leader effectiveness also occur at distinct temporal phases, with leader emergence preceding leader effectiveness. As mentioned earlier, a major criticism of the individual-centric approach to leadership research has been the neglect of considering the various environmental influences while examining leadership outcomes (Lord & Dinh, 2014). Organisational environments can often be complex (Marion & Uhl-Bien, 2002; Uhl-Bien & Marion, 2009), and subject to uncertainty, discontinuity and continuous change (Gulati, Sytch, & Tatarynowicz, 2012). In order to account for the fluidity of environments where leadership takes place, it is important to recognise leadership as a dynamic process where multiple factors can culminate in the making or breaking of leadership (Dansereau et al., 1995; Foti, Knee, & Backert, 2008). Conceptualising leadership as a dynamic process has led leadership theorists to advocate explorations into the temporal effects of leadership (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008; Shamir, 2011), as well as the complex developments within self-regulatory and interpersonal processes (Uhl-Bien, Marion, & McKelvey, 2007). Taking the relevant leadership literature into consideration, we subscribe to the views that 1) leader emergence and leader effectiveness are two conceptually

distinct leadership outcomes that feature in temporally distinct phases; 2) follower perceptions offer a more accurate reflection of leader emergence and leader effectiveness and; 3) leadership is a dynamic process that centres on relationships between leaders and followers that could be heavily influenced by time.

### **The demise of narcissus: Narcissistic leadership and its durability**

The Chocolate Cake Model (Campbell, 2005) was initially developed to explain the dynamic processes responsible for the temporality of romantic relationships with narcissists, which was typified by initial positive perceptions that waned over time. In order to explain how certain narcissistic traits are (mal)adaptive across different situations and contexts, the chocolate cake model was extended to develop the more contextually encompassing Contextual Reinforcement Model (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). Based on a costs and benefits framework, the Contextual Reinforcement Model proposes that narcissistic traits are likely to be adaptive in contexts that are classified as “emerging” zones and maladaptive in the “enduring” zones. This context dependent approach is also consistent with psychodynamic models of narcissism, where narcissistic self-appraisal and subsequent self-regulatory processes are sensitive to contextual changes (Campbell et al., 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1998). Whether or not a context is considered emerging or enduring is determined by the extent to which self-enhancement is possible. Narcissists would be attracted to and strive to gain entry to contexts that are construed as self-enhancing, and abstain from or exit contexts that are not. Contextual or temporal changes to self-enhancement opportunities cause a “natural” drift from emerging to enduring zones (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Campbell et al., 2011), which implies that due to changes in the social context, adaptive outcomes derived from the initial demonstration of narcissistic traits alone are destined to be short-lived. When applied in the context of

narcissistic leadership, it is likely that narcissists would be perceived positively as leaders initially but that these positive perceptions would wane over time.

Observed perceptions of narcissists also seem to support the honeymoon nature of narcissistic leadership, where there is an emphasis on making positive first impressions rather than preserving existing relations. For instance, narcissists are high in extraversion, and possess confidence and strong social skills, which are essential for effective social interaction in leadership (e.g., Judge et al., 2002). The initial attractiveness of narcissists for leadership positions extends well beyond extraversion. Indeed, narcissists are also known to make better first impressions (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2010; Carlson, Vazire, & Oltmanns, 2011; Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011; Paulhus, 1998), which likely contribute to their tendency to emerge as leaders, particularly in zero-acquaintance situations (Brunell et al., 2008; Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011). Further, their attraction to power has also been shown to bring about follower perceptions of narcissists as emergent leaders, beyond the effects of extraversion (Brunell et al., 2008). However, with increasing acquaintance, narcissists are more arrogant, are less entertaining, tend to brag, and overestimate their abilities (Paulhus, 1998). Thus, theorisation on narcissistic leadership and perceptions of narcissists seem to suggest that the temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership is characterised by a short honeymoon period that rapidly wanes.

### **Explanatory mechanisms of the temporality of narcissistic leadership**

Owing to the dynamic natures of both narcissism and leadership, narcissistic leadership can only be facilitated when the evolvement of narcissism and its consequent leadership behaviours are aligned with the dynamic social processes that characterise different temporal phases of leadership. From a narcissist's perspective, demonstrating appropriate leader behaviours at appropriate temporal leadership phases is only a secondary consideration if any,

because their self-regulation only engages in self-enhancement and not purposefully in leadership per se. Thus, mechanisms that explain the temporality of narcissistic leadership would need to demonstrate that narcissists engage in self-enhancing behaviours that are perceived positively initially for leadership but not over time. One potential mechanism that might demonstrate an evolution of such narcissistic leadership behaviours across time is transformational leadership.

### **Transformational leadership**

Transformational leadership is an approach to leadership that involves establishing relationships with followers through personal, emotional, and inspirational exchanges, so that followers are motivated to perform beyond their expectations (Bass, 1985). Transformational leadership is closely related to charismatic leadership, given the latter's similar focus on establishing emotional and inspirational exchanges with followers through visionary aspects of leadership (House & Shamir, 1993). Consequently, followers are able to internalise these emotional and inspirational exchanges as part of their self-esteem, resulting in greater commitment to and willingness to achieve their goals. The similarity between transformational leadership and charismatic leadership is also evident in the literature, where these two leadership concepts have been recognised as being synonymous (e.g., Conger & Kanungo, 1998; House & Podsakoff, 1994). However, while similarities do seem apparent, some (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994) have argued that charismatic leadership alone cannot possibly account for all forms of personal, emotional and inspirational exchanges between leader and follower. So instead of recognising the interchangeability between transformational leadership and charismatic leadership, charismatic leadership is considered a component of transformational leadership (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1994), mainly by capturing the visionary and/or inspirational aspects of charismatic leadership (e.g., Bass & Avolio, 1995;

Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Moorman, & Fetter, 1990). Although charismatic aspects are integral to the conceptualisation of transformational leadership, the notion that transformational leadership comprises components beyond charismatic leadership elements has provided added impetus for a more multifaceted approach. Consequently, a slew of other compatible transformational leadership qualities have been created: idealised influence (Bass, 1985), appropriate role modeling, fostering acceptance of group goals, high performance expectations, intellectual stimulation (Bass, 1985; Podsakoff et al., 1990) and individual consideration (Bass, 1985; Bass & Avolio, 1995), which can be further simplified into vision, support and challenge components (Hardy et al., 2010). Transformational leadership is also considered an effective form of leadership and has been associated with a myriad of positive outcomes, including leader effectiveness, leader and/or group performance, satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, and job satisfaction (see Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

In the context of narcissistic leadership, whether narcissistic behaviours are perceived as transformational, and in turn as effective leaders could account for why narcissists are favoured at specific temporal phases and not others. This explanatory utility of transformational leadership at the temporal level is evident in the equivocal findings in the narcissism-transformational leadership literature. For instance, US Presidents who were classified as more narcissistic were considered more charismatic (Deluga, 1997). Similarly, transformational leadership has been found to be positively related to narcissism (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006). Contrastingly, narcissists have been deemed as less transformational leaders (Khoo & Burch, 2008). These equivocal findings suggest that it is possible that narcissistic leadership explained through transformational leadership could be susceptible to temporal effects. More precisely, there might be certain temporal phases where narcissistic traits are recognised as transformational and other temporal phases where they are not.



### **Evolutionary basis of leadership, narcissism and narcissistic leadership**

Other potential explanations for the temporality of narcissistic leadership can perhaps be unearthed if we consider narcissistic leadership within the broader conceptual framework of evolutionary psychology. Examining narcissistic leadership within an evolutionary framework seems a natural step to take given that there already exists theorising on the evolutionary origins of both narcissism (Holtzman & Strube, 2011; Tracy, Cheng, Martens, & Robins, 2011) and leadership (Price & Van Vugt, 2014a, 2014b).

#### **Evolutionary theories of leadership**

The main premise of evolution is to succeed in the competition to survive and to reproduce (i.e., evolutionary fitness), which can be achieved through selected adaptations that maximise fitness benefits and minimise fitness costs. These selected adaptations have evolved to address chronic and recurrent problems that affect the chances of survival and reproduction (Tooby & Cosmides, 2005). Psychologically evolved adaptations in leader-follower relationships are no different (cf. Van Vugt & Ronay, 2014), as they are likely to have evolved over time to provide solutions to group coordination problems (e.g., more success when hunting in numbers instead of individually; cf. Tooby & Cosmides, 1992). Specifically, group coordination requires group decisions on a myriad of problems to maximise survival chances, which could be facilitated by the emergence of a leader – which in turn suggests that leadership is selected as a positive adaptation that enhances evolutionary fitness.

Although leadership arises as a consequence of group coordination problems, which suggests leadership as a provider of group level fitness benefits, evolutionary perspectives of leadership propose that it is also possible to consider fitness benefits at the individual level (Williams, 1966), thereby generating further insights on the evolution of leadership (Price & Van Vugt, 2014b). Integral to the individual level inquiry of the evolution of leadership is the

view that leadership involves interactive cooperation between leader and follower that is governed by the principle of “reciprocal altruism” (Trivers, 1971). Reciprocal altruism refers to the mutually beneficial exchange of fitness costs and benefits between leader and follower, in that a potential leader would only find it worthwhile to incur fitness costs and provide fitness benefits to others when fitness benefits can also be reciprocated to them for their initial act of “altruism”. Altruistic reciprocity shares parallels with transformational leadership as they both focus on the interaction between leader and follower. However, a key difference between these two approaches is that while transformational leadership is able to provide proximal explanations for leadership, altruistic reciprocity affords a more historic view of why we are (un)attracted to certain leaders (Price & Van Vugt, 2014b).

As mentioned earlier, evolutionary perspectives of leadership deem leadership as a solution to group coordination problems and an individual who is prepared to incur fitness costs to benefit others is likely to be considered as the leader. However, according to the principle of reciprocal altruism, a mutually beneficial leader-follower relationship only materialises when followers compensate leaders for the fitness costs they have incurred to benefit them. In such instances, followers compensate leaders by conferring them with social status (Price, 2003). Social status is a valuable currency in the leader-follower exchange of fitness costs and benefits and can be attained by engaging in either prestige or dominance strategies (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Prestige refers to the attainment of higher social status through the achievement of expertise that is valued and respected by others without the need for coercion. Contrastingly, dominance refers to the attainment of social status through the use of intimidation and coercion, mainly through the induction of fear. Although prestige and dominance are conceptually distinct from each other, both have been shown to be viable pathways to achieving leadership (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013).

However, an understanding of which social status strategies are involved in influencing leadership over time seems elusive.

In order to identify the salience of social status gaining strategies on leadership over time, it is crucial to consider the unique contextual characteristics that define each temporal phase of leadership. Service-for-Prestige Theory (Van Vugt, 2014a) could offer some insight to the reasons why leaders might engage in one strategy over the other - by predicting the evolutionary systems that typify each temporal phase of leadership. For instance, service-for-prestige theory contends that leaders are especially likely to provide public goods (e.g., assume fitness costs by coordinating group members to acquire a shared resource) during initial group formation, where group coordination is urgent. Since there is empirical evidence to suggest that both prestige and dominance are distinct, yet equally viable strategies for achieving leader characteristics of high social rank and influence (Cheng et al., 2013), individuals who can provide solutions towards group coordination, either through prestige or dominance strategies, would likely be recognised by group members as emergent leaders. However, beyond leader emergence, the public nature of the leader's contribution would most likely result in a collective action problem where leaders incur fitness costs to provide public goods (i.e., contributions that benefit all group members), while followers, incentivised by a higher net fitness benefit, receive public goods and decide to free-ride by not conferring (sufficient) social status to the leader. Unless mechanisms such as punishment and social exclusion are in place to neutralise the advantages of free-riding, leaders might disengage from the leader-follower relationship by offering either fewer or no public goods. Persisting with a prestige strategy is bound to fail, as it does not curb free-riding behaviour. Although dominant individuals tend not to be well-liked (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010), engaging in a dominance strategy could be deemed necessary and acceptable even by followers, in order to facilitate leadership

functions such as enforcing rules within the group to neutralise the advantages of free-riding, thereby minimising the collective action problem (Van Vugt, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2008). Thus, from a temporal perspective, prestige and dominance could independently and differentially determine leader effectiveness across time.

### **Evolutionary theories of narcissism**

Although social status is a valuable currency within the evolutionary leader-follower exchange of fitness costs and benefits, it is important to note that one's identification with social status seems to be mitigated by self-enhancement (Roccas, 2003). Unsurprisingly, self-enhancement is also underpinned by evolutionary principles, where self-enhancing behaviour is characterised by effective decision-making, attractive portrayal of mental and physical health, and gaining higher social status and/or leadership roles (Sedikides, Skowronski, & Gaertner, 2004). The value of self-enhancement in achieving evolutionary fitness has instigated investments in psychological processes with evolutionary bases that can assist in self-enhancement; such as self- and other-deception (von Hippel & Trivers, 2011), and overconfidence (Anderson, Brion, Moore, & Kennedy, 2012; Johnson & Fowler, 2011). Coincidentally, self-regulatory models of narcissism also posit that narcissists are heavily reliant on self-enhancement to regulate their inflated self-views with its genetic associations (Campbell et al., 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). Given narcissism's genetic intimations (Vernon, Villani, Vickers, & Harris, 2008), it is unsurprising that there have been scholarly predictions on the evolution of narcissism (Holtzman & Strube, 2011; Tracy et al., 2011).

The first evolutionary theory of narcissism emerged from a mating perspective, where an early preference for short-term mating is hypothesised to be responsible for the evolution of a variant of dominance – or narcissism. It is only about 1.5 million years ago that hominids, who originally focused on attractiveness and contentiousness (corresponding to promiscuity

and short-term mating), also started to invest in cooperativeness (corresponding to long-term pair-bonding) as a reproductive strategy (Eastwick, 2009; Holtzman & Strube, 2011). The viability of short-term and long-term mating strategies among humans has resulted in an evolutionary state whereby elements of both attractiveness and contentiousness (giving rise to socially aversive narcissistic tendencies) and cooperativeness (complex self-concepts that are descriptive of narcissists) are positively selected for (Holtzman & Strube, 2011). However, for narcissists, their evolutionary preference for short-term mating has manifested in to their propensity to engage in competitive behaviours (Holtzman & Strube, 2011), such as narcissists' inclination towards status-striving (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002) and clamour for leadership positions (Brunell et al., 2008). In the case of the latter, relationships with narcissists also tend to take the form of initial positive impressions, which are usually fleeting (Paulhus, 1998), such as in a leadership context where narcissists are likely to successfully to emerge as leaders in newly-acquainted groups (Brunell et al., 2008, Nevicka, De Hoogh et al., 2011), but not over time (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

The second evolutionary theory of narcissism posits that narcissism has evolved to operate on a balance of implicit shame against hubristic pride (Tracy et al., 2011). Stronger convictions in implicit shame ultimately pervade the temporary veil of hubristic pride, which limits narcissists to pursue only short-term successes. The emotion of pride is conceptualised as two distinct and independent facets: hubristic and authentic (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Hubristic pride is characterised as arrogant and conceiting, while authentic pride is characterised by feelings of accomplishment and confidence (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Although both facets of pride have been evidenced to evolve to enhance social status (Shariff & Tracy, 2009), hubristic pride in particular may be an evolutionary adaptation to promote a dominant strategy of acquiring social status (Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010). Thus, it is believed

that narcissism, comprising early life experiences of implicit shame (Campbell, Bosson, Goheen, Lakey, & Kernis, 2007) and other associated negative dispositional traits, could promote a dominance-oriented regulatory system that is programmed to seek status through the explicit demonstration of hubristic pride, which acts as a coping mechanism going into uncertain status enhancing environments (Tracy et al., 2007). Further, this emotional projection of hubristic pride to attain status is consistent with evolutionary notions of self-deception, where self-enhancement has evolved as a means for individuals to deceive themselves and others (von Hippel & Trivers, 2011). Thus, from a narcissistic leadership perspective, narcissists' evolved affective system is likely to lead them to adopt dominance strategies to gain leadership. More specifically, adopting a dominance strategy that is fuelled by implicit shame and explicit displays of hubristic pride, allows narcissists to be psychologically better equipped than others to cope with the demands of uncertain group coordination situations such as leader emergence. Although both prestige and dominance are equally viable ways to attaining leadership (Cheng et al., 2013), narcissists probably do not see the need to switch from a dominance approach to a prestige approach. However, with reference to the aforementioned literature on the evolution of leadership, narcissists' evolutionarily enforced persistence with dominance strategies is unlikely to make them effective leaders over time.

Taken together, these two evolutionary theories of narcissism suggest that narcissists are likely to have adapted largely dominance strategies for leadership. These dominance strategies preferred by narcissists also seem to tend towards short-term, immediate gains, which are reflective of their initial success during leader emergence (Brunell et al., 2008, Nevicka, DeHoogh, et al., 2011), but not over time.

## **Thesis Structure**

In summary, this introductory chapter has thus far identified leadership as a viable avenue to fulfil narcissistic self-regulation goals. Perceptions of narcissists as leaders, however, are dependent on the display of appropriate narcissistic characteristics within the corresponding temporal phases of leadership. This dynamic interplay between narcissism and follower perceptions of leadership over time has led to predictions that the temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership is one characterised by initial positive perceptions, which wane over time. However, this proposed temporal pattern of follower perceptions of leadership has yet to be empirically tested or demonstrated. Transformational leadership theory and evolutionary perspectives on narcissism and leadership also shed light on narcissists' inclination to engage in leadership opportunities and could possibly offer explanations for the theorised changes in perceptions of narcissistic leaders over time.

Across four studies, the present thesis provides the first empirical evidence to support the theoretical notion that narcissistic leadership is initially positively perceived but then lacks temporal durability. Additionally, the possible mechanisms governing the durability of narcissistic leadership are also explored, in particular, follower perceptions of transformational leadership and the evolutionary basis of social status striving (i.e., prestige and dominance). In accordance with the policy of the School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences, each chapter is written as a standalone manuscript in preparation for submission to a peer-reviewed journal, which inevitably leads to a degree of overlap on a number of topics. The redundancy caused by this overlap has, however, been minimised as much as possible.

## **Chapter 2**

It is noted in the literature that narcissists' success in leader emergence is largely due to the visionary/charismatic characteristics demonstrated by narcissists during such social

contexts. Equally, the waning of narcissistic leaders' initial positive follower perceptions over time could be due to narcissistic leaders no longer being perceived as visionary/charismatic.

The association between follower perceptions of narcissistic leadership and visionary/charismatic behaviours suggests that temporal differences in follower perceptions of narcissistic leaders could be explained by how they are perceived as transformational leaders over time. Thus, in Chapter 2 (Pilot Study), we assessed the durability of narcissists' leader effectiveness and whether the visionary component of transformational leadership (i.e., inspirational motivation) qualified as an explanatory variable of the relationship between narcissism and leader effectiveness, across two hypothetical temporal scenarios.

### **Chapter 3**

Chapter 3 (Studies 1 and 2) more comprehensively tested the temporal effects of narcissistic leadership, by utilising two studies with longitudinal, round-robin experimental designs to examine in greater depth the temporality of narcissistic leadership. Follower perceptions of transformational leadership was also examined as a potential explanatory mechanism of the temporality of narcissistic leadership across both the studies in Chapter 3.

### **Chapter 4**

In Chapter 4 (Study 3), we considered the temporality of narcissistic leadership within an evolutionary framework. Using the experimental design in Chapter 3, we replicated the hypothesised temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership. Additionally, we examined the evolutionary mechanisms of gaining social status (i.e., prestige and dominance) to see if they could provide us with further insights to the mechanisms behind the temporal effects of narcissistic leadership.



**Chapter 5**

Chapter 5 summarises the research findings from the research chapters, and the strengths and limitations of the research programme. The theoretical and applied implications arising from the research programme, as well as the future directions for research are also discussed.

**Chapter 2 -  
Narcissists as Inspirational Leaders: In for the Long Haul?<sup>1</sup>**

---

<sup>1</sup> Ong, C. W. (2014, April). Narcissists as inspirational leaders: In for the long haul? Poster presented at the 5th British Society for the Psychology of Individual Differences Annual Conference, London, United Kingdom.

### **Abstract**

Narcissists have been found to be positively perceived as leaders in leader emergent contexts but these positive perceptions tend to wane over time. This honeymoon period of narcissistic leader effectiveness is predicted to be contingent on followers perceiving narcissists as demonstrating visionary aspects of transformational leadership. We assessed the durability of narcissists' leader effectiveness and whether the visionary component of transformational leadership (i.e., inspirational motivation) qualified as an explanatory variable of the relationship between narcissism and leader effectiveness, across two hypothetical temporal scenarios. We invited participants to read a sex-specific vignette of a hypothetical narcissistic teammate in a football team which they were part of and tested their perceptions towards this hypothetical narcissist's leader effectiveness and inspirational motivation across two temporally distinct scenarios (for one important Cup game and over the whole season). The narcissistic teammate was rated as more inspirational and effective as a leader in the short duration scenario compared to the long duration scenario. We also present preliminary evidence of the mediating effect of transformational leadership on the relationship between narcissism and leadership effectiveness. Narcissists are perceived as more effective and inspirational leaders in the short term compared to the long term. Notably, the findings also suggest that perceptions of narcissists being inspirational could determine whether they are perceived as effective leaders.

### **Narcissists as Inspirational Leaders: In for the Long Haul?**

It is noted in the literature that narcissists' success in leader emergence is possibly due to the visionary/charismatic characteristics demonstrated by narcissists during such social contexts (Khoo & Burch, 2008). Equally, the waning of narcissistic leaders' initial positive follower perceptions over time is posited to be narcissistic characteristics no longer being considered as visionary/charismatic. This might mean that narcissists' initial positive perceptions as leaders that wanes over time is a consequence of how they are perceived as transformational leaders temporally. We test the visionary characteristics of narcissistic leadership by examining the visionary component of transformational leadership: Inspirational Motivation.

#### **Present Research**

The aim of the present research was twofold: 1) To test the hypothesis that narcissists in leaderless groups will be positively perceived as leaders in the short-term but not over the long-term, and 2) to examine the mediating role of transformational leadership in the temporal perception of narcissistic leaders.

Hypothesis 1 was tested in Study 1 by examining whether a hypothetical narcissist would be perceived as a more effective leader over a short duration compared to a long duration.

Hypothesis 2 was tested in Study 1 by examining the visionary component of transformational leadership: inspirational motivation. We hypothesised that narcissists would be more inspirational over a short period of time (compared to a long period).

#### **Method**

##### **Participants**

We recruited 188 participants (104 males, 84 females;  $M_{\text{age}} = 24.3$  years) via online advertisements on team sport websites, Internet fora and social media groups. A chance to win a £50 cash prize was offered as an incentive for completing the online questionnaire. Ninety percent of the sample participated in team sports such as football, rugby, American football and netball. Institutional ethics approval was obtained prior to the commencement of the study.

### Measures

**Vignette.** A sex-specific vignette, containing a description of a narcissistic teammate in a football team, was used in this study: André for male participants and Andrea for female participants (Appendix B). The description of the narcissistic teammate was adapted from Wallace and Baumeister's (2002) description of a narcissistic American football player, which we further developed to suit an association football context. Content validity was first established by discussing the vignette with narcissism and leadership research experts. In addition, five psychology Doctoral students familiar with narcissism research rated the extent to which they considered the description in the vignette to be of a narcissist on a 10-point Likert scale ( $M = 9.00$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ). A one-sample  $t$ -test further demonstrated the pertinence of the vignette in describing a narcissist ( $t = 28.46$ ,  $p < .001$ ).

**Inspirational motivation.** Inspirational motivation was assessed using the Inspirational Motivation subscale of the Differentiated Transformational Leadership Inventory (DTLI; Callow, Smith, Hardy, Arthur, & Hardy, 2009). The inspirational motivation subscale comprises four items (e.g., "He/She would talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in this game/season") that are rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*). Cronbach  $\alpha$  was .87 for the difficult game (short) and .85 for the whole season (long) scenarios in the current study.

**Leader effectiveness.** Leader effectiveness was assessed using a single item that was developed for the purposes of this study (“He/She would be an effective leader in this match/season”). Responses were made on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (*Strongly disagree*) to 5 (*Strongly agree*).

### Procedure

After reading the description of the study and providing consent, participants completed demographic items and were subsequently directed to the same-sex vignette. After reading the vignette, participants were asked to imagine themselves as new members of the football team and to consider their narcissistic teammate as the team captain across two scenarios: (a) for a single important and difficult cup game against a strong team, and (b) for the whole season. The former scenario represented a leadership role over a short period of time, while the latter scenario represented a leadership role over a long period of time. In order to test for within-subjects effects across the short and long term, all participants rated their narcissistic teammate across both short and long term scenarios.

### Results

The narcissistic teammate was rated higher in leader effectiveness for the short duration scenario ( $M = 3.12$ ,  $SD = 0.80$ ) compared to the long duration scenario ( $M = 2.74$ ,  $SD = 0.82$ ),  $t = 6.08$ ,  $p < .001$ . Similarly, inspirational motivation was also significantly higher for the short duration scenario ( $M = 3.55$ ,  $SD = 0.89$ ) compared to the long duration scenario ( $M = 3.24$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ),  $t = 5.01$ ,  $p < .001$ . Leader effectiveness was positively correlated with inspirational motivation in both the short duration ( $r = .64$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and long duration ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .001$ ) scenarios. The difference in leader effectiveness across scenarios was also significantly correlated with the change in inspirational motivation ( $r = .54$ ,  $p < .001$ ), which is the first

indication that transformational leadership might mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership (cf. Judd, Kenny, & McClelland, 2001).

### Discussion

In support of hypothesis 1, leader effectiveness was perceived to be significantly higher in a short duration scenario compared to a long duration scenario, which provides preliminary evidence that narcissists are perceived as more effective leaders in the short-term than in the long-term. This was further tested within a longitudinal design in Studies 1 and 2.

Similarly, inspirational motivation was perceived to be significantly greater in the short-term compared to the long-term. Additionally, the strong positive correlations between leader effectiveness and inspirational motivation in both the short and long duration scenarios suggest that the hypothesised temporal pattern of decreasing effectiveness of narcissistic leaders could be explained by how inspirational, or more broadly how transformational, they are perceived to be. The significant relationship between the leader effectiveness difference and the inspirational motivation difference across the two scenarios further supports hypothesis 2, suggesting a potential mediating effect of transformational leadership in the temporal relationship between narcissism and leadership.

Inspirational motivation is defined as the articulation of an exciting vision, inspiring others with this vision, and also expressing that followers can achieve the vision (Bass & Avolio, 2005). It has been proposed to be particularly effective in the early stages of the leadership cycle but less so later (see Shamir & Howell, 1999). Thus, it is perhaps not surprising that narcissists were perceived as effective in the short-term scenario but not in the long-term scenario. Although the visionary component of transformational leadership has been heavily postulated to impact temporal perceptions of narcissists as leaders, it is important to note that transformational leadership also comprises other components that could explain

temporal changes in narcissistic leadership. For example, individual consideration (where a leader shows respect and concern towards followers' feelings and needs) is a transformational leadership behaviour that has previously been negatively associated with narcissism (Khoo & Burch, 2008). Therefore, there is a need to investigate the more complete mediating role of transformational leadership on the relationship between narcissism and leadership, which we address in Chapter 3.

The results of this study were also limited by a number of experimental design flaws. First, despite the efforts to ascertain that the vignettes are descriptive of a high narcissist, the vignettes could still be construed as unreliable as there was an absence of a contrasting vignette (i.e., low narcissism vignette). The presence of a contrasting vignette manipulates narcissism levels, which would have made it possible to determine whether the observed effects were associated with either high or low narcissism. Second, the lack in counterbalancing the order of the scenarios could have led to order effects in a within-subjects design experiment such as the one employed in this study. More specifically, the participants responded to the long duration scenario after completing their ratings for the short duration scenario, which could have led to the skewing of responses in the long duration scenario not as a reflection of the participants' actual perceptions but perceptions that were relative to their responses in the previous short duration scenario. Future research should aim to minimise order effects by counterbalancing the response order of the scenarios; or perhaps even avoid it by introducing a between-subjects design where two separate, randomly selected, but demographically similar samples are assigned to each scenario. Although the latter recommendation is in conflict with the pseudo-longitudinal aims of this study in drawing out suggested temporal effects of narcissistic leader effectiveness, the reality of the vignette design confines this study to a cross-sectional nature, where any "temporal" findings are at best inferred. With such a constraint, a between-subjects



design could perhaps offer experimentally cleaner and clearer findings. Third, leader effectiveness was measured using a single item, which could be construed as psychometrically unsound practice in accurately capturing variable measurement. We address this issue of leadership measurement in Chapter 3 by replacing the single item in this study with a six-item measure of leadership used in Brunell et al., (2008).

In summary, this Pilot Study indicated that narcissists are more effective leaders in the short-term compared to the long-term; and offered some initial evidence that transformational leadership might mediate the narcissism - leadership relationship. We aimed to test the hypotheses more directly and comprehensively with a longitudinal design in Chapter 3.

**Chapter 3 –  
The Leader Ship is Sinking: A Temporal Investigation of Narcissistic  
Leadership<sup>23</sup>**

---

<sup>2</sup> Ong, C.W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C., Woodman, T., & Akehurst, S. (2015). The leader ship is sinking: A temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. *Journal of Personality*. doi: 10.1111/jopy.12155

<sup>3</sup> Ong, C. W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C., Woodman, T., & Akehurst, S. (2015, February). The leader ship is sinking: A temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. Poster presented at the 16th Society for Personality and Social Psychology Annual Convention, Long Beach, California.

### Abstract

**Objectives.** Individuals higher in narcissism have leader emergent tendencies. The characteristics of their personality suggest, however, that their leadership qualities will decrease over time as a function of group acquaintance. We present data from two studies that provide the first empirical support for this theoretical position within a transformational leadership framework. **Methods.** In Study 1 ( $n = 112$ ) we tested narcissistic leadership qualities in groups of unacquainted individuals over a 12-week period. In Study 2 ( $n = 152$ ) we adopted the same protocol with groups of acquainted individuals. **Results.** In Study 1, narcissism was positively associated with peer-rated leadership during initial group formation but not later. In Study 2, narcissism was not significantly associated with peer-rated leadership during initial group formation and was negatively associated with peer-rated leadership later. In Study 1, transformational leadership mediated the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially but not later on. In Study 2, transformational leadership failed to mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership throughout the study. **Conclusions.** Despite enjoying a honeymoon period of leadership, the appeal and attractiveness of the narcissistic leader rapidly wanes. This decline is explained in part by their changing transformational leadership qualities.

*Keywords:* transformational leadership, narcissism, time, group acquaintance, social relations model

### **The Leader Ship is Sinking: A Temporal Investigation of Narcissistic Leadership**

Relationships with narcissistic leaders can be a paradoxical experience, much like eating chocolate cake (Campbell, 2005; Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011). The first bite of a chocolate cake is usually rich in flavour and texture, and extremely gratifying. After a while, however, the richness of this flavour makes one feel increasingly nauseous. Being led by a narcissist<sup>4</sup> could be a similar experience: Narcissists might initially be perceived as effective leaders, but these positive perceptions may decrease over time. Originally developed to explain romantic relationships with narcissistic individuals, the Chocolate Cake Model (Campbell, 2005) has since been applied to describe the relationships between narcissistic leaders and their followers (Campbell et al., 2011).

Although the chocolate cake model is applicable to the temporal effect of narcissistic leadership, this effect remains complex because of the dyadic and dynamic nature of leadership (Dansereau et al., 1995; Foti, Knee, & Backert, 2008). Thus, understanding the dynamic and complex nature of the relationship between narcissism and leadership requires investigations that move beyond the simplistic position of examining whether narcissists make “good” or “bad” leaders. However, despite repeated calls (e.g., Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), there is currently no direct test of the temporal relationship between narcissism and leadership in the literature and no theoretical consideration of the role of transformational leadership within that temporal relationship. We aim to test the temporal component of narcissistic leadership

---

<sup>4</sup> The term “narcissist” has been commonly used in the literature (cf. Miller & Campbell 2011; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002) to refer to people scoring relatively higher on the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988), which is a measure of sub-clinical narcissism (i.e., not the NPD variant of narcissism). Consequently, we have used the term “narcissist” only when referring to and discussing previous research on sub-clinical narcissism. In addition, narcissism in the context of the current research is defined by narcissistic grandiosity, which is in line with previous theorisation of narcissistic leadership (e.g., Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006).

with a view to examining whether being led by people higher in narcissism is akin to eating chocolate cake. In providing the first empirical test of this theoretical position, we also present and explore a possible explanatory mechanism of this effect.

### **Narcissism and leadership**

The notion that narcissists have traits that lead followers to perceive them as leaders has been well-documented in the literature (e.g., Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Self-regulatory models (Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001) describe narcissists as individuals with positive, inflated, and predominantly agentic self-views who employ self-regulatory strategies in order to maintain or enhance these self-views. Thus, narcissists would be expected actively to seek out positions of leadership, because such positions might serve to promote their self-enhancement (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). From the perspective of the follower, narcissists seem to possess some of the requisite traits for effective leadership. For example, narcissists' extraverted disposition (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992) allows them to be socially skilled (Oltmanns, Friedman, Fiedler, & Turkheimer, 2004) and appear likable (Paulhus, 1998). Beyond extraversion, narcissists are also charismatic (Khoo & Burch, 2008), perform well in public tasks and difficult situations (Roberts, Callow, Hardy, Woodman, & Thomas, 2010; Roberts, Woodman, Hardy, Davis, & Wallace, 2013; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002; Woodman, Roberts, Hardy, Callow, & Rogers, 2011), and exude an aura of confidence and dominance (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992; Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Furthermore, many illustrious positions of leadership (e.g., the US presidency) have been occupied by individuals rated higher in narcissism (e.g., Deluga, 1997; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006; Watts et al., 2013). In summary, individuals higher in narcissism seem to possess traits that predispose followers to perceive them as effective leaders.

**Is narcissistic leadership durable?**

Despite their possession of seemingly effective leadership characteristics, narcissists are often rated negatively on their leadership qualities (e.g., Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008; Judge et al., 2006). One potential explanation for this paradox is the way that leadership has been conceptualised in the literature. That is, leadership has typically been defined and measured in two distinct ways: leadership *emergence* and leadership *effectiveness*. *Leadership emergence* is achieved by exercising influence or attaining high social status in a group of strangers. Contrastingly, *leadership effectiveness* is achieved by judgments of one's performance as a leader (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Thus, leader emergence and leader effectiveness are conceptually distinct and occur at distinct temporal phases, with leader emergence preceding leadership effectiveness. Despite the vast potential influence of temporality on a multitude of leadership behaviours and outcomes (see Shamir, 2011), there is a surprising dearth of consideration and evidence for the importance of temporality in leadership research (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008; Shamir, 2011).

The issue of temporality (or lack thereof) is equally evident when considering narcissistic characteristics and leadership. Indeed, many of the traits that propel narcissists into positions of leadership have been posited to be the same as those that precipitate their eventual downfall (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Narcissists at limited acquaintance might initially be perceived favourably as leaders because they are more extraverted (Brunell et al., 2008). Individuals high in extraversion possess confidence and strong social skills, which are essential for effective social interaction in leadership (e.g., Judge et al., 2002). The initial attractiveness of narcissists for leadership positions extends well beyond extraversion, however. Indeed, narcissists are also known to make better first impressions (Back et al., 2010; Carlson, Vazire, & Oltmanns, 2011; Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011; Paulhus, 1998),

which likely contribute to their tendency to emerge as leaders, particularly during zero-acquaintance situations (Brunell, et al., 2008; Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011). Further, their attraction to power has also been shown to bring about follower perceptions of narcissists as emergent leaders, beyond the effects of extraversion (Brunell et al., 2008). There is thus evidence that positive perceptions of narcissists in zero-acquaintance situations increase the likelihood of narcissists being regarded as emergent leaders. However, with increasing acquaintance, others view narcissists less favourably because narcissists are more arrogant, less entertaining, tend to brag, and overestimate their abilities (Paulhus, 1998). This temporal change highlights the importance and influence of acquaintance level on the temporal perceptions towards narcissistic leadership; whereby individuals higher in narcissism are deemed positively as leaders by newly-acquainted others, but less so by well-acquainted others. Consequently, since acquaintance is developed through accumulated interpersonal interactions over time, the variant findings between short- and long-term acquaintance suggests that temporality may be responsible for differences in perceptions of narcissistic leadership. As such, temporality of leadership is central to understanding the dynamics of the relationship between narcissism and leadership – an understanding that is currently plagued with inconsistency in the literature.

The nature of the narcissism-leadership relationship over time is compounded by the reciprocal influence that both the leader and the follower can have on the leader-follower relationship (e.g., Howell & Shamir, 2005). Although self-regulatory models of narcissism have allowed researchers to understand leadership through the lens of a narcissist, these models fail to account for the perspective of the follower and the potential temporal impact on the leader-follower relationship. As such, it is important to consider theoretical models (e.g., chocolate cake model) that might complement such self-regulatory models by providing a focus on the

perceptions of those who are engaged in relationships with narcissists. Such a consideration would allow us to understand how changing contexts over time might lead to different perceptions of narcissistic leaders (Campbell & Campbell, 2009).

Despite the theoretical advances that have been made regarding the dynamic relationship between narcissism and leadership, there is a dearth of evidence supporting this theorising. The closest empirical evidence for the temporal nature of the narcissism-leadership relationship comes from research focusing on the social cost of narcissists' decision-making strategies (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005). Campbell et al. demonstrated that narcissists' decision-making strategies focused on short-term gains at the expense of long-term benefits. Although these findings are somewhat supportive of narcissists' better performance in the short-term compared to the long-term, the decision-making paradigm does not integrate the social-interactional nature of leadership and thus cannot shed light on the temporal effectiveness of narcissistic leaders. It is this relative temporal effectiveness that is the focus of the present studies.

### **Transformational leadership as a mechanism**

There is likely a complex interplay between narcissism and leadership across time, and the specific mechanism via which the temporality of this relationship might unfold remains unclear. One likely explanation is that the specific changes in narcissists' leader behaviours evolve over the course of leadership. Specifically, transformational leadership might explain why narcissistic individuals are perceived initially as leaders and why such positive perceptions might wane over time. Transformational leadership is an approach to leadership that involves establishing relationships with followers through personal, emotional and inspirational exchanges, so that followers are motivated to perform beyond their expectations (Bass, 1985). Additionally, transformational leader behaviours are associated with a myriad of positive



outcomes, including: leader effectiveness, leader and/or group performance, satisfaction with the leader, follower motivation, and job satisfaction (see Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Indeed, the charismatic and visionary components of transformational leadership, which are positively linked with narcissism (Deluga, 1997; Khoo & Burch, 2008), will likely result in narcissists being initially perceived as effective leaders (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Thus, followers' perceptions of narcissistic leaders' effectiveness could be explained by narcissists' exhibition of transformational leadership behaviours.

The outcomes manifested through transformational leadership are also likely susceptible to the influence of time. For example, the positive impact of an inspirational speech given by a transformational leader might be short-lived unless its underlying vision is consistently reinforced by the leader's actions over time, and unless the leader expresses belief in the followers' ability to achieve that vision (see Shamir, 2011). Narcissists' ability to articulate a vision could influence followers to perceive them as transformational at the initial stage of leadership. However, given narcissists' continual striving for self-enhancement and personal glory to the extent of exploiting others for personal gain (e.g., Campbell et al., 2005; Jones, Woodman, & Barlow, 2014), their transformational leadership behaviours are likely to fade over time. Consequently, it is likely that transformational leadership will mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership effectiveness early during leadership, but not later. Specifically, the temporal reduction in this mediating effect is likely to be attributable to narcissists' diminishing display of transformational behaviours rather than any change in the well-established relationship between transformational leadership and leader effectiveness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004).

### **Present research**

The aim of the present research was twofold: (a) To test the hypothesis that individuals higher in narcissism will initially be perceived as leaders but that this perception will wane over time; and (b) to examine the mediating role of follower-perceived transformational leadership in the temporal perception of leaders who are higher in narcissism. We tested these predictions across two longitudinal studies utilising unacquainted groups in Study 1 and acquainted groups in Study 2. In Study 1, we hypothesised that individuals rated higher in narcissism would initially be perceived as leaders, but not beyond the initial group formation phase. In Study 2, we explored these hypotheses with acquainted groups, and specifically the hypothesis that narcissistic leadership would eventually be perceived as negative by followers. With respect to the mediating role of transformational leadership, we hypothesised that follower perceptions of transformational leadership would mediate the narcissism-leadership relationship initially but not over time.

### **Study 1**

#### **Method**

**Participants.** We recruited 142 freshmen students as part of a psychology module in their first week in university. The timing of this choice of participants maximised the likelihood of group members meeting for the first time or at least having minimal acquaintance with each other. After accounting for participant dropout, 112 participants (71 men and 41 women;  $M_{\text{age}} = 19.0$  years;  $SD = 1.81$ ) were randomly assigned to 24 leaderless groups of between four and six members ( $M = 4.67$  members;  $SD = 0.64$ ) and remained in the same groups throughout the study. A priori leader and follower roles were not assigned, thus enabling participants to develop and/or display leader behaviours during the group tasks (cf.

Judge et al., 2002). Institutional ethical approval was obtained prior to the commencement of the study.

### Measures

***Narcissism.*** We assessed narcissism using the self-report Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI comprises 40 pairs of forced-choice statements where participants are asked to select the statement that best describes them. For each pair of statements, participants decide between a narcissistic statement (e.g., “I am an extraordinary person”) and a non-narcissistic statement (e.g., “I am much like everybody else”). One point is scored for each narcissistic statement that is selected from each pair of statements. Following Brunell et al. (2008) we removed three pairs of statements that assess leadership (e.g., “I see myself as a good leader”) from the final NPI scores in order to minimise the incidence of common method variance (cf. Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003).

***Leadership.*** We assessed peer ratings of leadership using Brunell et al.’s (2008) leadership measure, which assesses the extent to which each group member serves as a leader for a group task (e.g., “Group member X assumed a leadership role in the group”). Responses to the six items were rated on a seven-point scale ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 7 (*very accurate*).

***Transformational leadership.*** We assessed peer ratings of transformational leadership using an adapted 10-item scale from the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (MLQ; Bass & Avolio, 2005). This adapted scale has been previously used by Barling, Loughin, and Kelloway (2002), who selected two items from each of the four components of transformational leadership (idealised influence, inspirational motivation, individual consideration, and intellectual consideration) and from contingent reward. Although contingent reward is

considered a transactional behaviour, it was included because it has previously loaded consistently with the four transformational leadership components (Barling et al., 2002; Carless, 1998), and correlated highly with the dimensions of transformational leadership (.68 - .77, see Avolio, Bass, & Jung, 1999). Additionally, an exploratory factor analysis with varimax rotation conducted by Barling et al. (2002) supported a single-factor structure that accounted for 55.5% of variance. Similar exploratory factor analyses performed on the present data also consistently supported a single-factor structure that accounted for between 46.6% and 82.9% variance for peer-rated transformational leadership. Responses to the items were rated on a five-point scale ranging from 0 (*not at all*) to 4 (*frequently if not always*).

### **Procedure**

The study was incorporated into a 12-week course as an experiential learning component of the course where students were asked to complete weekly group tasks in exchange for points. Feedback on group performance was presented in a league table at the beginning of each weekly lecture. The groups competed against each other for points and we told participants that the top three groups at the end of the study would win cash prizes of £50, £30, £20, respectively.

In the first week, we briefed participants that the study required them to work in groups to compete for points against other groups, gave assurances of confidentiality, and explained their right to withdraw from the study. After providing consent, participants completed a questionnaire pack that included narcissism and demographic questions.

In the second week, the participants engaged in their first group task. The groups completed a total of seven weekly tasks throughout the course, each lasting five minutes. The weekly tasks that were completed by the groups were common general knowledge tasks, such as naming all the medalists of Team Great Britain at the London 2012 Olympics, identifying the

states of the USA on a blank map, and problem solving activities such as number puzzles.<sup>5</sup> After completing the first group task in Week 2, participants appraised their group members' leadership and transformational leadership. These round-robin peer leadership and transformational leadership evaluations were completed again after the group tasks in Weeks 4, 8 and 11. In Week 12, the final results were announced and the top three groups were awarded the cash prizes.

### Data analysis

**Round-robin peer ratings.** Due to the round-robin nature of the study, we applied the Social Relations Model (Kenny, 1994) to the peer ratings for leadership and transformational leadership. The social relations model takes into account the interdependent nature of dyadic and intergroup perceptions, and segregates the peer ratings into perceiver, target, and relationship effects. In this study, we only extracted *target effects*, because these are independent of perceiver and relationship biases and we were only interested in the extent of group agreement on the leadership of a given target (see Kenny, 1994). Estimates of target effects were derived using the TripleR package (Schönbrodt, Back, & Schmukle, 2012; see Gebauer, Sedikides, Verplanken, & Maio, 2012 for a similar approach) operating on R (R Core Team, 2013), while accounting for the multiple groups.

**Multilevel modeling.** Given the nested nature of the data of participants within groups, and participants' leadership target effects being estimated at each time point, multilevel modeling was used to test the hypothesis that the narcissism-leadership relationship would change across time. Since the effect at each time point was of interest, we subjected the data to a multilevel multivariate response model. The proposed model comprised three hierarchical

---

<sup>5</sup> Details of the activities are available on request from the first author.

levels: time at Level 1, individuals at Level 2, and groups at Level 3. All analyses were tested using MLwiN via the iterative generalised least squares (IGLS) function (V.2.25; Rasbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2012).

Before conducting multilevel analyses, we standardised narcissism scores within each sex to control for sex differences (cf. Tchanz, Morf, & Turner, 1998). All variables were also group mean centred. We used group mean centering rather than grand mean centering because it enabled us to analyse the relationships at the individual level by removing the influence of group (Enders & Tofighi, 2007). As we aimed to investigate the effects of narcissism at the individual level on the outcome variable across time, the removal of between group variance through group mean centering before analysis was appropriate. We employed group mean centering for all leadership target effects when accounting for groups in TripleR, and for narcissism in MLwiN.

***Multilevel mediation.*** We tested the hypothesised mediating role of transformational leadership on the narcissism-leadership relationship with multilevel mediation analyses. We calculated the indirect effect of the *a* (narcissism predicting transformational leadership) and *b* (transformational leadership predicting leadership) paths (cf. Bauer, Preacher, & Gil, 2006) and subsequently tested this effect with the Monte Carlo Method for Assessing Mediation (MCMAM; Bauer et al., 2006; MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams, 2004) calculator developed by Selig and Preacher (2008). The MCMAM calculator was specified at 95% confidence interval and 20,000 repetitions.

## Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the variables are presented in Table 1. Although the correlations provide some indication of the associations between narcissism and peer leadership perceptions, they are not indicative of possible relationships that arise from group

membership, which warrants a multilevel approach. Initial inspection of the multilevel model revealed a non-significant reduction in the -2loglikelihood statistic when the random slopes model was specified over the random intercepts model. Consequently, the random intercepts model was adopted because allowing Level 3 slopes to vary did not significantly improve the model. As expected, ICCs derived from the basic model for leadership target effects were .00 across all time points since group level variance has already been accounted for in the a priori round-robin analyses<sup>6</sup>. However, a three-level model was still specified because narcissism could relate differentially to leadership within each group. The main effect of narcissism on leadership target effects was positive and significant at Time 1 ( $\beta_0 = .18$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $p = .02$ ), but non-significant at Time 2 ( $\beta_1 = .10$ ,  $SE = .06$ ,  $p = .11$ ), Time 3 ( $\beta_2 = .11$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $p = .18$ ) and Time 4 ( $\beta_3 = .11$ ,  $SE = .07$ ,  $p = .12$ ).

---

<sup>6</sup> ICCs derived for peer-rated leadership prior to accounting for group level effects were 0.00 at Time 1, 0.01 at Time 2, 0.33 at Time 3 and 0.05 at Time 4 in Study 1. In Study 2, the ICCs for peer-rated leadership prior to accounting for group level effects were 0.52 at Time 1 and 0.12 at Time 2. The ICCs were near zero at Time 1 and Time 2 in Study 1, which could be due to unacquainted groups being assigned at random (i.e., an indication that randomisation was successful). Group differences are minimised if members are assigned randomly as observed in other studies that have used a similar small group zero-acquaintance paradigm, where substantive between group differences are absent (e.g., Albright, Kenny, & Malloy, 1988; Kenny, Horner, Kashy, & Chu, 1992; Malloy & Albright, 1990). As group members become more acquainted across time, the effect of randomisation is likely to wear out, resulting in more considerable group differences. Consequently, substantial group level effects were evident from the ICCs observed at Time 3 and Time 4 of Study 1. Furthermore, higher ICCs were also observed in Study 2, which utilised self-selected, acquainted groups.

**Table 1**

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations between narcissism and peer-rated leadership perceptions in Study 1

		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Narcissism	13.72	6.77	(.85)								
2	Leadership Time 1	4.40	0.76	.17	(.92)							
3	Leadership Time 2	4.64	1.12	.15	.39**	(.93)						
4	Leadership Time 3	4.46	0.88	.12	.23	.61**	(.90)					
5	Leadership Time 4	4.47	0.87	.08	.45**	.68**	.87**	(.88)				
6	Transformational leadership Time 1	2.57	0.55	.22*	.82**	.56**	.47*	.44**	(.91)			
7	Transformational leadership Time 2	2.47	0.55	.17	.52**	.85**	.54**	.54**	.64**	(.93)		
8	Transformational leadership Time 3	2.47	0.63	-.14	.29	.46*	.64**	.72**	.15	.51**	(.94)	
9	Transformational leadership Time 4	2.37	0.56	.08	.25	.62**	.61**	.75**	.27	.45*	.51**	(.92)

Note: The range of total score is 0-37 for narcissism; 1-7 for mean peer-rated leadership; and 0-4 for mean peer-rated transformational leadership. Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients are presented in parentheses (nb.  $\alpha$ s for leadership and transformational leadership were averaged across group members). Correlations are between narcissism and target effects of leadership and transformational leadership.

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



**Mediation analysis.** The hypothesis that transformational leadership would mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially but not later was tested using multilevel mediation analysis. As recommended by Bauer et al. (2006) the simple product term  $a * b$  was used to quantify the indirect effect. Multilevel mediation analyses revealed significant indirect effects at Time 1 ( $\beta_a = .10, SE = .04, p = .01; \beta_b = 1.82, SE = .13, p = .00$ ; indirect effect 95% CI [.05, .31]) and Time 2 ( $\beta_a = .09, SE = .04, p = .01; \beta_b = 1.63, SE = .14, p = .00$ ; indirect effect [.03, .26]) but not at Time 3 ( $\beta_a = .01, SE = .04, p = .69; \beta_b = 1.19, SE = .25, p = .00$ ; indirect effect [-.07, .10]) or Time 4 ( $\beta_a = .04, SE = .05, p = .35; \beta_b = .85, SE = .15, p = .00$ ; indirect effect [-.04, .12]). Despite significant indirect effects only being evident at Time 1 and Time 2, it is noteworthy that the  $b$  paths (transformational leadership predicting leadership) were significant and positive at each time point.

### Discussion

Individuals rated higher in narcissism were initially perceived as leaders, but these perceptions disappeared over time; this finding was as hypothesised and is consistent with the chocolate cake model. Transformational leadership significantly mediated the relationship between narcissism and leadership early on but this mediating effect also dissipated over time. This dissipation was largely a specific reflection of the dissipation of the narcissism transformational leadership relationship. Indeed, the effect of transformational leadership on leadership remained consistently positive across each of the four time points. This finding is informative because it supports previous research that has revealed a strong association between transformational leadership behaviours and effective leadership (see Judge & Piccolo, 2004) and suggests that the leadership decline of individuals higher in narcissism is associated with a relative decline in the degree to which they display transformational leadership behaviours.

By utilising unacquainted groups in this study, we minimised prior knowledge of a person's narcissistic qualities, thereby maximising the likelihood of achieving a zero-acquaintance environment for leader emergence. The initial positive perceptions of narcissistic leadership in unacquainted groups – and not when the groups become more acquainted – is consistent with previous research, which has revealed that narcissists are viewed more positively by new acquaintances than by close others (Back et al., 2010; Carlson et al., 2011; Paulhus, 1998). Nonetheless, our 12-week protocol does not allow us to extrapolate any inferences beyond the emergent phase of leadership in unacquainted groups. That is, although we have established that unacquainted groups soon tire of leaders who display narcissistic traits, we remain somewhat in the dark with regard to the emergent phase of leadership among acquainted groups. For example, after a longer period of acquaintance one would expect that the groups would not only have tired of many of the narcissistic leadership traits but would actively see these narcissistic traits as detrimental to effective leadership. Thus, in order to test the robustness of our hypotheses and to explore narcissism-leadership effects beyond the initial unacquainted phase, in Study 2, we used acquainted group members. The use of acquainted groups increases the likelihood of group members having prior knowledge of narcissistic group members' leadership qualities, or lack thereof. Such a protocol allows for the examination of leadership perceptions in an acquainted phase that is beyond the more artificially derived (but yet untainted by acquaintance) leader emergence phase of Study 1.

## Study 2

### Method

**Participants.** We recruited 152 students (95 men, 56 women, 1 unreported) from psychology modules<sup>7</sup> in junior and senior years. The participants were self-assigned to 29 groups each comprising four to six members ( $M = 5.24$  members;  $SD = 0.58$ ) and remained in the same groups throughout the study. As in Study 1 a priori leader and follower roles were not assigned. Institutional ethical approval was obtained prior to the commencement of the study.

### Measures

***Narcissism, leadership and transformational leadership.*** These were measured and derived in the same way as in Study 1. Exploratory factor analyses of the transformational leadership scale supported a single-factor structure that accounted for between 37.5% and 73.3% variance for peer-rated transformational leadership.

### Procedure

The procedure was the same as in Study 1. Participants completed round-robin peer leadership and transformational leadership evaluations at two time points: at Time 1 – after the first group task (Week 2), and at Time 2 – after the last group task (Week 11).

### Data analysis

We used the same round-robin and multilevel analyses as in Study 1.

---

<sup>7</sup> In British universities, it is typical for students in the same degree programme to register for the same modules, which results in a core group of students with frequent opportunities to interact with each other during tutorials, group work, etc. The sample recruited in Study 2 comprised students who were in the second semester of their junior and senior years, and had been acquainted with each other for at least one and a half years. The participants recruited in Study 2 were not the same participants as in Study 1.

## Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the variables are presented in Table 2. We tested the hypothesis that individuals rated higher in narcissism would eventually be negatively perceived as leaders using multilevel analysis. Initial model inspection revealed a non-significant reduction in the -2loglikelihood statistic when the random slopes model was specified over the random intercepts model. Consequently, we used a random intercepts model. The main effects of narcissism on leadership target effects were non-significant at Time 1 ( $\beta_2 = -.03$ ,  $SE = .04$ ,  $p = .43$ ) and significantly negative at Time 2 ( $\beta_3 = -.09$ ,  $SE = .05$ ,  $p = .049$ ).

## Mediation analysis

As with Study 2, the simple product term  $a * b$  was used to quantify the indirect effect. Multilevel mediation analyses with transformational leadership target effects as a mediator revealed non-significant indirect effects for Time 1 ( $\beta_a = -.03$ ,  $SE = .04$ ,  $p = .39$ ;  $\beta_b = .61$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $p = .00$ ; indirect effect 95% CI [-.07, .03]) and Time 2 ( $\beta_a = -.02$ ,  $SE = .05$ ,  $p = .73$ ;  $\beta_b = .28$ ,  $SE = .09$ ,  $p = .00$ ; indirect effect [-.04, .02]). Despite no significant indirect effects, the  $b$  path (transformational leadership predicting leadership) was consistently significant and positive.

## Discussion

The finding that individuals rated higher in narcissism were not perceived as leaders initially and were negatively perceived as leaders later on is consistent with the hypothesis within the chocolate cake model framework. Transformational leadership did not mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership at either time point, as hypothesised. The effect of transformational leadership on leadership remained positive and significant across both time points, which is consistent with the findings from Study 1. This consistent positive effect observed between transformational leadership and leadership further supports the notion that

the temporal perceptions of individuals higher in narcissism as leaders are dependent on the degree to which they display transformational behaviours.

In the acquainted groups of Study 2, in contrast to the unacquainted groups of Study 1, there was no honeymoon period and the individuals higher in narcissism were eventually perceived negatively. Previous research has shown that narcissists are viewed less positively by close others than by new acquaintances (Back et al., 2010; Carlson et al., 2011; Paulhus, 1998) - an effect that is strengthened by the present temporal design. The contextual difference between acquainted and unacquainted groups supports our earlier suggestion that perceptions of narcissistic leadership in more temporally advanced contexts are different from those perceptions where leadership is still in its infancy.

T-11-2

Temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership

Means

Standard deviations, and zero-order correlations between narcissism and peer-rated leadership perceptions in Study 2

		Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1	Narcissism	13.90	7.31	(.87)				
2	Leadership Time 1	4.36	0.76	.03	(.88)			
3	Leadership Time 2	4.54	1.10	-.19	.37**	(.94)		
4	Transformational leadership Time 1	2.81	0.39	-.08	.54**	.20	(.85)	
5	Transformational leadership Time 2	3.63	2.74	-.05	.09	.24**	.10	(.94)

Note: Range of total score is 0-37 for narcissism; 1-7 for mean peer-rated leadership; and 0-4 for mean peer-rated transformational leadership. Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients are presented on the diagonal in parentheses (nb.  $\alpha$ s for leadership and transformational leadership were averaged across group members). Correlations are between narcissism and target effects of leadership and transformational leadership.

\*\* $p < .05$ .

### General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was twofold: (a) to test the hypothesis that individuals rated higher in narcissism would be perceived as leaders early on before losing such favour over time, and (b) to examine the mediating role of transformational leadership on the narcissism-leadership relationship across time.

We examined the temporality of narcissistic leadership via longitudinal investigations of groups comprising unacquainted and acquainted members in Studies 1 and 2, respectively. This approach enabled us to investigate narcissistic leadership during initial unacquainted group formation and in the more acquainted and established temporal phases of leadership<sup>8</sup>. The findings in Study 1 revealed that individuals higher in narcissism were perceived as leaders by unacquainted group members initially but not later on. In Study 2<sup>9</sup> we found that acquainted group members did not rate individuals higher in narcissism as leaders and later rated narcissism as a negative leadership trait. Taken together, the findings of the two studies are consistent with the chocolate cake model (Campbell, 2005; Campbell et al., 2011) and demonstrate that initial positive peer perceptions of narcissistic leadership fade over time, and eventually become negative.

---

<sup>8</sup> The assumption that the participants in Study 2 were more familiar with one another relative to the participants in Study 1 was inferred by the purposefully crafted instructions for group formation. Specifically, it is assumed that self-selected groups comprising junior and senior year university students would be more acquainted than randomly assigned groups comprising freshmen university students. Such an assumption, however, could be strengthened by the inclusion of an objective measure of acquaintance and/or familiarity as a manipulation check.

<sup>9</sup> Study 2 can be considered a direct replication of Study 1 in terms of the first and last assessment. Study 2 replicated the waning of perceptions towards narcissistic leaders over time. However, the utilisation of participants with varying levels of acquaintance from Study 1 meant that the temporal pattern was different, in that non-significant perceptions of narcissistic leaders eventually became negative over time in Study 2 rather than the observed initial favourable perceptions that became non-significant over time in Study 1.

The peer-rated effects from both studies also complement previous predictions that individuals who possess the qualities that are suitable for leader emergence do not necessarily possess the qualities for leader effectiveness (Hogan et al., 1994; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Indeed, it has been suggested that narcissists' excellent social skills act as a buffer for their more undesirable traits that are geared towards agentic self-enhancement (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Thus, the observed peer-rated effects are consistent with theoretical predictions of how narcissists would fare as leaders over time, both from a self-regulatory and follower perspective.

Across the two studies we also examined whether transformational leadership could explain why narcissistic leadership wanes over time. In Study 1, transformational leadership in unacquainted groups mediated the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially, but not later. In Study 2, with more acquainted groups, transformational leadership was not a meaningful mediator of the narcissism-leadership relationship. It is noteworthy that a consistent significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and leadership was revealed across all time points across both studies. This consistent relationship further supports the beneficial effects of transformational leadership on leader effectiveness (Judge & Piccolo, 2004). Specifically in the context of narcissistic leadership, the degree to which individuals higher in narcissism are viewed as leaders over time will likely be dependent on how capable they are of displaying the requisite transformational behaviours within their group.

Beyond the initial stage of leadership, positive follower perceptions of narcissistic leadership could gradually be damaged by the perceived lack of transformational leadership behaviours on offer, as individuals higher in narcissism are more likely to display behaviours that serve their drive for self-enhancement. In the initial stage of leadership, however, it is likely that individuals higher in narcissism have the ability to portray visionary aspects of



transformational leadership making them attractive as leaders (Khoo & Burch, 2004; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). Indeed, followers find visionary leaders more appealing than representative leaders who focus on their group's collective identity (Halevy, Berson, & Galinsky, 2011). Besides *vision*, transformational leadership also comprises strong *support* and *challenge* components (Arthur, Hardy & Woodman, 2012; Hardy et al., 2010), both of which could be particularly crucial beyond the initial stage of leadership. For example, *individual consideration* is a *support* component of transformational leadership and narcissists' relative lack of individual consideration (Khoo & Burch, 2008) may well contribute to the eventual decay of their leadership effectiveness.

Individuals rated higher in narcissism might also be positively perceived as leaders during the initial stage of leadership by virtue of being placed in a context that is optimal for them to emerge as leaders. Being randomly assigned to groups with unacquainted group members in Study 1 inadvertently created a more uncertain social context (relative to the acquainted group context of Study 2) in which narcissistic leadership can thrive. Indeed, narcissists are more likely to be chosen as leaders in uncertain contexts, despite followers being aware of their undesirable traits (Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, & Ten Velden, 2013), and are considered effective leaders even when performance suggests otherwise (Nevicka, Ten Velden, et al., 2011).

### **Future research and applied implications**

The present data suggest that it is the ability of individuals with narcissistic traits to display transformational leadership behaviours that enables them to be perceived as leaders early on. Transformational leadership involves the establishment of emotional relationships between leader and follower, which could be particularly impactful beyond the initial stage of leadership. One emotional aspect that could be useful for leadership beyond the initial stage –

and one that narcissists are theorised to lack – is empathy (e.g., Watson & Morris, 1991). Empathy has been positively linked with leadership (Kellett, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2006) and has been shown to impact group cohesion (Van Vugt & Schaller, 2008). If narcissistic leaders have the capacity to become more empathic towards their followers then perhaps the durability of the follower satisfaction in their leadership might increase. Empathy is considered a multidimensional construct that involves cognitive and affective components (Vreeke & van der Mark, 2003). Cognitive empathy is the ability to discern the emotional states of others without undergoing emotional contagion, while affective empathy is an observer's emotional response to the affective state of others (Davis, 1983). Contrary to reports that narcissists lack empathy, narcissists have been found to be capable of cognitive empathy, although they lack affective empathy (Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). Furthermore, perspective-taking has been shown to increase narcissists' empathy (Hepper, Hart, & Sedikides, 2014). This leads to the intriguing prospect that narcissists who are capable of displaying empathic behaviours, and who understand the importance of displaying such behaviours, might enjoy a longer period of follower-endorsed leadership.

Narcissists are attracted to leadership because it is perceived as an opportunity for self-enhancement (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). Evidently, an element of self-enhancement appears critical to motivate narcissists to act upon something. Drawing from previous research on task persistence (Wallace, Ready, & Weitenhagen, 2009), it seems that narcissists are more likely to persist in their leadership roles only to the degree that competing opportunities for self-enhancement are absent. Such persistence might be hard to enact in reality, however. Indeed, narcissists are less likely to delay gratification (Vazire & Funder, 2006) and more likely to take advantage of more immediate opportunities for self-enhancement over more complex self-enhancing opportunities (Wallace et al., 2009). This fixation on instant self-enhancement

suggests that narcissists can be effective leaders provided that they are constantly focused on short-term self-enhancing goals. Additionally, when working in groups, narcissists perform better as leaders by engaging in more non-verbal communication and team assistance under the context of high reward interdependence (Nevicka, De Hoogh, et al., 2011), which suggests that narcissists can be drawn towards self-enhancement through the achievement of group goals. Consequently, organisations can encourage narcissists to be more effective leaders over time by structuring more self-enhancing short-term leadership goals that are highly interdependent. For example, traditional annual work reviews can be restructured into regular monthly reviews where narcissists' leadership performance is judged by team feedback and performance.

Although the decline of initial positive peer perceptions of leadership appears characteristic of narcissistic leaders, Boal and Hooijberg (2000) proposed that such a temporal pattern of leadership is rather more universal. Termed the "honeymoon effect", this temporal decline is thought to be caused by leadership stagnation that could emerge from overconfidence, homogeneity, or complacency (Giambatista, 2004). Narcissistic leaders might suffer from the honeymoon aftermath much like any leader displaying the aforementioned traits, since leader training and selection criteria in general seem to promote narcissistic characteristics that are favourable towards leader emergence in the first place (Campbell et al., 2011). Thus, an overemphasis on the qualities that promote leader emergence not only suits narcissists but could also lead to a higher concentration of narcissists in leadership positions, and paradoxically less effective leadership. Future research would benefit from exploring how individuals higher in narcissism perform in leadership selection processes that focus on aspects that are important for leadership effectiveness rather than leadership emergence, and whether these processes can be incorporated within current practices in leadership recruitment. Such a leadership recruitment awareness and focus would stand to increase the likelihood of selecting

“temporally resilient” leadership and enhance organisational stability. Put simply, the leader that looks good at first may be precisely the leader to avoid for the long-term.

### **Limitations**

The main limitation of the present research is its external validity because of the exclusive use of students. However, this population afforded an excellent naturalised environment to test the hypotheses, and we were able to utilise samples at varying degrees of acquaintance to explore effects over an extended period. Such a stable environment might not be so easily achievable in other organisational settings. A second limitation of the studies was the lack of consideration of group performance. This concern is rather modest, however, because performance scores were used as a motivator for continued engagement across the timeline, which was important in allowing leadership to be continually relevant across time. In other words, performance was not conceptualised as a dependent variable. Nonetheless, given that organisational performance is volatile when fronted by narcissistic leaders (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007), temporal investigations of team performance appear worthy of research attention. A third limitation of the present research was its quasi-longitudinal design, which enabled us to examine different temporal phases of leadership, but not with the same sample of participants. The two time-point design employed in Study 2 was also experimentally weaker relative to the four time-point design used in Study 1.<sup>10</sup> A repeated measures design that presents a consistent investigation of narcissistic leadership over an extended temporal phase would be an interesting extension of the present research.

---

<sup>10</sup> Study 2 was conducted chronologically before Study 1, and thus was less sophisticated in its experimental design. We have made improvements to Study 1 by introducing four time points as opposed to two time points in Study 2.

### **Conclusion**

Individuals higher in narcissism are initially perceived as leaders in unacquainted leaderless groups. They do not enjoy these positive perceptions for long, however, and eventually suffer a decline towards negative perceptions from their followers. The initial positive perception of individuals higher in narcissism as leaders is mediated by their display of appropriate transformational leadership behaviours such that their effectiveness is largely dependent on how transformational they are perceived to behave.

**Chapter 4 –  
The Leader Ship is Destined to Sink: An Evolutionary Perspective on  
the Decline of the Narcissistic Leader**

### Abstract

Narcissists' obsession with self-enhancement lead them to actively pursue high social status, and attaining leadership positions are particularly attractive in that respect. This pursuit of leadership positions has led narcissists to be positively perceived as leaders initially, but not across time. According to evolutionary perspectives, self-enhancement is an evolved self-disposition that can be satiated through the achievement of high social status by prestige and/or dominance strategies. Consequently, narcissists' utilisation of either prestige or dominance strategies at different times could explain why they are favourably perceived as leaders initially but not later on. We present the first empirical evidence for the temporality of narcissistic leadership within the theory of evolutionary social status seeking, by testing narcissistic individuals' leadership over a 12-week period. We found that narcissism was positively associated with peer-rated leadership during initial group formation but not later. Prestige predicted leadership robustly over time, but dominance predicted leadership only in the short-term. Although both prestige and dominance mediated the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially, this effect waned over the course of 12 weeks. The modifications in peer perceptions of prestige and dominance strategies utilised by narcissists explain the temporal changes of narcissistic leadership.

### **The Leader Ship was Destined to Sink: An Evolutionary Perspective of the Decline of the Narcissistic Leader**

The origins of leadership probably occurred 2.5 million years ago, when ancestral humans, the genus *Homo*, roamed the earth. The concept of leadership adopted by the genus *Homo* was widely considered to resemble that of the Melanesian “Big Man” (Sahlins, 1963), described as, “...like a banyan ... though the biggest and tallest in the forest, is still a tree like the rest. But, just because it exceeds all others, the banyan gives support to more lianas and creepers, provides more food for the birds, and gives better protection against sun and rain.” (Hogbin, 1943, p. 258). “Big Man” leadership was dominant because leadership in characteristically egalitarian societies at that time was limited by expertise and granted only by followers. However, in the present day human societies have become increasingly hierarchical, rendering “Big Man” leadership unsuitable across various contemporary situations and contexts. In its place, researchers have begun to examine other prominent leadership traits (e.g., personality; DeRue, Nahrgang, Wellman, & Humphrey, 2011, and Judge et al., 2002) that may help to explain leadership (in)effectiveness. Of relevance to the present study is the personality of narcissism.

The current popularity of narcissistic leadership is supported empirically. Given their drive for self-enhancement (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002), it is not surprising that narcissists actively pursue and are highly successful in achieving leadership positions (Brunell et al., 2008). However, positive peer perceptions of narcissistic leaders only last for a short honeymoon period, as narcissists are eventually rated negatively by their peers (Ong, Roberts, Arthur, Woodman, & Akehurst, 2015). The temporality of narcissistic leadership clearly indicates that narcissistic tendencies can either be adaptive or maladaptive for leadership, and the extent to which these tendencies are adaptive or maladaptive is largely dependent on time. From an



evolutionary perspective, self-enhancement is considered an evolved self-disposition (Sedikides, Skowronski, & Gaertner, 2004; von Hippel & Trivers, 2011) that can be satiated through the achievement of high social status by prestige and/or dominance strategies (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001; Tracy, Cheng, Martens, & Robins, 2011). Thus, narcissists' obsession with self-enhancement and their initial highly successful pursuit of leadership positions could be an evolved psychological adaptation in attempts to guarantee their *survival* over time.

Consequently, placing the temporality of narcissistic leadership within an evolutionary framework could offer potential explanations for the temporally dynamic relationship between narcissism and leadership. In this study, we apply an evolutionary framework to examine the temporality of narcissistic leadership, and to investigate the evolutionary strategies that could be responsible for the rise and fall of narcissistic leaders over time.

### **Evolutionary perspectives of leadership**

Although a wealth of research exists within current psychological investigations on leadership (e.g., Bennis, 2007; Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Van Vugt, 2006), much of this literature has been disparate and little attempt has been made to integrate them under a unifying theoretical framework (Chemers, 2000; Van Vugt, 2006). Evolutionary theories have offered complementary explanations to psychological postulations (Barrett, Dunbar, & Lycett, 2002) and could possibly provide a suitable encompassing framework to integrate psychological empirical findings in leadership (Van Vugt, 2006).

The main premise of evolution is to succeed in the competition to survive and reproduce (i.e., evolutionary fitness), which can be achieved through selected adaptations that maximise fitness benefits and minimise fitness costs. These selected adaptations have evolved to address chronic and recurrent problems that affect the chances of survival and reproduction (Tooby & Cosmides, 2005). Psychologically evolved adaptations in leader-follower relationships are no

different (cf. Van Vugt & Ronay, 2014), as they are likely to have evolved over time to provide solutions to group coordination problems (e.g., more success when hunting in numbers instead of individually; cf. Tooby & Cosmides, 1992). Specifically, group coordination requires group decisions on a myriad of problems to maximise survival chances, which could be facilitated by the emergence of a leader – which in turn suggests that leadership is selected as a positive adaptation that enhances evolutionary fitness. However, psychological findings on leadership depict that not all people are attracted to – or suitable as – leaders (e.g., Judge et al., 2002). This view is consistent with evolutionary theorisation that leadership and followership co-evolve in humans, which implies that these roles can be adaptive under the right conditions (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Henrich and Gil-White postulated that natural selection favoured humans who had the ability to procure cultural information, by getting close to and learning from knowledgeable and/or skilled others in the group. In return for increased social learning, the fitness cost for followers would be for them to defer benefits (e.g., by offering food, mates, etc.) to these knowledgeable and/or skilled others, who in turn benefit from the deference and grant followers permission to copy their knowledge and skills. This “exchange” between copying knowledge and skills and providing deference in return is an elaborated form of “reciprocal altruism” (Trivers, 1971), which, when balanced, can lead to optimal leader-follower relationships.

The notion of reciprocity to create mutually beneficial leader-follower relationships is further extended by an evolutionary model, where two paths are proposed for attaining social status: *prestige* and *dominance* (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Although prestige and dominance are conceptually distinct from each other, both have been shown to be viable pathways to achieving leadership (Cheng, Tracy, Foulsham, Kingstone, & Henrich, 2013). Prestige refers to the attainment of higher social status through the achievement of expertise that is valued and

respected by others without the need for coercion. Contrastingly, dominance refers to the attainment of social status through the use of intimidation and coercion, mainly through the induction of fear. Thus, leader-follower relationship is operationalised by an exchange of fitness costs and benefits that is achieved through the means of prestige and dominance.

Although Henrich and Gil-White's (2001) theorisation of leadership is consistent with evolutionary ideas of reciprocity and the decisions surrounding fitness costs and benefits, it seems that the prestige offered in exchange for experts providing information is conceptualised as more of a private good (Price & Van Vugt, 2014a; 2014b). The service-for-prestige theory suggests that besides private goods, leaders also provide public goods (e.g., assume fitness costs by coordinating group members to acquire a shared resource) and should be compensated by receiving prestige collectively from the group (Price & Van Vugt, 2014a; 2014b). The assertion that leaders provide public goods is perhaps most evident during initial group formation, where group coordination is urgent. Individuals who can provide solutions towards group coordination, either through prestige or dominance strategies, would likely be recognised by group members as emergent leaders. However, the public nature of the leader's contribution would most likely result in a collective action problem where leaders incur fitness costs to provide public goods (i.e., contributions that benefit all group members), while followers, incentivised by a higher net fitness benefit, receive public goods and decide to free-ride by not conferring (sufficient) prestige to the leader. Unless mechanisms such as punishment and social exclusion are in place to neutralise the advantages of free-riding, leaders might disengage from the leader-follower relationship by offering either fewer or no public goods. Although dominant individuals tend not to be well-liked (Cheng, Tracy, & Henrich, 2010), it might be necessary in order to either: a) facilitate leadership functions such as enforcing rules within the group to neutralise the advantages of free-riding, thereby minimising the collective action

problem (Van Vugt, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2008), or b) achieve a leadership position from which leaders are in the position to administer prestige strategies. This postulation furthers the current understanding that both prestige and dominance are distinct, yet equally viable strategies for achieving leader characteristics of high social rank and influence (Cheng et al., 2013) - particularly from a temporal perspective, where prestige and dominance could independently and differentially determine leader effectiveness across time.

### **The temporality of narcissistic leadership within an evolutionary framework**

As described earlier, self-regulatory motivations of narcissism (Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001) and the evolutionary perspectives of self-enhancement (Sedikides et al., 2004; von Hippel & Trivers, 2011) have identified self-enhancement as key to the preservation of narcissistic self-views and the enhancement of human evolutionary fitness respectively. Thus, it is unsurprising that narcissists, in their evolutionary quest to survive and reproduce, are attracted to attaining leadership positions; and have developed evolved psychological adaptations to maximise their success in doing so. Consequently, viewing narcissistic leadership from an evolutionary social status perspective can not only offer insights into the evolutionary interplay between leadership and narcissism, but also potentially explain the temporal changes in narcissistic leaders' downfall.

Narcissists tend to succeed as emergent leaders particularly in newly-acquainted groups (Brunell et al., 2008; Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain, 2011; Ong et al., 2015), where leader-follower roles are not yet established. As we have alluded to earlier, the context of working together in newly-acquainted groups effectively presents a group coordination problem that requires leadership; and narcissists, who covet self-enhancement in the form of higher social status, take advantage of certain evolved narcissistic adaptations in order to emerge as leaders. Since leader-follower roles would have been uncertain during initial

group formation, service-for-prestige posits that leaders and followers share mutual social bargaining power, and potential leaders are likely to establish reciprocity with potential followers by offering public goods in return for prestige. This is consistent with previous findings on how narcissistic leaders are often the preferred choice during situations of uncertainty (Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, & Ten Velden, 2013), possibly with the understanding that during times of leadership uncertainty, adopting prestige strategies that aim to establish reciprocity would be best practice. However, the uncertainty of the leader emergence context also hinges on superficial and fickle leadership perceptions that could impact narcissists' chances on leader emergence (Küfner, Nestler, & Back, 2013).

Consequently, employing dominance-oriented strategies such as exuding an aura of confidence (Bradlee & Emmons, 1992) could also help narcissists to cope psychologically with the uncertainty of establishing themselves as emergent leaders (Tracy et al., 2011). Thus, both dominance and prestige strategies are effective strategies towards leader emergence, which is empirically supported by how both prestige and dominance are effective for achieving social rank and influence among newly-acquainted groups (Cheng et al., 2013).

Beyond the period of leader emergence, positive follower perceptions of narcissistic leaders disappear over time (Ong et al., 2015); which has been attributed to the negative influences of narcissistic characteristics such as being exploitative (Campbell, Bush, Brunell, & Shelton, 2005) and losing sight of group goals in their pursuit of self-enhancement (Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011). However, positive and significant correlational peer-ratings in existing athletic teams (at least four months together; Cheng et al., 2010) between narcissism and dominance and leadership and dominance seem to suggest that narcissistic leaders are likely to be positively perceived by followers beyond the period of leader emergence if they engage in a dominance strategy. These findings are consistent with the

conditions post-leader emergence, where narcissists have achieved higher social status through leader emergence, and in turn greater social bargaining power. This greater social bargaining power might prompt narcissists to prefer a dominance strategy in order to maximise net fitness benefits; and they can do so without risking negative follower perceptions of them as leaders because a dominance strategy could be construed as attempts to enforce rules to stem followers' free-riding behaviour. Contrastingly, continuing to adopt a prestige approach would not only prevent narcissists from capitalising on the short-term self-enhancement gains they thrive on (Wallace, Ready, & Weitenhagen, 2009), but also increase the possibility for follower free-riding to occur. Furthermore, the presence of competition from the out-group creates an in-group bias that can further consolidate the legitimacy of adopting dominance over prestige strategies because leaders are seen as organising their groups against external competition (Price & Van Vugt, 2014a, 2014b). However, as narcissistic leaders persist with dominance strategies, followers suffering from chronic net fitness losses (by deferring but yet not receiving any benefits from the leader) would have an increased collective intent to reject narcissistic leaders, which consequently results in followers' positive perceptions of narcissistic leaders to disappear over time. Thus, narcissists adopting dominance strategies immediately after leader emergence would prolong positive follower perceptions of narcissistic leadership, but prolonged adoption of dominance would result eventually in the waning of followers' positive perceptions of narcissistic leadership.

### **Present Research**

The aim of this research was to examine the temporality of narcissistic leadership from an evolutionary social status perspective. More specifically, we examined the separate mediating roles of prestige and dominance on the relationship between narcissism and leadership over time. We tested these predictions across a longitudinal study utilising minimally-acquainted

groups and hypothesised that narcissists would be perceived initially as leaders, but not later on. When the mediating roles of dominance and prestige were considered, we hypothesised that prestige would mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially during leader emergence but not over time. Similar to prestige, dominance would mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially during leader emergence but unlike prestige, the mediating effect would also be observed immediately after leader emergence. However, over time dominance would not mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership.

## Method

### Participants

We recruited 96 senior-year students<sup>11</sup> (69 males and 27 females;  $M_{\text{age}} = 21.7$  years;  $SD = 2.54$ ) from a psychology module in the beginning of the second semester, who were assigned to 22 leaderless groups of four to five members (four-member groups = 14; five-member groups = 8) and kept individuals in the same groups throughout the study. We did not assign a priori leader and follower roles, thus enabling participants to develop and/or display leader behaviours during the group tasks (cf. Judge et al., 2002). We obtained institutional ethical approval before the start of the study.

---

<sup>11</sup> Recruiting senior-year students, but randomly assigning them to groups to minimise levels of acquaintance in this study enabled us to mimic genuine organisational conditions where members have been in the same organisation for some time but are working together for the first time on a specific project. Participants rated the extent to which they knew a specific member of their group on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*extremely well*). The low levels of acquaintance ( $M_{\text{acquaintance}} = 1.99$ ,  $SD = 1.32$ ) showed that the random group assignment was successful in minimising acquaintance across the groups. Furthermore, the low ICC observed at Time 1 was consistent with previous studies utilising a similar small-group, low-acquaintance paradigm, suggesting that the random group assignments were successful in minimising acquaintance (See Footnote 2).

## Measures

**Narcissism.** We assessed narcissism using the self-report Narcissism Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16; Ames, Rose & Anderson, 2006; Raskin & Hall, 1979; Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI-16 comprises 16 pairs of forced-choice statements that are drawn from Raskin and Terry's (1988) original 40-item NPI, where participants are asked to select the statement that best describes them. For each pair of statements, participants decide between a narcissistic statement (e.g., "I am an extraordinary person") and a non-narcissistic statement (e.g., "I am much like everybody else"). One point is scored for each narcissistic statement that is selected from each pair of statements.

**Leadership.** We assessed peer ratings of leadership using Brunell and colleagues' (2008) leadership measure (used in Ong et al., 2015), which assesses the extent to which each group member serves as a leader for a group task (e.g., "Group member X assumed a leadership role in the group"). Responses to the six items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*very inaccurate*) to 7 (*very accurate*).

**Social status – dominance and prestige.** We assessed peer ratings of dominance and prestige using the Dominance and Prestige Rating Scales (Cheng et al., 2010). Eight items (e.g., "I am afraid of him/her") correspond to dominance; nine items (e.g., "I respect and admire him/her") correspond to prestige. Responses to all items were rated on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*).

## Procedure

We incorporated the study into a 12-week course as an experiential learning component of the class where students were asked to complete weekly group tasks in exchange for points. We presented feedback on group performance in a league table at the beginning of each weekly lecture. The groups competed against one another for points and we told



participants that the top three groups at the end of the study would win cash prizes of £50, £30, £20, respectively.

In the first week, we briefed participants that the study required them to work in groups to compete for points against other groups, gave assurances of confidentiality and explained their right to withdraw from the study. After providing consent, the participants completed a questionnaire pack that included narcissism and demographic questions.

In the second week, the participants engaged in their first group task. The groups completed a total of seven weekly tasks throughout the course, each lasting five minutes. These weekly tasks completed by the groups followed those administered in Ong et al. (2015), which ranged from general knowledge tasks such as naming all the medalists of Team Great Britain at the London 2012 Olympics and identifying the states of the United States of America on a blank map, to problem solving activities such as number puzzles. After completing the first group task in Week 2, we asked participants to appraise their other group members' leadership and levels of prestige and dominance behaviours. These peer evaluations were also completed after the group tasks in Weeks 4, 7 and 10.

### Data Analysis

**Round-Robin Peer Ratings.** Due to the round-robin nature of the study, we applied the social relations model (Kenny, 1994) to the peer ratings for leadership, prestige and dominance. The social relations model takes into account the interdependent nature of dyadic and intergroup perceptions, and it segregates the peer ratings into perceiver, target, and relationship effects. In this study, we extracted only *target effects* because these are independent of perceiver and relationship biases, and we were only interested in the extent of group agreement on the leadership of a given target (see Kenny, 1994). Estimates of target effects were derived for all the imputed datasets using the *TripleR* package (Schönbrodt, Back, & Schmukle,

2012; see Gebauer, Sedikides, Verplanken, & Maio, 2012, for a similar approach) operating on R (R Core Team, 2013), while accounting for the multiple groups.

**Multilevel Modelling.** Given the nested nature of the data of participants within groups, and participants' leadership target effects being estimated at each time point, we used multilevel modeling to test the hypothesis that the narcissism-leadership relationship would change across time. Since the effect at each time point was of interest, we used a multilevel multivariate response model (cf. Ong et al., 2015). The proposed model comprised three hierarchical levels: time at Level 1, individuals at Level 2, and groups at Level 3. All analyses were tested using MLwiN via the iterative generalised least squares (IGLS) function (V.2.25; Rasbash, Browne, Healy, Cameron, & Charlton, 2012). Before conducting multilevel analyses, we standardised narcissism scores within each sex to control for sex differences (cf. Tschanz, Morf, & Turner, 1998). All variables were also group mean centred. We used group mean centring rather than grand mean centring because it enabled us to analyse the relationships at the individual level by removing the influence of group (Enders & Tofighi, 2007). As we aimed to investigate the effects of narcissism at the individual level on the outcome variable across time, the removal of between-group variance through group mean centring before analysis was appropriate. We employed group mean centring for leadership, prestige and dominance target effects when accounting for groups in TripleR, and for narcissism in MLwiN.

**Multilevel Mediation.** We tested the hypothesised mediating role of prestige and dominance on the narcissism-leadership relationship with multilevel mediation analyses. We calculated the indirect effect of the *a* path (narcissism predicting prestige and dominance separately) and *b* path (prestige and dominance separately predicting leadership; cf. Bauer, Preacher, & Gil, 2006) and subsequently tested this effect with the Monte Carlo Method for Assessing Mediation (MCMAM; Bauer et al., 2006; MacKinnon, Lockwood, & Williams,

2004) calculator developed by Selig and Preacher (2008). The MCMAM calculator was specified at the 95% confidence interval and 20,000 repetitions.

**Missing Data.** The proportion of missing cases per analysis in this study was 15.1%, which is considered common in psychology studies (Peugh & Enders, 2004). However, the existence of missing data was not a result of attrition observed among individuals higher in narcissism as there were no differences in narcissism scores of the participants absent at Time 4 (but were present at Time 1) relative to all the participants present at Time 1 of the study (Time 1 = 3.01,  $SD = 2.90$ ; Time 4 = 3.45,  $SD = 2.94$ ;  $t(126) = -0.80$ ,  $p = .76$ ). Nonetheless, in order to prevent potential bias brought about by missing data, we subjected the data to multiple imputation analysis using the *mice* package (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011) on R (R Core Team, 2013). Although 3-5 imputations are typically used in missing data analysis (Rubin, 1987, Schafer, 1997), Graham, Olchowski and Gilreath (2007) recommended that greater numbers of imputations be performed to prevent power falloff. Thus, we performed a conservative 20 imputations with 20 iterations per imputation, which more than matched the proportion of missing cases (White, Royston & Wood, 2010). These imputations were also generated at the item level rather than the scale level as recommended by Gottshall, West and Enders (2012). Due to the lack of development in multiple imputations of round-robin data within a multilevel framework, we decided that the most appropriate approach to generating the imputations without compromising too much the relationships among variables in the data was to create a predictor matrix through the *quickpred* function that can be used to produce the imputations. The *quickpred* function generates modeling steps to the level of predictors and selects to the model only predictors that contain adequate information to impute the target variable. The condition for predictors to be included was set at .25 proportion of usable cases. Convergence of the Gibbs sampler is achieved when the variance between different sequences

is not larger than the variance within each individual sequence (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011). Convergence was checked visually for all imputed variable means and standard deviations to ensure that all the imputation streams freely intermingled with one another, without showing definite trends (see Appendix G for sequence plots for each imputed variable). We conducted all analyses on each imputed dataset and the final results pooled using Rubin's (1987) equation.

### Results

Descriptive statistics and correlations for all the variables are presented in Table 1. The correlations between leadership and prestige at each corresponding time point were significant and positive across all time points ( $r = .58 - .67$ ). The correlations between leadership and dominance were significant and positive at Time 1 and 2 ( $r = .46 - .48$ ), but not at Time 3 and 4. Similarly, the correlations between prestige and dominance were significant and positive at Time 1 and 2 ( $r = .27 - .53$ ) but not at Time 3 and 4. Initial inspection of the multilevel model revealed a non-significant reduction in the  $-2\log$ likelihood statistic when the random slopes model was specified over the random intercepts model. Consequently, we adopted the random intercepts model because allowing Level 3 slopes to vary did not significantly improve the model. As expected, ICCs derived from the basic model for leadership target effects were .00 across all time points since group level variance has already been accounted for in the a priori

round-robin analyses<sup>12</sup>. However, a three-level model was still specified because narcissism could relate differentially to leadership within each group. The main effect of narcissism on leadership target effects was positive and significant at Time 1 ( $\beta_0 = .21$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p = .04$ ), but non-significant at Time 2 ( $\beta_1 = .11$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p = .23$ ), Time 3 ( $\beta_2 = -.05$ ,  $SE = .10$ ,  $p = .63$ ) and Time 4 ( $\beta_3 = -.15$ ,  $SE = .12$ ,  $p = .22$ ).

### **Mediation analysis.**

The hypothesis that prestige and dominance would separately mediate the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially but not later was tested using multilevel mediation analysis. As recommended by Bauer et al. (2006) the simple product term  $a * b$  was used to quantify the indirect effect.

*Prestige as a mediator.* Multilevel mediation analyses with prestige as a mediator of the relationship between narcissism and leadership revealed significant indirect effects at Time 1 ( $\beta_a = .15$ ,  $SE = .07$ ,  $p = .03$ ;  $\beta_b = .47$ ,  $SE = .19$ ,  $p = .01$ ; indirect effect 95% CI [.001, .18]) but not at Time 2 ( $\beta_a = .10$ ,  $SE = .07$ ,  $p = .15$ ;  $\beta_b = .37$ ,  $SE = .16$ ,  $p = .02$ ; indirect effect [-.01, .12]), Time 3 ( $\beta_a = -.10$ ,  $SE = .07$ ,  $p = .13$ ;  $\beta_b = .67$ ,  $SE = .19$ ,  $p = .00$ ; indirect effect [-.18, .02]), or Time 4 ( $\beta_a = -.05$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $p = .52$ ;  $\beta_b = .67$ ,  $SE = .30$ ,  $p = .02$ ; indirect effect [-.17, .08]). It is

---

<sup>12</sup> ICCs derived for peer-rated leadership prior to accounting for group level effects were 0.00 at Time 1, 0.34 at Time 2, 0.40 at Time 3 and 0.60 at Time 4. As observed in Ong et al. (2015), the zero ICC at Time 1 could be due to the successful random assignment of participants into lowly-acquainted groups. Group differences are minimised if members are assigned randomly as observed in other studies that have used a similar small group zero-acquaintance paradigm, where substantive between group differences are absent (e.g., Albright, Kenny, & Malloy, 1988; Kenny, Horner, Kashy, & Chu, 1992; Malloy & Albright, 1990). As group members become more acquainted across time, the effect of randomisation is likely to wear out, resulting in more considerable group differences. Consequently, substantial group level effects were evident from the ICCs observed at Time 2, Time 3 and Time 4 of this study.

noteworthy that prestige significantly predicted leadership across all four time points, which suggests that prestige is a robust predictor of leadership and that narcissists lose leadership through the fairly rapid loss of prestige.

***Dominance as a mediator.*** When dominance was entered as a mediator of the narcissism - leadership relationship, multilevel mediation analyses revealed an indirect effect that was marginally significant at Time 1 ( $\beta_a = .20$ ,  $SE = .09$ ,  $p = .02$ ;  $\beta_b = .22$ ,  $SE = .13$ ,  $p = .08$ ; indirect effect 95% CI [-.005, .12]), a significant indirect effect at Time 2 ( $\beta_a = .28$ ,  $SE = .09$ ,  $p = .00$ ;  $\beta_b = .36$ ,  $SE = .11$ ,  $p = .00$ ; indirect effect [.03, .20]), and non-significant indirect effects at Time 3 ( $\beta_a = .15$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $p = .048$ ;  $\beta_b = -.09$ ,  $SE = .16$ ,  $p = .57$ ; indirect effect [-.08, .04]) and Time 4 ( $\beta_a = .10$ ,  $SE = .08$ ,  $p = .23$ ;  $\beta_b = -.11$ ,  $SE = .20$ ,  $p = .60$ ; indirect effect [-.08, .04]). It is noteworthy that dominance seems to be a predictor of leadership only in the short-term (i.e., Time 1 and Time 2), which suggests that regardless of narcissism, dominance is only useful to leadership in the short-term.

Table 3

Means, standard deviations, and zero-order correlations between narcissism, peer-rated leadership, dominance and prestige perceptions

	Mean	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1 Narcissism	3.01	2.90	(.76)												
2 Leadership Time 1	4.42	1.02	.20	(.88)											
3 Leadership Time 2	4.41	0.69	.11	.59**	(.89)										
4 Leadership Time 3	4.50	0.72	-.05	.29**	.42**	(.93)									
5 Leadership Time 4	4.18	1.32	-.07	.36**	.28*	.28*	(.92)								
6 Dominance Time 1	2.72	0.76	.33**	.46**	.29**	-.19	.20	(.87)							
7 Dominance Time 2	2.84	0.82	.23*	.31**	.48**	-.10	.17	.72**	(.89)						
8 Dominance Time 3	2.94	0.73	.22	.22*	.30**	-.14	.15	.64**	.66**	(.85)					
9 Dominance Time 4	3.09	0.90	.11	.07	.07	-.14	.12	.32**	.19	.66**	(.86)				
10 Prestige Time 1	4.41	0.67	.20	.64**	.37**	.12	.22*	.53**	.30**	.13	.01	(.80)			
11 Prestige Time 2	4.61	0.51	.09	.42**	.67**	.36**	.25*	.18	.27**	.16	.16	.29**	(.73)		
12 Prestige Time 3	4.69	0.47	.06	.35**	.34**	.58**	.26*	.01	.04	-.05	-.14	.35**	.38**	(.73)	
13 Prestige Time 4	4.52	0.69	-.18	.34**	.25*	.21	.66**	.06	.11	-.16	-.15	.19	.42**	.28**	(.77)

Note: The range of total score is 0-16 for narcissism; 1-7 for mean peer-rated leadership, prestige and dominance. Cronbach  $\alpha$  coefficients for leadership, prestige and dominance are presented in parentheses (nb.

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





## Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to examine the mediating roles of prestige and dominance on the relationship between narcissism and leadership across time. This temporal investigation utilised a longitudinal experimental design with groups of minimally-acquainted members. We observed that narcissists were rated positively as leaders initially but not later on. This main effect was consistent with the findings in Ong et al. (2015) where similar temporal perceptions of narcissistic leadership were observed among unacquainted groups.

When the mediating effect of prestige was considered, we found that prestige mediated the relationship between narcissism and leadership initially, but not later on, as hypothesised. These findings are consistent with previous empirical results that prestige is a viable means to leader emergence (Cheng et al., 2013). Additionally, it is noteworthy that a consistent, significant positive relationship between prestige and leadership was revealed across all time points. This consistent relationship empirically supports service-for-prestige, where followers are adapted to positively perceive leaders who demonstrate the willingness and ability to provide them with benefits (i.e., leader-follower reciprocity achieved by the reception of benefits in exchange for prestige; Price & Van Vugt, 2014a, 2014b). However, more pointedly in the context of narcissistic leadership, this consistent relationship suggests that follower perceptions of narcissists as leaders are primarily dependent on the extent to which narcissists are able to demonstrate prestigious leadership behaviours. The reason why narcissists were perceived as prestigious leaders initially could be because narcissists' confidence, charisma and social skills enabled them to convince followers that narcissistic leaders have high levels of domain relevant expertise. The authenticity of narcissists' high levels of domain expertise

would be difficult for followers to ascertain in the beginning but not over time, which explains why narcissistic leaders' initial prestigious impression is eroded across time.

When dominance was considered as a mediator, we found positive indirect effects of narcissism predicting leadership via dominance initially and after the initial phase of leader emergence, but not at the later time points. Additionally, the relationship between dominance and leadership approached significance at Time 1, was significant at Time 2 and non-significant later on. This latter effect indicates that, narcissism notwithstanding, individuals employing a dominance approach would be positively perceived as leaders early on but not later. The temporal findings were largely as hypothesised and support the notion that dominance is a viable means to leader emergence. Dominance may also qualify as a crucial stabilising force within groups in a tumultuous post-leader emergence environment that is represented by follower free-riding and out-group hostility. The long-term effect of dominance was as hypothesised and supports the notion that engaging solely on leader dominance on a prolonged basis is disadvantageous to followers.

The temporal changes in follower perceptions of narcissistic leadership can be explained by two service-for-prestige postulations. First, service-for-prestige predicts that dominant leadership would come to the fore when followers lack exit options. When followers lack exit options, their social bargaining power reduces, and this in turn encourages leaders to maximise net fitness benefits by disregarding follower interests (Price & Van Vugt, 2014b). For followers, being in a group led by a narcissist early in the experiment would arguably be further away from "exiting" the group compared to the latter stages of the experiment when they are closer to "exiting". Thus, followers' positive perceptions of narcissistic leaders dominant strategies early on but not later correspond to the proximity followers were from exiting the group. Second, followers prefer leaders who deliver ingroup advantage and this follower

ingroup bias is intensified in the presence of outgroup hostility, also known as the “rally effect” (Van Vugt et al., 2008). The rally effect provides followers with security through a willingness to cooperate with the leader against external rivals, while leaders benefit from gaining status (Van Vugt & De Cremer, 1999). Since the rally effect enhances leaders’ status, the propensity for it to be abused for greater power is highly probable (Price & Van Vugt, 2014b). In the current study, narcissistic leaders, being characteristically manipulative and exploitative, were likely to take advantage of the rally effect to consolidate their leadership in the early stages of the experiment. However, as the rankings of the groups became more apparent in the latter stages of the experiment, outgroup competition weakened, which in turn led to declines in the rally effect and any consequent efforts to maintain leadership.

Taken together, the results show that the application of an evolutionary framework does offer unique perspectives on the mechanisms with which narcissists are temporally viewed as leaders by their followers. The results in the current study are consistent with previous assertions that both prestige and dominance are viable ways to leadership attainment (Cheng et al., 2013). However, the viability of prestige and dominance strategies on leadership across time was found to vary among narcissistic leaders. Specifically, beyond the period of leader emergence, the waning follower perceptions of narcissists as leaders are explained by narcissistic leaders’ consistent lack of engagement in prestigious behaviours. The findings for dominance yielded more complex predictions of narcissistic leaders’ utility of dominance strategies across time. First, dominance had a stabilising effect that was crucial for optimal group functioning in the period after leader emergence. Second, narcissistic leaders engaged in a dominance strategy in order to harness its short-term usefulness towards leadership and disengaged from it eventually as engaging solely on dominance was no longer perceived by followers as a viable long-term leadership strategy.

### **Future research and theoretical implications**

The current findings suggest that while effective leadership is achievable over the long-term through engagement in more prestigious strategies, narcissistic leaders prefer more dominant strategies that translate to short-term leader effectiveness. Narcissistic leaders' preference for dominance and by association short-term success is consistent with empirical findings (Wallace, Ready, & Weitenhagen, 2009). However, given narcissists' obsession with self-enhancement, it seems counterintuitive for narcissists to prefer dominant strategies that bring short-term self-enhancement, at the expense of more consistent, longer-term self-enhancement by adopting prestigious strategies in leadership. Evolutionary theories, non-evolutionary theories (e.g., social-cognitive theories) of narcissism, and environmental characteristics of human hierarchies could provide answers for why this might be the case.

#### **Evolutionary theories of narcissism.**

Evidence of a genetic basis linked with narcissism (Vernon, Villani, Vickers, & Harris, 2008) supports notions of an evolutionary basis for narcissism. The first evolutionary theory of narcissism posits narcissism as an evolved variant of dominance, so it is in narcissists' being to prefer dominant strategies, and consequently short-term self-enhancement in leadership. This theory emerged from a mating perspective about 1.5 million years ago when hominids, apart from focusing on attractiveness and contentiousness (corresponds to promiscuity and short-term mating), also started to invest in cooperativeness (corresponds to long-term pair-bonding) as a reproductive strategy (Eastwick, 2009; Holtzman & Strube, 2011). The viability of short-term and long-term mating strategies among humans has led to the emergence of narcissism as a variant product - where elements of both attractiveness and contentiousness (giving rise to socially aversive narcissistic tendencies) and cooperativeness (complex self-concepts that are descriptive of narcissists) are positively selected for (Holtzman &

Strube, 2011). This intertwined evolution of cooperative and attractive and contentious adaptations suggests that narcissists are often caught in predicaments that are reflected in paradoxical accounts of narcissists as leaders. For example, narcissists have been positively perceived as leaders (e.g., Brunell et al., 2008; Nevicka, De Hoogh et al., 2011) as well as negatively perceived as leaders (e.g., Blair, Hoffman, & Helland, 2008; Judge et al., 2006). From a temporal perspective of narcissistic leadership, the intertwining of long-term and short-term mating traits could explain why narcissists are willing to engage in groups in order to pursue self-enhancement despite being socially aversive; which is consistent with how narcissists are able to successfully emerge as leaders in newly-acquainted groups (Brunell et al., 2008, Nevicka, De Hoogh et al., 2011, Ong et al, 2015). Over time, short-term mating adaptations take over and narcissistic leaders adopting dominant strategies would eventually be perceived as ineffective. This lack of long-term narcissistic leader effectiveness under the current climate of intertwined cooperative and attractive and contentious adaptations, could to a certain extent mean the dilution in the effectiveness of short-term mating manifested narcissistic tendencies. Such a conjecture implies that narcissists are likely to further evolve to incorporate more cooperativeness into their repertoire of self-enhancement strategies, in order to thrive in social environments that place cooperativeness at their core. This evolution towards a more cooperative brand of narcissistic self-enhancement is evident in previous research on narcissistic self-enhancement adaptations in communal settings (e.g., Gebauer et al., 2012), as well as narcissists' adaptiveness in incorporating communal traits like perspective-taking (Hepper et al, 2014) and humility (Owens, Wallace, & Waldman, 2015), which could translate to long-term leadership effectiveness. However, for narcissistic leadership in its current evolutionary state, short-term mating processes seem to be the default strategy adopted - consequently leading to a preference for short-term self-enhancement.

The second evolutionary theory of narcissism posits that narcissism has evolved to operate on a balance of implicit shame against *hubristic pride* (Tracy et al., 2011). Stronger convictions in implicit shame ultimately pervade the temporary veil of hubristic pride, which limits narcissists to pursue only short-term successes. The emotion of pride is conceptualised as two distinct and independent facets: *hubristic* and *authentic* (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Hubristic pride is characterised as arrogant and conceiting, while authentic pride is characterised by feelings of accomplishment, confidence and stress (Tracy & Robins, 2007). Although both facets of pride have been evidenced to evolve to enhance social status (Shariff & Tracy, 2009), hubristic pride in particular has been selected to promote a dominant strategy of acquiring social status (Cheng et al., 2010; Tracy, Shariff, & Cheng, 2010). Thus, it is believed that narcissism, comprising early life experiences of implicit shame (Campbell et al., 2007) and other associated negative dispositional traits, could promote a dominance-oriented regulatory system that is programmed to seek status through the explicit demonstration of hubristic pride, which acts as a coping mechanism going into uncertain status enhancing environments (Tracy et al., 2007). Further, this emotional projection of hubristic pride to attain status is consistent with evolutionary notions of self-deception, where self-enhancement has evolved as a means for individuals to deceive themselves and others (von Hippel & Trivers, 2011). From a narcissistic leadership perspective, narcissists are successful in leader emergence because a) they are social status hungry individuals fueled by implicit shame, and b) explicit displays of hubristic pride allow them to be psychologically more well-equipped than others to cope with the demands uncertain group coordination situations. However, the short-term utility of hubristic pride on achieving leadership also highlights the inadequacy of solely relying on hubristic pride to cope with persisting in leadership positions over the long-term. Given the conceptual and empirical links between hubristic pride and dominance, the eventual disengagement in dominance

strategies by narcissistic leaders, coupled with the short-term utility of dominance on leadership reflected in the current study seem to reinforce the notion that hubristic pride and/or dominance in isolation is ineffective for positive long-term narcissistic leadership. Future research can examine if narcissists' preference for short-term self-enhancement opportunities is limited by the narrow utility of hubristic pride/dominance (i.e., as a coping mechanism reserved for uncertain social contexts like leader emergence).

#### **Non-evolutionary perspectives.**

Although the aforementioned evolutionary theories of narcissism do successfully explain the temporal effects of narcissistic leadership, it should be noted that these effects are not exclusively explained by evolutionary theories alone. For instance, self-regulatory theories of narcissism could explain why narcissists are seen as prestigious initially but not over time. More specifically, narcissists could engage in prestige strategies that are more impactful in the short-term, rather than other strategies that are less impactful in the short-term but more temporally resilient. For example, narcissists could invest more heavily in self-regulatory processes like boasting and name-dropping, which immediately implies perceptions of prestige that are more impactful in the short-term, over demonstrating competence in the task at hand, which takes more time to achieve perceptions of prestige. Narcissists' impulsivity towards self-enhancement (Vazire & Funder, 2006) and their focus on short-term self-enhancement (Wallace et al., 2009) seem to support such a postulation. Thus, future research could investigate if favourable initial perceptions of narcissists as prestigious leaders that wane over time are due to narcissists' preference for engaging in prestige strategies that are more impactful but only effective in the short-term.

Intrapersonal factors such as the manner in which narcissists express their self-superiority beliefs and how followers infer such behaviours (Hoorens, Pandelaere, Oldersma,

& Sedikides, 2012) could explain followers' shifting perceptions of narcissistic leaders' dominance. Self-superiority beliefs have been associated with diverse outcomes ranging from social rejection to social acceptance (Hoorens, 2011; Sedikides, Hoorens, & Dufner, 2015) and this diversity of outcomes could be dependent on how self-superiority is expressed (Van Damme, Hoorens, & Sedikides, 2015). The Hubris Hypothesis has been developed to demonstrate how one's self-superiority claims are expressed can determine how observers perceive the claimant's self-view, and how observers in turn infer liking for the claimant (Van Damme et al., 2015). More specifically, observers infer from explicit self-superiority claims that the claimant has a negative view of others, which the observers in turn infer as the claimant having a negative view of them. Finally, observer inferences that the claimant has a negative view of them lead observers to evaluate the claimant unfavourably. In the context of narcissistic leadership, perceptions of dominance strategies are favourably perceived initially because group members are likely to accept other in-group members self-enhancing to become more socially accepted, and only object to others' self-enhancement when they are at a cost to them (Anderson, Srivastava, Beer, Spataro, & Chatman, 2006). According to the hubris hypothesis, group members incur social costs when they begin to interpret a narcissistic leader's explicit dominance as claims that narcissistic leaders are better than them. However, why this interpretation of dominance that leads to others' dislike for narcissists occurs in a later temporal phase is questionable and is worthy of future research.

#### **Environmental characteristics of human society.**

We mentioned earlier that modern societies have evolved from earlier egalitarian iterations and arrived at increasingly hierarchical ones. This evolutionary transformation of human society is evident in today's unprecedented levels of income inequality in the developed world (Stiglitz, 2012). For example, CEO incomes in the United States between 2000-2013 are



200-400 times that of the average worker (Mishel & Sabadish, 2013). Consequently, achieving higher social status through leadership has never been more important in today's society - where narcissism has possibly evolved to help humans become more adept at attaining self-enhancing leadership positions. Contrastingly, as shown in the current study, narcissistic leaders are clearly inept in keeping their followers positive about their leadership across time, due to their persistence in dominance and lack of investment in prestige strategies. Narcissistic leaders are probably cognisant of their inability to remain as effective leaders over time and one strategy is to look for other short-term self-enhancement opportunities (Wallace et al., 2009). Another strategy that narcissistic leaders can employ, especially when competing opportunities for self-enhancement are scarce, is to persist with dominance to inflict fear and ultimately forcing the submission of their followers, because increasing fear inevitably increases the cost of challenging superiors (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). Additionally, greater transitivity of deference (i.e., if A defers to B and B defers to C, then A defers to C) in dominance relative to prestige could also result in the superiors of narcissistic leaders overlooking negative follower perceptions of being dominated by narcissistic leaders (Henrich & Gil-White, 2001). The reality that leaders in most organisations are no longer chosen or sanctioned by followers via a bottom-up approach, but by their superiors is a reflection of how a dominance approach can be useful for leadership, even beyond the short-term. The applied ramifications of such leader selection and/or vindication practices are reflected in managers' perceptions that pleasing superiors are more instrumental to career success than pleasing followers (Sayles, 1993). Narcissists are well-positioned to benefit from these increasingly hierarchical, top-down societal structures because all that is required of them is to attain leadership positions, dominate their followers into submission and engage in strategies to please their superiors. Thus, this notion that narcissists are suited to modern hierarchical societies complements the aforementioned

postulations that narcissism is an evolutionary psychological adaptation that enhances human survival and reproduction.

### **Limitations**

The main limitation of the present research is its utilisation of students in their senior year, which might lead to higher levels of acquaintance among group members as opposed to newly-acquainted groups. However, level of acquaintance has often been construed as the amount of time in a group or organisation (e.g., Study 2; Cheng et al., 2010) that is based on the naïve assumption that interactions would take place between individuals. Moreover, the temporal component of narcissistic leadership has already been tested in both newly- and well-acquainted groups (Ong et al., 2015), so selecting these populations again would offer little advancement of the knowledge base on the temporality of narcissistic leadership. Contrastingly, recruiting senior students but randomly assigning them to groups to minimise acquaintance allowed us to test the hypotheses in an often neglected but realistic and common organisational condition where members have been in the same organisation for some time but are working together for the first time on a specific project. Since this study utilised a student population, its lack of external validity could be addressed by conducting future studies on other populations in different organisational settings.

### **Conclusion**

The temporality of narcissistic leadership can be explained by two distinct evolutionary routes to attaining social status in human societies: prestige and dominance. The initial positive perceptions of narcissists as leaders is mediated by narcissists' demonstration of either prestige or dominance strategies. While the lack of engagement in prestige strategies led to the waning of narcissistic leadership, narcissistic leaders' persistence in dominance strategies

led to positive follower perceptions of them as leader in the period immediately after leader emergence, but not after.

## Chapter 5 – General Discussion

The present chapter provides a thesis summary followed by a discussion of the theoretical and applied implications of the temporality of narcissistic leadership. Next, an exploration of the future research directions of the present research, as well as the strengths and limitations of the thesis is presented. Finally, this chapter concludes with a brief personal reflection of the PhD process.

### Summary of thesis

Chapter 1 critically reviewed the narcissistic leadership literature and identified certain theoretical and empirical limitations that needed to be addressed. These limitations were centred on the lack of empirical substantiation for the theorised temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership, and the explanatory mechanisms responsible for it. Thus, a temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership was necessary, in order to test empirically if predictions about the temporality of narcissistic leadership – one that is characterised by initial positive perceptions that wane over time – truly exists. Equally, a temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership would enable a more in-depth understanding of the various explanatory mechanisms at play across time.

One of the assertions that had emanated from cross-sectional investigations was that narcissists tend to exhibit charismatic/visionary qualities, which help to inspire and persuade followers to perceive them as effective leaders (Deluga, 1997; Khoo & Burch, 2008). To test the hypothesis that the temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership exists, and whether this trend can be explained by how charismatic/visionary narcissists are perceived, in Chapter 2 we conducted an online vignette study where participants had to rate a narcissistic team member's leadership under two temporally distinct scenarios. In the Pilot Study, we found that narcissists were likely to be rated more positively in the short-term duration scenario compared to the

long-term duration scenario; and also found preliminary evidence that charismatic/visionary aspects of leadership could explain the temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership.

The results from Chapter 2 provided an impetus to test more robustly the hypothesised temporality of narcissistic leadership, which we achieved in Chapter 3 by conducting two longitudinal, round-robin studies with varying levels of acquaintances. The results in Chapter 3 provided the first empirical evidence that narcissists are initially perceived favourably as leaders but that these favourable perceptions rapidly wane. We also demonstrated that transformational leadership, a conceptualisation of leadership that focuses on the personal, emotional and inspirational aspects of the leader-follower relationship - where charismatic/visionary aspects correspond to the inspirational component of transformational leadership - explained why followers initially perceived narcissists as leaders and not over time.

In this thesis, we were also interested in the historic manifestations of narcissistic leadership and whether evolutionary adaptations have led narcissists to be more likely than others to succeed as leaders initially, but also cause them to lose favour as leaders over time. In Chapter 4, we utilised a similar longitudinal, round-robin experimental design to Chapter 3 to examine the temporality of narcissistic leadership within an evolutionary framework. More specifically, we examined whether evolutionary strategies of gaining social status could explain the temporality of narcissistic leadership at the specific temporal phases. In Chapter 4, we showed that the evolutionary strategies of prestige and dominance do provide greater insight to why narcissists are perceived favourably as leaders initially and not over time. Indeed, although narcissists are theoretically more inclined to exhibit dominance strategies, narcissists' leader emergent traits could be construed as both dominant and prestigious. While narcissists were no longer perceived as prestigious beyond leader emergence (which explained why they were not perceived favourably as leaders over time), dominance strategies were positively perceived

immediately after leader emergence, most probably built upon the effects of ingroup bias (i.e., favouring members of the same group over members in other groups) and the necessity to neutralise potential follower free-riding (i.e., benefitting from leader contributions without reciprocating in kind), which enabled narcissists to prolong their initial honeymoon period as leaders but not over the long-term. Thus, the results suggest that the honeymoon period of narcissistic leadership eventually wanes because narcissists lacked engagement in prestigious strategies, and/or disengagement in dominance strategies.

### **Theoretical implications**

The findings from the thesis highlighted a number of relevant theoretical implications that could inform future research directions. Most notably, these implications include the short-term favourability of narcissistic leadership, how their focus on short-term self-enhancement could be innate, the explanatory effects of transformational leadership on the temporality of narcissistic leadership, and the evolutionary basis of the temporality of narcissistic leadership.

#### **Narcissistic leadership does not last long**

Previous theorising has predicted that the relationship between the narcissistic leader and their followers is contingent on its temporality (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006). From a narcissism perspective, the temporal effects of narcissistic leadership underscores the importance of conceptualising narcissism as a dynamic self-regulatory process where the narcissistic self is constantly being updated and modified as a consequence of the changing factors that affect self-regulation and vice versa. From a leadership perspective, our findings demonstrated the complexity of leader – follower relationship processes with respect to time, which is in line with calls for temporally-based leadership research (Bluedorn & Jaussi, 2008; Shamir, 2011). Studying the temporality of narcissistic leadership allowed us to break

down the complexities of narcissistic self-regulation, and the interactions with their construal systems and social environment, into definitive chunks that are characteristic of a particular temporal phase/context. The variation in perceptions towards narcissistic leadership across time offers an explanation for the equivocal results on narcissistic leadership that have been observed across cross-sectional studies – that differences in perceptions of narcissistic leaders are possibly due to temporal/contextual changes. Further, according to Implicit Leadership Theory (Lord, Brown, Harvey, & Hall, 2001), followers' perceptions of leadership tend to change with the situation, providing support for the argument that follower perceptions of narcissistic leaders change over time because of the changing context of leadership. Indeed, this view of temporally/contextually dependent narcissistic leader – follower relationships is consistent with previous findings that have demonstrated narcissistic leadership to be susceptible to contextual differences (Nevicka et al., 2013).

The initial favouring of narcissistic leaders that wanes over time possibly corresponds with temporal changes in follower perceptions of narcissists' self-enhancement behaviour. Self-enhancement operates primarily for the benefit of the self and in doing so, there might be trade-offs incurred as a consequence (Baumeister & Scher, 1988) - especially since self-enhancement is considered to be contextually/temporally influenced (Campbell & Campbell, 2009). Such a view seems to suggest that the temporality of narcissistic leadership is dependent on the self-enhancement behaviours of narcissistic leaders, and how followers perceive these self-enhancing behaviours across time. Indeed, the Contextual Reinforcement Model (Campbell & Campbell, 2009) shows that narcissistic leaders undergo a “natural drift” from an initial “emerging zone” where self-enhancement is more cost beneficial to an “enduring zone” where self-enhancement involves more trade-offs (to both narcissistic leaders and their followers) to the extent that considering exit strategies could prove more advantageous to self-

image preservation. The temporality of narcissistic leadership is a consequence of corresponding contextual/temporal self-enhancement benefits and trade-offs, highlighting the importance of taking a temporal approach in narcissistic leadership as opposed to a snapshot approach. Thus, taking a temporal approach is crucial because it affords greater sensitivity towards the temporal changes in social and personality parameters that influence the social-cognitive and self-regulatory processes that define narcissistic leadership.

### **Narcissists' preference for short-term self-enhancement could be innate**

Given narcissists' apparent preference for short-term self-enhancement (Campbell et al., 2004; Vazire & Funder, 2006; Wallace et al., 2009), it seems that narcissists are "programmed" to be attracted to and coincidentally possess the requisite leadership behaviours to achieve short-term self-enhancement, and therefore are less likely to demonstrate leadership behaviours that are appropriate for the long-term.

It is possible that the process of narcissistic self-regulation is dictated by a "time-bomb" mechanism where the default self-enhancement strategy is focused on the short-term. The existence of such a mechanism suggests that narcissistic self-regulation is not merely contingent on opportunities for self-enhancement, but on self-enhancement that requires less time to achieve. Equally, it is possible that narcissists' higher success in the short-term is not because they are strategic about short-term self-enhancement, but simply because they are impulsive by nature (Vazire & Funder, 2006). Impulsivity is the dispositional lack of self-control that is akin to ego undercontrol (Block, 2002; Block & Block, 1980), which could explain narcissists' inability to consistently meet the high self-regulatory demands that are required to preserve their inflated self-image - which is more evident when observed in the long-term.

Other conceptualisations of narcissism might also offer potential explanations for narcissists' preference for short-term self-enhancement. One mitigating factor of narcissists'



preference for short-term self-enhancement could be their implicit vulnerability of the self. The insecurities associated with narcissistic vulnerability could be inhibiting the extent to which narcissistic self-enhancement is pursued over time. Indeed, narcissism has been proposed as a source of hardiness in the face of adversity, but only when self-esteem is high (Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2004) – suggesting that the self-enhancing effects of narcissism would be curtailed when the influence of narcissistic vulnerability, which is associated negatively with self-esteem (e.g., Foster & Trimm, 2008) is considered. Although narcissistic vulnerability did not account for the waning of narcissistic leader perceptions over time in the Chapter 3 findings, it is possibly due to the explicit self-report assessment of what is considered an implicit construct of narcissism.

While it might seem that narcissistic vulnerability is a stumbling block towards narcissists achieving self-enhancement in the long-term, it could possibly act as a protective mechanism to safeguard narcissists' health and well-being. The beneficial health effects of narcissistic vulnerability is implied from the higher physiological stress narcissists experience in daily life, leading to the experience of negative emotions and in turn translating to higher cost to health and well-being (Cheng, Tracy, & Miller, 2013). Thus, the high levels of stress experienced through the continuous pursuit of self-enhancement could be attenuated by targeting and achieving short-term self-enhancement that is activated by narcissistic vulnerability. Such a postulation, however, is speculative and warrants future research. Also warranting future research are other mechanisms and factors that underpin the modality of this proposed “time-bomb” mechanism.

The multidimensional nature of the NPI (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988) has also led to conceptualisations of adaptive and maladaptive narcissism (Barry & Malkin, 2010). More specifically, the NPI's assessments of authority/leadership and self-sufficiency could be

considered as adaptive, as they infer positive qualities such as assertiveness and self-confidence, while assessments of exploitativeness, exhibitionism and entitlement are considered maladaptive, as they seem to correspond to negative qualities such as hostility and impulsivity (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988). From the perspective of narcissistic leadership temporality, it could be that narcissists' adaptive characteristics are more recognised relative to their maladaptive characteristics initially, leading to favourable perceptions of narcissists as leaders during leader emergence. However, narcissistic leaders' adaptive characteristics might disappear and/or maladaptive characteristics might become more apparent over time, leading to the waning of favourable follower perceptions of narcissists as leaders over time. Future research can examine the concept of adaptive and maladaptive narcissism and whether it can contribute to the explanation for the temporal pattern of narcissists as leaders.

Narcissism, particularly narcissistic grandiosity, has been typically cast as an agentic preservation of the self (Campbell & Foster, 2007; Morf et al., 2011) and found to be lacking in communal self-representations such as empathy and interpersonal warmth (Campbell et al., 2002; Findley & Ojanen, 2013; Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). The agency-communion model (Gebauer et al., 2012), however, posits that while the central focus of narcissism is to satisfy agentic self-motives, narcissists can achieve these agentic goals through communal means. This could mean that in leader-follower group dynamics, narcissistic leaders could engage in communal behaviours in order to achieve agentic outcomes. Thus, it is possible that favourable follower perceptions of narcissists as leaders initially are a consequence of narcissists' behaviours being judged as communal, even though these behaviours were agentially motivated. However, narcissistic leaders continual engagement in communal behaviours over time might be hampered by their impulse to achieve agentic self-enhancement (Vazire & Funder, 2006), thus leading to inconsistent and/or curtailed engagement in communal

behaviours over time. Such a postulation offers a plausible explanation for the waning of follower perceptions of narcissistic leadership over time. Equally, it is possible that narcissistic leaders are judged as favourably as leaders for an extended period of time if they decide to utilise communal methods to achieving agentic self-enhancement. Such a prediction is plausible given narcissists' awareness of others' motives and emotions (Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012) and their capacity to exhibit a range of communal behaviours like empathy (Hepper et al., 2014) that are contrary to mainstream characteristics of narcissism. A caveat of this prediction would be the presence of agentic outcomes that can be achieved over the long-term. If narcissists identify leader emergence as an agentic goal and not leader effectiveness, then it is unlikely that narcissists would persist with communal behaviours beyond the initial phase of leader emergence. Future research examining the temporal effects of communal narcissism on leadership across time could provide further understanding of how communal narcissism is associated with leadership across time, as well as the conditions that dictate the activation of communal narcissism in the context of leadership.

### **Narcissism and transformational leadership**

As mentioned in Chapter 1, previous research examining the associations between narcissism and transformational leadership has been equivocal. The findings from this thesis suggest that these equivocal findings are most probably a consequence of the lack of consideration of temporality, since previous studies have largely been cross-sectional in design, and thus are only able to offer snapshots of perceptions towards narcissistic leadership. In contrast, the findings in Chapter 3 have taken into account the effects of temporality on narcissistic leadership, where narcissists are perceived as leaders initially because they are perceived to demonstrate transformational leadership behaviours, and not as leaders over time because narcissists are not perceived to demonstrate transformational leadership behaviours.

The findings in Chapter 3 suggest that narcissists have the capacity to demonstrate appropriate transformational behaviours when they perceive that a certain context is self-enhancing (i.e., leader emergence), and not demonstrate transformational behaviours when they when a context is perceived as lacking in self-enhancement (i.e., leader effectiveness). If narcissists are aware of the transformational needs of followers and have the capacity to satisfy these needs, then as long as elements of self-enhancement are guaranteed in the long-term, narcissists could continue to be effective leaders. Regrettably, narcissistic self-enhancement outcomes are usually not neatly aligned with positive relationship outcomes, because narcissistic self-enhancement processes can sometimes lead to anti-social behaviours like aggression (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998), self-handicapping (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002) and taking credit or blaming others (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; John & Robins, 1994). Such negative interpersonal outcomes are possibly a consequence of narcissists' inability to establish warm and emotionally intimate relationships (Campbell et al., 2006), which further highlights narcissists' investment in extraverted and confident qualities when participating in social interactions as engaging in self-image preservation (e.g., Bradlee & Emmons, 1992).

Given the focus of transformational leadership on the emotional aspect of the leader-follower relationship, the finding that transformational leadership explained the positive perceptions of narcissists as leaders initially but not later on suggests that it is the ability to emotionally connect with followers that is crucial for narcissistic leader-follower relationships to thrive. Perhaps the establishing of such emotional connections are only possible initially because of the bold, charismatic visions espoused by narcissistic leaders that are capable of rallying followers, but are also self-enhancing to narcissists as they attain leadership status; but not over time as narcissistic leaders are found to be inactive in pursuing these socialised visions

(Galvin, Waldman, & Balthazard, 2010). If narcissistic leaders' lack of follow-through on their socialised visions is rectified, then the emotional connections between narcissistic leader and their followers can be maintained, which in turn increases the likelihood for narcissists to remain as effective leaders over time. Such a postulation is supported by recent research suggesting that narcissists are malleable towards more communal traits like empathy (Hepper et al., 2014) and humility (Owens et al., 2015), to the extent that it is possible for narcissists to self-enhance within a more communal paradigm by demonstrating more communal behaviour (Gebauer et al., 2012). Thus, it would be interesting to examine if greater alignment of narcissistic self-enhancement goals with leader-follower relationship expectations can extend narcissistic leadership effectiveness across time.

The role of transformational leadership within the temporality of narcissistic leadership also gives rise to the debate on whether transformational leadership should be conceptualised and measured globally (e.g., Carless, 1998) or differentially (e.g., Hardy et al., 2010; Lowe, Kroeck & Sivasubramaniam, 1996). There are different views in terms of which approach is best. The lack of clear theoretical distinctions (Barbuto, 1997) and empirical distinctions between the transformational leadership components (i.e., the failure to confirm the factor structure of the proposed transformational leadership model and the strong intercorrelations between the components; Avolio et al., 1999; Carless, 1998; Tejeda, Scandura, & Pillai, 2001), seem to suggest a global approach to transformational leadership. Another advantage of taking a global approach is that it makes the process of data collection more straightforward, especially in complex experimental designs. Indeed, a global approach is recommended for initial explorations, which could be subsequently refined with a differentiated approach (Arthur & Tomsett, 2015). Thus, transformational leadership was treated as a global measure in Studies 2

and 3, given that these are the first empirical examinations of narcissistic leadership temporality, involving complex data collection procedures.

In contrast, following a differentiated approach would make possible the examination of the specific transformational leadership behaviours such as vision (i.e., inspirational motivation), support (i.e., individual consideration) and challenge (i.e., high performance expectations and intellectual stimulation) leadership behaviours and how they correspond to the different temporal phases of leadership and narcissistic traits. We have touched on the potential benefits of adopting a differentiated approach to transformational leadership in the discussion in Chapter 3. We identified that charismatic/visionary components of transformational leadership that are crucial for leader emergence could be more aligned to narcissistic character traits compared to other personality types (see also findings in Chapter 2). When leader-follower relations are extended over time, characteristically “non-narcissistic” transformational leadership behaviours like challenge and support components could be increasingly sought after but are unlikely to be reciprocated by narcissistic leaders because they offer little in return in terms of self-enhancement. Furthermore, without the buffer of demonstrating the appropriate transformational leadership behaviours over time, self-enhancement intentions of the narcissistic leaders become more apparent and are likely to be negatively evaluated by followers (Hoorens, Pandelaere, Oldersma, & Sedikides, 2012), thus intensifying the waning of their perceptions towards narcissistic leaders over time. Future research can examine the independent explanatory effects of the differentiated components of transformational leadership on narcissistic leadership, to identify pertinence and propensity of certain components of transformational leadership behaviours at different points in time.

**The temporality of narcissistic leadership is a product of evolution**

The findings presented in Chapter 4 provided the first empirical evidence of an evolutionary basis for the temporality of narcissistic leadership. In the same vein as evolutionary theorising on social rank attainment, the dominance-prestige evolutionary account is a viable theoretical basis for explaining narcissistic leadership. Our findings demonstrated that narcissists were perceived as both dominant and prestigious leaders during leader emergence, which is consistent with previous research suggesting dominance and prestige as two viable pathways to achieving leadership (Cheng et al., 2013). Additionally, the distinctiveness of dominance and prestige approaches (Anderson & Kilduff, 2009; Cheng & Tracy, 2014) in achieving leadership suggests that narcissists are highly adaptive during leader emergence in achieving leadership. The findings immediately after leader emergence showed empirically the effectiveness of narcissists engaging in dominance strategies to maintain leadership status in a temporal phase that is prone to follower free-riding and ingroup bias as predicted in Service-for-Prestige (Price & Van Vugt, 2014a; 2014b). Nonetheless, whether narcissists have adapted to temporal demands of leadership immediately after leader emergence by taking a dominance approach or their preference for taking a dominance approach coincided well with the characteristics of the temporal phase immediately after leader emergence is unclear and warrants future research. Overall, taking a dominance-prestige account of narcissistic leadership temporality highlighted the unique leadership contexts that characterise specific temporal phases of leadership and the corresponding leadership characteristics that are required for leadership effectiveness.

The success of narcissists in achieving leader emergence by independently engaging in prestige and dominance strategies highlights the awareness and adaptability narcissists may possess when navigating through the complexities and uncertainties that are descriptive of

leader emergent contexts. Narcissists seem to know instinctively that there exist two ways to the top and are comfortable in engaging in either strategy to maximise their chances of leadership under specific circumstances. The proposed emergence of narcissism as an evolved variant of dominance in a period when long-term cooperativeness was increasingly viable as a mating strategy (Holtzmann & Strube, 2011), seems to support narcissists' dexterity when it comes to employing prestige or dominance strategies to achieve leader emergence. However, the lack of positive perceptions towards narcissistic leadership over the long-term suggests that narcissists are less evolved to succeed in leadership contexts in the long-term. Since narcissism has evolved from dominant mating strategies, its default mode is likely to be that of dominance, which in turn implies their natural inclination to engage in dominance strategies – making any efforts to engage in prestige strategies increasingly challenging over time. Similarly, the idea of narcissism as an evolved trait characterised by explicit hubristic pride and implicit shame (Tracy et al., 2011) suggests that the weak basis of hubristic claims would be effective in the short-term (in its utility as a coping mechanism) but not in the long-term, especially when checked by feelings of shame. Such a notion is supported by the propensity for overconfident people to receive prestige and deference from others (Anderson, Brion, Moore, & Kennedy, 2012), which coincidentally provides an explanation for narcissists being perceived as both prestigious and dominant during leader emergence. Indeed, the social advantages in displaying overconfidence requires individuals to engage in evolutionary self-deceptive self-enhancement – to convince themselves of their superior qualities before they can impress others with them (von Hippel & Trivers, 2011). However, the cost of being overconfident is the possibility of not fulfilling previously communicated intentions over time, which is consistent with the evolutionary hubristic pride-shame account of narcissism, making it more difficult for narcissistic leaders to maintain their social standing as leaders. Thus, the evolutionary account of narcissistic



leadership has provided new insights that explain its temporality and should be applied in future research.

### **Applied implications**

The finding that narcissists are positively perceived as leaders initially but not over time, paired with previous observations on the prevalence of narcissism among prominent leaders (Deluga, 1997; Watts et al., 2013), suggests that narcissists are likely to take up leadership roles in most organisational domains, even though they are doomed to fail as leaders over time. In order to rectify the destructive effects of narcissistic leadership in the long-term, strategies that allow narcissists to be more effective leaders over time (since they already possess certain leadership qualities, particularly during leader emergence), and/or level the influence of narcissists in leader selection processes are required.

#### **Helping narcissistic leaders become more “temporally resilient”**

There currently exist several proposals to help narcissists lead more effectively (e.g., Maccoby, 2000). The central idea behind these suggestions is the recognition of mutually beneficial outcomes for narcissists and their followers when narcissists emerge as leaders (i.e., narcissists are able to self-enhance while followers benefit in terms of group organisation) and attempt to extend these mutual benefits over time. Instilling narcissistic leaders with “temporal resilience” requires the engagement in mutually beneficial strategies - enabling narcissists to constantly self-enhance when in leadership but in doing so, also allow followers to benefit from the actions of narcissistic leaders. As discussed in Chapter 3, introducing regular leader performance goal appraisals could help to more accurately calibrate leadership goals to the effect it is challenging and sufficiently self-enhancing in regular short-term periods for narcissists, but also equally beneficial for followers. In order to manage narcissistic goal appraisals, organisations can either incorporate regular appraisals into the organisation’s formal

staff review procedures, or as proposed by Maccoby (2000), allow a trusted confidant/advisor who is rooted in reality to assist narcissistic leaders in their decision-making and goal-setting. These interventions can help to keep narcissistic self-enhancement in check – to ensure it is sufficiently self-enhancing for narcissists to be motivated to engage in positive leadership behaviours that would preserve and/or enhance their leadership effectiveness.

The finding that transformational leadership explained the perceptions of narcissistic leader effectiveness initially but not over time seems to suggest that engaging in strategies to foster closer emotional bonds between narcissistic leader and followers could also prove to be a worthwhile approach to increase narcissistic leader effectiveness over time. Indeed, transformational leadership has been described as making a link with followers by being generous, showing concern for followers, giving special attention to neglected others, treating followers as individuals and expressing appreciation when followers perform well (Bass, 1985). Bass (1985) also alluded to the empathic capabilities of transformational leaders that make them competent mentors, leading to suggestions that transformational (charismatic) leaders are sensitive to the needs of followers (Conger & Kanungo, 1987). Narcissists also seem to have an awareness of the benefits of engaging in close relationships with others, or the detriments of not doing so. For example, narcissists are likely to realise that displaying narcissistic traits like superiority when working in groups would be counterproductive to their self-enhancement aims (Hoorens et al., 2012). Additionally, narcissists are highly adaptive in communal contexts in being able to successfully achieve self-enhancement through communal means (Gebauer et al., 2012). Furthermore, promising findings in the literature such as communal activation (Finkel, Campbell, Buffardi, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2009), sharing key similarities (Konrath, Bushman, & Campbell, 2006), humility (Owens et al., 2015) and perspective-taking (Hepper et

al., 2014) could offer a basis for potential interventions that tap into the interpersonal connection between narcissistic leader and followers to be implemented.

In the latter example, exposing narcissists to a perspective-taking paradigm led to higher empathic responses by narcissists, which suggests that previous observations of narcissists being low in empathy (Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984; Watson & Morris, 1991) is automatic and can be elevated (Hepper et al., 2014). Further, narcissists show an awareness of others' emotions (cognitive empathy) but lack in displaying the appropriate reactions in response to others' emotions (affective empathy; Wai & Tiliopoulos, 2012). These findings imply that narcissists have the capacity and potential to be more empathic, and interventions like perspective-taking or empathy training (Klimecki, Leiberg, Ricard, & Singer, 2013) can be implemented to induce narcissists to engage in more empathic behaviour.

Another approach that can tap into both the charismatic/visionary strengths of narcissists and their potential to engage more synergistically with their followers is by encouraging narcissistic leaders to have higher organisational identification (Reina, Zhang, & Peterson, 2014). Leader organisational identification refers to a leader's perceived "oneness" with the organisation (Ashforth & Mael, 1989, p.21), where "the distinction between firm and self is minimised"(Boivie, Lange, McDonald, & Westphal, 2011, p. 570). When a leader is high in organisational identification, there is likely a greater congruence between the leader's and the organisation's goals and performance outcomes (Reina et al., 2014). Increased goal congruence as a consequence of identifying more with the organisation means that narcissistic leaders are more likely to demonstrate behaviours that are beneficial to the collective. Indeed, increasing goal congruence by designing individual goals to be more interdependent with other group members' goals has encouraged narcissistic leaders to engage in more team-oriented behaviour that in turn led to better team performances (Nevicka, DeHoogh et al., 2011).

However, narcissistic self-enhancement is still likely to persist even when narcissistic leaders are more highly identified with the organisation; just that self-enhancement is less likely to be at the expense of the collective good.

With increased organisational identification, narcissistic leaders are also more likely to articulate socialised visions to achieve organisational success, and in doing so, followers would perceive narcissistic leaders as more charismatic/visionary (Reina et al., 2014). Articulating a socialised vision is linked to several positive outcomes for leaders which include gaining more acceptance from followers (Fanelli, Misangyi, & Tosi, 2009; Joshi, Lazarova, & Liao, 2009), more intent for followers to collaborate, share knowledge and make joint decisions (Schaubroeck, Lam, & Cha, 2007; Varella, Javidan, & Waldman, 2012), and higher levels of follower behavioural integration (Ling, Simsek, Lubatkin, & Veiga, 2008). Socialised visions articulated by narcissistic leaders are often bold and risky but yet are still accepted by followers as charismatic/visionary (Galvin et al., 2010). Thus, the moderating effects of leader organisational identification on the relationship between narcissism and team behavioural integration and ultimately performance, seems to imply that the negative effects of narcissistic leadership can be stemmed if leaders firmly align themselves to the organisation. However, what is required (e.g., self-enhancement opportunities) to keep narcissistic leaders strongly identified with the organisation over time, and whether leader organisational identification is effective over time in attenuating the negative effects of narcissistic leadership remain unclear and are areas worthy of future research. In essence, narcissistic leaders seem to have the capacity to engage in closer relationships with their followers, which leads to positive group outcomes; but whether forging closer relationships with followers can lead to a more “temporally resilient” brand of narcissistic leadership is still unclear and requires further empirical research.

Maccoby (2000) mooted the possibility of narcissistic leaders indoctrinating followers to submit to their ideologies as a way to maintain effective narcissistic leadership over time. Such a notion seems inconceivable; especially when in reality there usually exist exit strategies and alternatives available to followers. However, it is perhaps possible under conditions of perceived threat from outgroups, for narcissistic leaders to achieve a degree of ideological submission from their followers. Known as collective narcissism, it is a concept of narcissism that extends into the interpersonal domain, where an ingroup is idealised instead of the self (Golec de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, & Jayawickreme, 2009). The effects of ingroup bias according to Service-for-Prestige also support the probability of collective narcissism occurring under conditions of outgroup threat. However, whether the assumed coherence and homogeneity of ingroup greatness extends over the long-term is unknown. Given our conclusion that adopting a persistent dominance strategy is unlikely to extrapolate into effective narcissistic leadership over time, it seems that any positive effects of collective narcissism is unlikely to extend into the long-term. However, such a postulation remains speculative since the effects of collective narcissism have been observed across different social and cultural contexts (Golec de Zavala et al., 2009) and warrants future research.

#### **Rethinking the leader selection process – leveling the narcissism bias**

Another approach to addressing the destructive effects of narcissism in the long-term is to re-evaluate the processes of leader selection. Current leader selection and leader training processes seem to promote narcissistic characteristics that are favourable for leader emergence (Campbell et al., 2011). Indeed, the interview method of leader selection could positively bias interviewer evaluations of more narcissistic candidates (Paulhus, Westlake, Calvez, & Harms, 2013). An overemphasis on the qualities that encourage leader emergence would not only suit narcissists but also result in a higher concentration of narcissists in leadership positions.

Unsurprisingly, having more narcissists occupying leadership positions consequently leads to the temporality of narcissistic leadership being generalised as a universal phenomenon (Boal & Hooijberg, 2000). More precisely, leadership in most contexts is likely to stagnate over time when there is overconfidence, homogeneity, and complacency, leading to what is termed as a “honeymoon effect” – a temporal pattern of leadership that is characterised by a familiar initial positive leadership that declines over time (Giambastista, 2004).

Since leader selection and recruitment processes favour the demonstration of narcissistic qualities, tertiary institutes of learning that are concerned with the employability of their students in an increasingly competitive job market, have started to equip students by training them to excel in current formats of leadership selection and recruitment and/or focus on short-term competitiveness (Bergman, Westerman, & Daly, 2010). In a social climate where narcissism is reported to be steadily increasing, particularly amongst Generation Y (Reynolds, Stewart, Sisco, & MacDonald, 2005; Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, & Bushman, 2008), such educational foci on competing in the short-term only serves to reinforce the notion that narcissism is essential for a successful life. Indeed, millennial students in business schools have been found to have high levels of narcissism, and expect greater success in securing employment, high salaries and promotions (Westerman, Bergman, Bergman, & Daly, 2012). It is telling that current modes of leader selection and recruitment, and by association leadership training in educational institutes are in need of updating, in order to shift some of the focus away from narcissism and instead examine other characteristics that are more predictive of temporally consistent leadership effectiveness. Incorporating other leader selection criteria not only makes recruitment more equitable, it also helps to identify more well-rounded candidates that are more suitable for leadership over the long-term. Furthermore, the changes in leader

selection processes could reasonably result in ripple effects in education and more broadly on an entire generation, where narcissism is no longer seen as pivotal for success.

### **Strengths and Limitations of the Thesis**

#### **Strengths**

A major strength of the thesis lies in the consistent employment of a longitudinal, round-robin experimental design in three of the four studies conducted. Prior to this thesis, there had been no empirical evidence to support the theorising on the temporality of narcissistic leadership. Such an experimental design was sensitive to, and enabled us to detect, any temporal changes in narcissistic leadership; and also to study the mechanisms involved at each identified temporal phase of leadership. Furthermore, utilising a similar experimental design over three studies while tweaking only certain variables in each study enabled replications of the findings, making them more robust.

Another strength of the studies that resulted in more robust findings was the utilisation of cutting edge statistical techniques such as social relations modelling, multilevel modelling and multiple imputations throughout this thesis to examine the hypotheses outlined. We also made an effort to use different levels of acquaintance in each of the three longitudinal studies to simulate different group formation situations that are realistic across various organisational domains, thereby extending the external validity of the findings having successfully replicated them across the studies.

From a theoretical perspective, we incorporated transformational leadership theory and evolutionary theories of leadership and social status attainment to identify the mechanisms that can explain the temporality of narcissistic leadership. To our knowledge, the collection of studies conducted in this thesis is the first time the aforementioned theories have been applied to investigate the temporality of narcissistic leadership. In essence, this thesis addressed a major

gap in the narcissistic leadership literature by not only presenting empirical evidence via a longitudinal study, but have successfully replicated this finding twice, as well as applied contemporary theories to examine the mechanisms of how narcissistic leadership is influenced by temporality. We have also taken advantage of advanced statistical analyses and introduced varying levels of acquaintance in each study to make the findings more robust and externally valid.

### **Limitations**

The first limitation of the thesis is the exclusive use of student participants in three of the four studies conducted, which limits the external validity of the results. However, utilising student participants provided a naturalised environment to test our hypotheses, permitting investigations of narcissistic leadership at varying levels of acquaintance and temporality. Such a stable environment might not be so readily available in other organisational settings.

The second limitation relates to the lack of consideration of group performance as the leadership outcome. This concern is rather modest given that team performance in the context of the current studies was intended as a motivator for continued engagement in the group tasks to make leadership continually relevant across time. However, the volatility of group performance when fronted by narcissistic leaders (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007) suggests that examining the temporality of narcissistic leadership via group performance outcomes is worthy of future research.

The third limitation of the thesis pertains to the conceptual stance taken in the utility of transformational leadership as the mediator variable in Chapter 3. As discussed earlier, the treatment of transformational leadership in its differentiated components was not possible given the utility of an abbreviated measure of global transformational leadership. Thus, it would be interesting to examine if a differentiated transformational leadership measure could



possibly provide complementary insights by identifying the specific transformational leadership behaviours that are important at specific temporal phases of leadership, and whether these behaviours are suitably aligned with narcissistic self-enhancement goals.

The fourth limitation pertains to the variation in sample sizes across the studies despite the similarity in experimental design. Multilevel analysis mainly utilises asymptotic maximum likelihood methods, which operates under the assumption that sample sizes are sufficiently large. Indeed, multilevel simulation studies have suggested that it is more important to consider group-level sample size rather than individual-level sample size and although there is currently no universally agreed minimum  $N$  for group-level samples, a group-level  $N$  of 30 is widely recommended (e.g., Hox, 2010). Across the studies where we have taken a multilevel approach to analyses, we group-level  $N$ s of 24, 29 and 22. Although they were short of the recommended sample size of 30, effort has been taken to maximise the number of groups under the constraint that sample size is dependent on the number of students that have enrolled in the modules concerned. As a consequence, there is a possibility that the group level analyses in this thesis could be limited by a lack of power. Future studies could attempt to replicate these studies in alternative organisational settings where sample size can be more easily manipulated to match the demands of statistical power assumptions.

The fifth limitation pertains to the lack of manipulation of self-enhancement, where the availability of leadership in leaderless groups at various levels of acquaintance does not equate to the manipulation of self-enhancement as a variable across the studies. Manipulating and measuring self-enhancement would enable us to draw clearer conclusions about the waning perceptions of narcissists as leaders directly as a product of decreasing self-enhancement (e.g., impulsivity; Vazire & Funder, 2006). However, narcissists are by definition known to engage in social relationships in order to self-enhance (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001).

Consequently, the pursuit of leadership positions qualifies as opportunities for self-enhancement because they offer higher social status and power (Brunell et al., 2008). Furthermore, the manipulation of acquaintance level in these studies was intended for examinations of narcissistic leadership under different temporal contexts and not for the purposes of manipulating self-enhancement. Future research can examine follower perceptions towards narcissistic leaders when leadership positions offer varying degrees of self-enhancement.

### **Future research directions**

This section lists the future research possibilities emanating directly from the findings of this thesis, as well as the generic research areas that stem from our research on the temporality of narcissistic leadership. In general, the rationale for most of the research areas identified below have already been discussed in earlier sections of the thesis and therefore are described in a brief and succinct manner in this section.

#### **Proximal future research directions**

1. The initial positive perceptions towards narcissistic leadership are transient in nature. Are the temporal changes in perceptions towards narcissistic leaders based on the breaking down of emotional connections between narcissistic leader and their followers and can the temporal pattern be successfully altered with suitable interventions such as empathy training? Previous empirical evidence derived from perspective-taking training (Hepper et al., 2014) seems to indicate promise in helping narcissists maintain emotional connections with their followers.
2. Previous theory and our findings have suggested an initial favouring of narcissistic leaders that quickly wanes over time. However, the findings in Chapter 4 suggest that there could be further distinction of temporal phases beyond leader emergence. What

are the self-appraisal and self-regulatory processes involved when narcissists lose favour from their followers beyond leader emergence?

3. Which differentiated components of transformational leadership are crucial at specific temporal phases of narcissistic leadership? Visionary components of transformational leadership seem to be crucial for leadership initially, but over time support and challenge components of transformational leadership might be perceived as more definitive of leadership.
4. Our findings in Chapter 4 have explored empirically the evolutionary perspectives on narcissistic leadership, which are consistent with predictions of service-for-prestige. However, further research is needed to empirically test service-for-prestige predictions, particularly immediately after narcissists emerge as leaders. More specifically, is taking a dominance approach indicative of leadership because it helps to address follower free-riding and is buffered by the favourable effects of ingroup bias?
5. Can we help narcissists to become better leaders? More empirical research is needed (especially across applied organisational settings) to identify suitable interventions to help narcissistic leaders lead more effectively over time. What is the efficacy of incorporating certain qualities with existing narcissistic characteristics in helping narcissists lead effectively over the long-term? As discussed earlier, would a cocktail of charisma plus empathy be a potent combination in helping narcissists to thrive as effective leaders over time?
6. Narcissistic vulnerability and its role in leadership. Could narcissists' preference for short-term self-enhancement be influenced by narcissistic vulnerability? Future research can investigate if narcissistic vulnerability functions as protective mechanism to help maintain narcissists' health and well-being.

**Generic future research directions**

1. This thesis investigated the temporality of narcissistic leadership, which highlights the significance of considering personality when determining leadership temporality. Thus, it is possible to consider more broadly how personality (i.e., Big 5 or other specific personality traits) is associated with leadership and is personality predictive of leadership temporality? Is there utility for personality to be used as a leader selection and/or monitoring tool, in that it can predict and/or monitor leadership in the short-term, as well as in the long-term?
2. Narcissism and its vulnerability. Is narcissistic vulnerability less influential for leadership? Or are there weaknesses in the current measurements available in the literature when they do not tap into the implicit nature of narcissistic vulnerability? Perhaps measurements tapping into the implicit nature of narcissistic vulnerability (i.e., a measurement in the nature of the Implicit Association Test; Greenwald, McGhee, & Shwartz, 1998) is necessary in future research in order to more accurately reflect the influence of narcissistic vulnerability on leadership.
3. Narcissism as a personality trait and its evolutionary origins have been explored in Chapter 4 of this thesis. On a broader scale, can evolutionary theories provide greater understanding of how personality affects leadership effectiveness?
4. Current leader training and selection practices might benefit from a rethink. Are we producing leaders for the long-term or are current leadership selection and training processes reflective of the current leadership climate (i.e., a preference for short-term leadership?) Is the leadership of the future one that is influenced by a shift from an industrialised economy to a knowledge-based economy, where leadership systems become less bureaucratic, less hierarchical, but more transient, more adaptive to the

dynamic needs of organisations, especially in the areas of creativity and knowledge generation (Uhl-Bein et al., 2007)? Would such leadership systems result in greater capacity for leader emergence to occur?

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the findings from this thesis show empirically for the first time that the temporality of narcissistic leadership is characterised by initial positive follower perceptions that wane over time. This temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership can be explained by the perceptions of narcissists' ability to display transformational leadership behaviours for a short initial period. The explanatory effect of transformational leadership highlights the significance and also the fickleness of the emotional relationship between leader and followers in determining leadership effectiveness over time. Further insights into the temporality of narcissistic leadership were obtained from an evolutionary perspective; where the temporal pattern of narcissistic leadership is explained by distinct initial perceptions of narcissists as either dominant or prestigious individuals, as dominant individuals immediately after leader emergence, but not over time. The findings, from an evolutionary perspective, suggest that narcissists are highly adaptable for the purposes of self-enhancement in the short-term, and therefore are very successful in leadership emergence contexts. However, we postulate that narcissists are likely to revert to their default evolutionary dominance strategies over time, which has shown to illicit positive perceptions of narcissists as leaders early on but not later. Investing in mutually beneficial strategies that focus on establishing closer relationships between narcissistic leaders and their followers, where narcissistic leaders are consistently motivated to self-enhance and their followers benefit from their leadership, is a promising approach to extending the positive effects of narcissistic leadership into the long-term. An alternative approach would be to rethink current leader selection and training processes to

encourage a more broad-based appreciation of the different traits that are predictive of consistent, long-term leadership effectiveness. The relative benefit of each approach is likely context-specific.

Personal reflection

滾滾長江東逝水，  
浪花淘盡英雄。  
是非成敗轉頭空。  
青山依舊在，  
幾度夕陽紅。

—楊慎(1488-1559)

The current of the Yangtze River runs eastwards,  
Heroes fade like the river spray.  
Right and wrong, success and failure, are fleeting.  
But the land still exists,  
And the sun still rises and sets.

- Yang Shen (1488-1559)

This is the introductory poem to the Chinese classic “Romance of the Three Kingdoms” and represents very well what I have learnt in my PhD journey. It relates to the temporality of narcissistic leadership, where narcissists rise as heroes initially, but alas their success is fleeting. Narcissists might also feel vulnerable in other temporal contexts, but their fear of failure is temporary. This research, like the poem, also reflects the transience of achievements and failures in life.

These last four years raced past like the Yangtze River, waiting for no one. Knowing that time would not sit still for me pushed me to keep learning, to keep trying, regardless of the successes and the even more frequent failures. This approach of always wanting to be better, I have felt very keenly among the staff whom I have had the pleasure of interacting with over the past four years. They are all heroes in my eyes, but I don’t think at any point, they see themselves as heroes, ready to rest on their laurels. Instead, their relentless quest for knowledge and producing new knowledge has seen them constantly riding the crest of the river current. I have been lucky enough to experience the publication process with a respected peer-reviewed journal that culminated in feelings of elation that usually comes with that acceptance email from the editor. However, I quickly realised the effervescent nature of this achievement – your emotions raise you to the top but it just fades like the river spray. This temporary “high” made me cherish even more the process itself – the support I have been given and the hard work we have put in as a team. This publication experience consolidated my belief that always wanting to be better is the best quality I have learnt during the course of my PhD. As the Chinese saying goes, “there is always a mountain higher than the one before it”, I endeavour to keep believing in and challenging myself in as many areas of my life as possible.



## References

- Albright, L., Kenny, D. A., & Malloy, T. E. (1988). Consensus in personality judgments at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *55*, 387-395. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.55.3.387
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*, 440-450. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002
- Anderson, C., Brion, S., Moore, D. A., & Kennedy, J. A. (2012). A status-enhancement account of overconfidence. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *103*, 718-735. doi: 10.1037/a0029395
- Anderson, C., & Kilduff, G. J. (2009). Why do dominant personalities attain influence in face-to-face groups? The competence-signaling effects of trait dominance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *96*, 491-503. doi: 10.1037/a0014201
- Anderson, C., Srivastava, S., Beer, J., Spataro, S. E., & Chatman, J. A. (2006). Knowing your place: Self-perceptions of status in face-to-face groups. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *91*, 1094-1110. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.91.6.1094
- Arthur, C. A., Hardy, L., & Woodman, T. (2012). Realising the Olympic dream: vision, support and challenge. *Reflective Practice*, *13*, 399-406. doi: 10.1080/14623943.2012.670112
- Arthur, C. A., & Tomsett, P. (2015). Transformational leadership behaviour in sport. In S. D. Mellalieu & S. Hanton (Eds.), *Contemporary advances in sport psychology* (pp. 175-201). Abingdon, Oxon: Routledge.
- Ashforth, B. E., & Mael, F. (1989). Social identity theory and the organization. *Academy of Management Review*, *14*, 20-39. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1989.4278999

- Avolio, B. J. (2007). Promoting more integrative strategies for leadership theory-building. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 25. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.25
- Avolio, B. J., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: A multi-level framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *6*, 199-218. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(95)90035-7
- Avolio, B. J., Bass, B. M., & Jung, D. I. (1999). Re-examining the components of transformational and transactional leadership using the Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *72*, 441-462. doi: 10.1348/096317999166789
- Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism-popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *98*, 132-145. doi: 10.1037/a0016338
- Barbuto, J. E. (1997). Taking the charisma out of transformational leadership. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, *12*, 689-697.
- Barling, J., Loughlin, C., & Kelloway, K. E. (2002). Development and test of a model linking safety-specific transformational leadership and occupational safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 488-496. doi: 10.1037//0021-9010.87.3.488
- Barrett, L., Dunbar, R., & Lycett, J. (2002). *Human evolutionary psychology*. London: Palgrave.
- Barry, C. T., & Malkin, M. L. (2010). The relation between adolescent narcissism and internalizing problems depends on the conceptualization of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*, 684-690. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2010.09.001
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. New York: Free Press.

- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1994). Transformational leadership and organizational culture. *The International Journal of Public Administration*, *17*, 541-554. doi: 10.1080/01900699408524907
- Bass, B. M., & Avolio, B. J. (2005). *MLQ: Multifactor Leadership Questionnaire (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.)*. Redwood City, CA: Mind Garden.
- Bauer, D. J., Preacher, K. J., & Gil, K. M. (2006). Conceptualizing and testing random indirect effects and moderated mediation in multilevel models: new procedures and recommendations. *Psychological Methods*, *11*, 142-163. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.11.2.142
- Baumeister, R. F., & Scher, S. J. (1988). Self-defeating behavior patterns among normal individuals: Review and analysis of common self-destructive tendencies. *Psychological Bulletin*, *104*, 3-22. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.104.1.3
- Bennis, W. (2007). The challenges of leadership in the modern world: Introduction to the special issue. *American Psychologist*, *62*, 2-5. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.62.1.2
- Bergman, J. Z., Westerman, J. W., & Daly, J. P. (2010). Narcissism in management education. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, *9*, 119–131. doi: 10.5465/AMLE.2010.48661195
- Blair, C. A., Hoffman, B. J., & Helland, K. R. (2008). Narcissism in organizations: A multisource appraisal reflects different perspectives. *Human Performance*, *21*, 254–276. doi: 10.1080/08959280802137705
- Block, J. (2002). *Personality as an affect-processing system*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Block, J. H., & Block, J. (1980). The role of ego-control and ego-resiliency in the organization of behavior. In W. A. Collins (Ed.), *The Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology: Vol.*

13. *Development of cognition, affect, and social relations* (pp.39–101). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Bluedorn, A., & Jaussi, K. (2008). Leaders, followers, and time. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *19*, 654–668. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.09.006
- Boal, K. B., & Hooijberg, R. (2000). Strategic leadership research: Moving on. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 515-549. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00057-6
- Boivie, S., Lange, D., McDonald, M. L., & Westphal, J. D. (2011). Me or we: The effects of CEO organizational identification on agency costs. *Academy of Management Journal*, *54*, 551–576. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2011.61968081
- Bradlee, P. M. & Emmons, R. A. (1992). Locating narcissism within the interpersonal circumplex and the five-factor model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*, 821-830. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(92)90056-U
- Brunell, A. B., Gentry, W. A, Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Kuhnert, K. W., & Demarree, K. G. (2008). Leader emergence: the case of the narcissistic leader. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 1663–1676. doi: 10.1177/0146167208324101
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does selflove or self-hate lead to violence?. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *75*, 219-229. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.75.1.219
- Buss, D. M., & Chiodo, L. M. (1991). Narcissistic acts in everyday life. *Journal of Personality*, *59*, 179-215. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.1991.tb00773.x
- Callow, N., Smith, M. J., Hardy, L., Arthur, C. A., & Hardy, J. (2009). Measurement of transformational leadership and its relationship with team cohesion and performance level. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *21*, 395-412. doi: 10.1080/10413200903204754.

- Campbell, W. K. (2005). *When you love a man who loves himself: How to deal with a one-way relationship*. Chicago: Sourcebooks Casablanca.
- Campbell, W. K., Bosson, J. K., Goheen, T. W., Lakey, C. E., & Kernis, M. H. (2007). Do narcissists dislike themselves “deep down inside”? *Psychological Science*, *18*, 227–229. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01880.x
- Campbell, W. K., Brunell, A. B., & Finkel, E. J. (2006). Narcissism, interpersonal self-regulation, and romantic relationships: An agency model approach. In K. D. Vohs & E. J. Finkel (Eds.), *Self and relationships: Connecting intrapersonal and interpersonal processes* (pp. 57–83). New York, NY, US: Guildford Press.
- 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 & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *31*, 1358–68. doi: 10.1177/0146167205274855
- Campbell, W. K., & Campbell, S. M. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the peculiar benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and examination of leadership. *Self and Identity*, *8*, 214–232. doi: 10.1080/15298860802505129
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, J. D. (2007). The narcissistic self: Background, an extended agency model, and ongoing controversies. In C. Sedikides & S. J. Spencer (Eds), *The self: Frontiers of social psychology* (pp. 115-138). New York, US: Psychology Press.
- Campbell, W., Goodie, A. S., & Foster, J. D. (2004). Narcissism, confidence, and risk attitude. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *17*, 297-311. doi: 10.1002/bdm.475
- Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review*, *21*, 268–284. doi: 10.1016/j.hrmmr.2010.10.007

- Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2011). Narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Six suggestions for unifying the field. In K. W. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 485-488). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*, 329-347. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.2000.2282
- Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 358-368. doi: 10.1177/0146167202286007
- Carless, S. A. (1998). Assessing the discriminant validity of transformational leadership behavior as measured by the MLQ. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, *71*, 353-358. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8325.1998.tb00681.x
- Carlson, E. N., Vazire, S., & Oltmanns, T. F. (2011). You probably think this paper's about you: Narcissists' perceptions of their personality and reputation. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *101*, 185-201. doi: 10.1037/a0023781
- Carlyle, T. (1840). *On heroes, and hero-worship and the heroic in history*. London: Chapman & Hall Limited.
- Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. C. (2007). It's all about me: Narcissistic chief executive officers and their effects on company strategy and performance. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *52*, 351-386. doi: 10.2189/asqu.52.3.351
- Chemers, M. M. (2000). Leadership research and theory: A functional integration. *Group Dynamics*, *4*, 37-43. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.4.1.27

- Cheng, J. T., & Tracy, J. L. (2014). Toward a unified science of hierarchy: Dominance and prestige are two fundamental pathways to human social rank. In J. T. Cheng, J. L. Tracy & Anderson, C (Eds.), *The psychology of social status* (pp. 3-27). Springer New York.
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., Foulsham, T., Kingstone, A., & Henrich, J. (2013). Two ways to the top: Evidence that dominance and prestige are distinct yet viable avenues to social rank and influence. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *104*, 103-125. doi: 10.1037/a0030398
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Henrich, J. (2010). Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *31*, 334-347. doi: 10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2010.02.004
- Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L., & Miller, G. E. (2013). Are narcissists hardy or vulnerable? The role of narcissism in the production of stress-related biomarkers in response to emotional distress. *Emotion*, *13*, 1004-1011. doi: 10.1037/a0034410
- Cisek, S. Z., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2008). Do narcissists use material possessions as a primary buffer against pain? *Psychological Inquiry*, *19*, 205-207. doi: 10.1080/10478400802608848
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1987). Toward a behavioral theory of charismatic leadership in organizational settings. *Academy of Management Review*, *12*, 637-647. doi: 10.5465/AMR.1987.4306715
- Conger, J. A., & Kanungo, R. N. (1998). *Charismatic leadership in organizations*. Redwood City, CA: Sage Publications.
- Conway, J. M., & Huffcutt, A. I. (1997). Psychometric properties of multisource performance ratings: A meta-analysis of subordinate, supervisor, peer, and self-ratings. *Human Performance*, *10*, 331-360. doi: 10.1207/s15327043hup1004\_2

- Dansereau, F., Jr., Yammarino, F. J., Markham, S. E., Allutto, J. A., Newman, J., Dumas, M., ... Keller, T. (1995). Individualized leadership: A new multiple-level approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 6, 413-450. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(95)90016-0
- Davis, M. H. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 44, 113-126. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 8, 49 -65. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(97)90030-8
- DeRue, D. S., Nahrgang, J. D., Wellman, N. E. D., & Humphrey, S. E. (2011). Trait and behavioral theories of leadership: An integration and meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *Personnel Psychology*, 64, 7-52. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01201.x
- Eastwick, P. W. (2009). Beyond the Pleistocene: Using phylogeny and constraint to inform the evolutionary psychology of human mating. *Psychological Bulletin*, 135, 794-821. doi: 10.1037/a0016845
- Enders, C. K., & Tofighi, D. (2007). Centering predictor variables in cross-sectional multilevel models: a new look at an old issue. *Psychological Methods*, 12, 121-138. doi: 10.1037/1082-989X.12.2.121
- Fanelli, A., Misangyi, V. F., & Tosi, H. L. (2009). In charisma we trust: The effects of CEO charismatic visions on securities analysts. *Organization Science*, 20, 1011-1033. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0407



- Findley, D., & Ojanen, T. (2013). Agentic and communal goals in early adulthood: Associations with narcissism, empathy, and perceptions of self and others. *Self and Identity, 12*, 504-526. doi: 10.1080/15298868.2012.694660
- Finkel, E. J., Campbell, W. K., Buffardi, L. E., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. E. (2009). The metamorphosis of Narcissus: Communal activation promotes relationship commitment among narcissists. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 1271–1284. doi: 10.1177/0146167209340904
- Foster, J. D., & Trimm, R. F. (2008). On being eager and uninhibited: Narcissism and approach-avoidance motivation. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1004–1017. doi: 10.1177/0146167208316688
- Foti, R. J., Knee, R. E., Jr., & Backert, R. S. G. (2008). Multiple level implications of frame leadership perceptions as a dynamic process. *The Leadership Quarterly, 19*, 178–194. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2008.01.007
- Freud, S. (1931/1959). Libidinal Types. In J. Strachey (Ed.), *Collected Papers*, (Vol. 5, Chapter XXIII). London, England: Hogarth Press Ltd.
- Freud, S. (1914/1957). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Strachey (Ed. And Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 73-102). London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Freud, S. (1905/1957). Three essays on sexuality. In J. Strachey (Ed. And Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 7, pp. 125-245). London, England: Hogarth Press.
- Galvin, B.M., Waldman, D. A., & Balthazard, P. (2010). Visionary communication qualities as mediators of the relationship between narcissism and attributions of leader charisma. *Personnel Psychology, 63*, 509–537. doi: 10.1111/j.1744-6570.2010.01179.x

- Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 103*, 854–878. doi: 10.1037/a0029629
- Giambatista, R. C. (2004). Jumping through hoops: A longitudinal study of leader life cycles in the NBA. *The Leadership Quarterly, 15*, 607–624. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.07.002
- Golec de Zavala, A., Cichocka, A., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 97*, 1074–1096. doi: 10.1037/a0016904
- Gottschall, A. C., West, S. G., & Enders, C. K. (2012). A comparison of item-level and scale-level multiple imputation for questionnaire batteries. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 47*, 1–25. doi: 10.1080/00273171.2012.640589
- Graham, J. W., Olchowski, A. E., & Gilreath, T. D. (2007). How many imputations are really needed? Some practical clarifications of multiple imputation theory. *Prevention Science, 8*, 206–13. doi: 10.1007/s11121-007-0070-9
- Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. L. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 74*, 1464–1480. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464
- Gulati, R., Sytch, M., & Tatarynowicz, A. (2012). The rise and fall of small worlds: Exploring the dynamics of social structure. *Organization Science, 23*, 449–471. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0592
- Halevy, N., Berson, Y., & Galinsky, A. D. (2011). The mainstream is not electable: When vision triumphs over representativeness in leader emergence and effectiveness. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 893–904. doi: 10.1177/0146167211402836
- Hardy, L., Arthur, C. A., Jones, G., Shariff, A., Munnoch, K., Isaacs, I., & Allsopp, A. J. (2010). The relationship between transformational leadership behaviors, psychological,

- and training outcomes in elite military recruits. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 21, 20–32. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.10.002
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31, 588-599. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204
- Henrich, J., & Gil-White, F. J. (2001). The evolution of prestige: Freely conferred deference as a mechanism for enhancing the benefits of cultural transmission. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 22, 165-196. doi: 10.1016/S1090-5138(00)00071-4
- Hepper, E. G., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2014). Moving narcissus: Can narcissists be empathic? *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40, 1-13. doi: 10.1177/0146167214535812
- Hogan, R., Curphy, G. J., & Hogan, J. (1994). What we know about leadership: Effectiveness and personality. *American Psychologist*, 49, 493-504. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.49.6.493
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 9, 40–51. doi: 10.1111/1468-2389.00162
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology*, 9, 169–180. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.9.2.169
- Hogbin, H. I. (1943-44). Native councils and courts in the Solomon Islands. *Oceania*, 14, 258-283.
- Holtzman, N. S., & Strube, M. J. (2011). The intertwined evolution of narcissism and short-term mating: An emerging hypothesis. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 146–152). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

- Hooijberg, R., & Choi, J. (2000). Which leadership roles matter to whom? An examination of rater effects on perceptions of effectiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *11*, 341–364. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(00)00044-8
- Hoorens, V. (2011). The social consequences of self-enhancement and self-protection. In M. D. Alicke & C. Sedikides (Eds.), *Handbook of self-enhancement and self-protection* (pp. 235–257). New York, NY : Guilford Press.
- Hoorens, V., Pandelaere, M., Oldersma, F., & Sedikides, C. (2012). The hubris hypothesis: You can self- enhance, but you'd better not show it. *Journal of Personality*, *80*, 1237-1274. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00759.x
- House, R. J., & Podsakoff, P. M. (1994). *Leadership effectiveness: Past perspectives and future directions for research*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- House, R. J., & Shamir, B. (1993). Toward the integration of transformational, charismatic, and visionary theories. In M. M. Chemers & R. Ayman (Eds.), *Leadership theory and research: Perspectives and directions* (pp. 81-107). San Diego, CA, US: Academic Press.
- Howell, J. M., & Shamir, B. (2005). The role of followers in charismatic leadership: Relationships and their consequences. *Academy of Management Review*, *2005*, *96* –112. doi: 10.5465/AMR.2005.15281435
- Hox, J. J. (2010). *Multilevel analysis: Techniques and applications*. (2nd ed.). New York: Routledge.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *66*, 206-219. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.66.1.206
- Johnson, D. D., & Fowler, J. H. (2011). The evolution of overconfidence. *Nature*, *477*, 317-320. doi: 10.1038/nature10384

- Jones, B. D., Woodman, T., & Barlow, M. (2014). Narcissism predicts moral disengagement and anti-social behaviour. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise* (under second review).
- Joshi, A., Lazarova, M. B., & Liao, H. (2009). Getting everyone on board: The role of inspirational leadership in geographically dispersed teams. *Organization Science*, 20, 240-252. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1080.0383
- Judd, C. M., Kenny, D. A., & McClelland, G. H. (2001). Estimating and testing mediation and moderation in within-subject designs. *Psychological Methods*, 6, 115-134. doi:10.1037//1082-989X.6.2.115
- 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, 765-780. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.87.4.765
- Judge, T. A., Colbert, A. E., & Ilies, R. (2004). Intelligence and leadership: a quantitative review and test of theoretical propositions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 542-552. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.3.542
- 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. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.91.4.762
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their relative validity. *The Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, 755-68. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.89.5.755
- Kellett, J. B., Humphrey, R. H., & Sleeth, R. G. (2006). Empathy and the emergence of task and relations leaders. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 146-162. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2005.12.003

- Kenny, D. (1994). *Interpersonal perceptions: A social relations analysis*. New York: Guildford Press.
- Kenny, D. A., Horner, C., Kashy, D. A., & Chu, L. (1992). Consensus at zero acquaintance: Replication, behavioral cues, and stability. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *62*, 88-97. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.62.1.88
- Kernis, M. H., & Sun, C. R. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *28*, 4-13. doi: 10.1006/jrpe.1994.1002
- Khoo, H. S., & Burch, G. S. J. (2008). The “dark” side of leadership personality and transformational leadership: an exploratory study. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 86-97. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.07.018
- Klimecki, O. M., Leiberg, S., Ricard, M., & Singer, T. (2013). Differential pattern of functional brain plasticity after compassion and empathy training. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *9*, 873-879. doi: 10.1093/scan/nst060
- Kohut, H. (1985). Creativeness, charisma, group psychology: Reflections on the self-analysis of Freud (1976). In C. B. Strozier (Ed.), *Self psychology and the humanities: Reflections on a new psychoanalytic approach* (pp. 171-214). London: England: W. W. Norton & Company Ltd.
- Konrath, S., Bushman, B., & Campbell, W. K. (2006). Attenuating the link between threatened egotism and aggression. *Psychological Science*, *17*, 995–1001. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2006.01818.x
- Küfner, A. C., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2013). The two pathways to being an (un-)popular narcissist. *Journal of Personality*, *81*, 184-195. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00795.x

- Lakey, C. E., Rose, P., Campbell, W. K., & Goodie, A. S. (2008). Probing the link between narcissism and gambling: the mediating role of judgment and decision-making biases. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, 21, 113-137. doi: 10.1002/bdm.582
- Lasch, C. (1991). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. London: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Levy, K. N., Ellison, W. D., & Reynoso, J. S. (2011). A historical review of narcissism and narcissistic personality. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 3-13). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Ling, Y., Simsek, Z., Lubatkin, M. H., & Veiga, J. F. (2008). Transformational leadership's role in promoting corporate entrepreneurship: Examining the CEO-TMT interface. *Academy of Management Journal*, 51, 557-576. doi: 10.5465/AMJ.2008.32626023
- Lord, R. G., Brown, D. J., Harvey, J. L., & Hall, R. J. (2001). Contextual constraints on prototype generation and their multilevel consequences for leadership perceptions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 311-338. doi:10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00081-9
- Lord, R. G., De Vader, C. L., & Alliger, G. M. (1986). A meta-analysis of the relation between personality traits and leadership perceptions: An application of validity generalization procedures. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 402. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.71.3.402
- Lord, R. G., & Dinh, J. E. (2014). What have we learned that is critical in understanding leadership perceptions and leader-performance relations? *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 7, 158-177. doi: 10.1111/iops.12127
- Lowe, K. B., Kroeck, K. G., & Sivasubramaniam, N. (1996). Effectiveness correlates of transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic review of the MLQ literature. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, 385-425. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(96)90027-2

- Maccoby, M. (2000). Narcissistic leaders: The incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, 78, 68-78.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Lockwood, C. M., & Williams, J. (2004). Confidence limits for the indirect effect: Distribution of the product and resampling methods. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 39, 99-128. doi: 10.1207/s15327906mbr3901\_4
- Malloy, T. E., & Albright, L. (1990). Interpersonal perception in a social context. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 58, 419-428. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.58.3.419
- Mann, R. D. (1959). A review of the relationships between personality and performance in small groups. *Psychological Bulletin*, 56, 241-270. doi: 10.1037/h0044587
- Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2002). Leadership in complex organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 12, 389-418. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00092-3
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Addressing criticisms of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI). In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 146-152). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, 78, 1529-1564. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x
- Mishel, L., & Sabadish, N. (2013). CEO pay in 2012 was extraordinarily high relative to typical workers and other high earners. *Economic Policy Institute. Issue Brief*, 367. Retrieved from [http://www.lexissecuritiesmosaic.com/gateway/sec/speech/2013\\_ceo-pay-2012-extraordinarily-high.pdf](http://www.lexissecuritiesmosaic.com/gateway/sec/speech/2013_ceo-pay-2012-extraordinarily-high.pdf)



- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*, 177–196. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1204\_1
- Morf, C. C., Torchetti, L., & Schürch, E. (2011). Narcissism from the perspective of the dynamic self-regulatory processing model. In K. W. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 56-70). Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Mullen, B., Salas, E., & Driskell, J. E. (1989). Salience, motivation, and artifact as contributions to the relation between participation rate and leadership. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *25*, 545-559. doi:10.1016/0022-1031(89)90005-X
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *22*, 910–925. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.07.011
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., & Ten Velden, F. S. (2013), Uncertainty enhances the preference for narcissistic leaders. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *43*, 370–380. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.1943
- Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2011). Reality at odds with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science*, *22*, 1259–1264. doi: 10.1177/0956797611417259
- 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. doi: 10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00066-7

- Ong, C. W., Roberts, R., Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T., & Akehurst, S. (2015). The leader ship is sinking: A temporal investigation of narcissistic leadership. *Journal of Personality*. doi: 10.1111/jopy.12155
- Owens, B. P., Walker, A. S., & Waldman, D. A. (2015). Leader narcissism and follower outcomes: The counterbalancing effect of leader humility. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1203-1213. doi: 10.1037/a0038698
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 74, 1197-1208. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1197
- Paulhus, D. L., Westlake, B. G., Calvez, S. S., & Harms, P. D. (2013). Self-presentation style in job interviews: The role of personality and culture. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 2042-2059. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12157
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark triad of personality: Narcissism, machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36, 556-563.
- Peugh, J. L., & Enders, C. K. (2004). Missing data in educational research: A review of reporting practices and suggestions for improvement. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 525-556. doi: 10.3102/00346543074004525
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y., & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.88.5.879
- Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., Moorman, R. H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviors and their effects on followers' trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviors. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107-142. doi: 10.1016/1048-9843(90)90009-7

- Price, M. E., & Van Vugt, M. (2014a). The evolution of leader-follower reciprocity: The theory of service-for-prestige. *Frontiers in Human Neuroscience*, *8*, 1-17. doi: 10.3389/fnhum.2014.00363
- Price, M. E., & Van Vugt, M. (2014b). The service-for-prestige theory of leader-follower relations: A review of the evolutionary psychology and anthropology literatures. In R. D. Arvey & S. M. Colarelli (Eds.), *Biological foundations of organizational behavior* (pp. 169-201). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- R Core Team. (2013). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria. Retrieved from <http://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rank, O. (1914/1971). *The double: A psychoanalytic study*. (H. Tucker Jr., Trans). Chapel Hill, NC: UNC Press.
- Rasbash, J., Browne, W. J., Healy, M., Cameron, B., & Charlton, C. (2012) *MLwiN Version 2.25*. Centre for Multilevel Modelling, University of Bristol.
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports*, *45*, 590. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.590
- Raskin, R., & Novacek, J. (1991). Narcissism and the use of fantasy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *47*, 490-499. doi: 10.1002/1097-4679(199107)47:4<490::AID-JCLP2270470404>3.0.CO;2-J
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *54*, 890-902. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890
- Reina, C. S., Zhang, Z., & Peterson, S. J. (2014). CEO grandiose narcissism and firm performance: The role of organizational identification. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *25*, 958-971. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2014.06.004

- Reynolds, J., Stewart, M., Sisco, L., & MacDonald, R. (2006). Have adolescents become too ambitious? High school seniors' educational and occupational plans, 1976 to 2000. *Social Problems*, *53*, 186–206. doi: 10.1525/sp.2006.53.2.186
- Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *74*, 672-685. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.672
- Roberts, R., Callow, N., Hardy, L., Woodman, T., & Thomas, L. (2010). Interactive effects of different visual imagery perspectives and narcissism on motor performance. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *32*, 499-517.
- Roberts, R., Woodman, T., Hardy, L., Davis, L., & Wallace, H. M. (2013). Psychological skills do not always help performance: The moderating role of narcissism. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *25*, 316-325. doi: 10.1080/10413200.2012.731472
- Roccas, S. (2003). Identification and status revisited: The moderating role of self-enhancement and self-transcendence values. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 726-736. doi: 10.1177/0146167203029006005
- Rosenthal, S., & Pittinsky, T. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 617–633. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.005
- Rubin, D. B. (1987). *Multiple imputation for nonresponse in surveys*. New York: Wiley.
- Sahlins, M. D. (1963). Poor man, rich man, big-man, chief: Political types in Melanesia and Polynesia. *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, *5*, 285-303. doi: 10.1017/S0010417500001729
- Schafer, J. L. (1997). *Analysis of incomplete multivariate data*. London; New York: Chapman & Hall.

- Schaubroeck, J., Lam, S. S. K., & Cha, S. E. (2007). Embracing transformational leadership: Team values and the impact of leader behavior on team performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1020–1030. doi: 10.1037/0021-9010.92.4.1020
- Schönbrodt, F. D., Back, M. D., & Schmukle, S. C. (2012). TripleR: An R package for social relations analyses based on round robin designs. *Behavior Research Methods, 44*, 455–470. doi: 10.3758/s13428-011-0150-4
- Sedikides, C., Hoorens, V., & Dufner, M. (2015). Self-enhancing self-presentation: Interpersonal, relational, and organizational implications. In F. Guay, D. M. McInerney, R. Craven, & H. W. Marsh (Eds.), *Self-concept, motivation and identity: Underpinning success with research and practice. International advances in self research* (Vol. 5, pp. 29–55). Charlotte, NC: Information Age.
- Sedikides, C., Rudich, E. A., Gregg, A. P., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy?: Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 87*, 400–416. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.87.3.400
- Sedikides, C., Skowronski, J. J., & Gaertner, L. (2004). Self-enhancement and self-protection motivation: From the laboratory to an evolutionary context. *Journal of Cultural and Evolutionary Psychology, 2*, 61–79. doi: 10.1556/JCEP.2.2004.1-2.4
- Selig, J. P., & Preacher, K. J. (2008, June). Monte Carlo method for assessing mediation: An interactive tool for creating confidence intervals for indirect effects [Computer software]. Retrieved from <http://quantpsy.org/>.
- Shamir, B. (2011). Leadership takes time: Some implications of (not) taking time seriously in leadership research. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 307–315. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2011.02.006

- Shamir, B., & Howell, J. M. (1999). Organizational and contextual influences on the emergence and effectiveness of charismatic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *10*, 257-283. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00014-4
- Shariff, A. F., & Tracy, J. L. (2009). Knowing who's boss: Implicit perceptions of status from the nonverbal expression of pride. *Emotion*, *9*, 631-639. doi: 10.1037/a0017089
- Stiglitz, J. (2012). *The price of inequality*. UK: Penguin.
- Stogdill, R. M. (1948). Personal factors associated with leadership: A survey of the literature. *The Journal of Psychology*, *25*, 35-71. doi: 10.1080/00223980.1948.9917362
- Tejeda, M. J., Scandura, T. A., & Pillai, R. (2001). The MLQ revisited: Psychometric properties and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *12*, 31-52. doi: 10.1016/S1048-9843(01)00063-7
- Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (1992). The psychological foundations of culture. In J. Barkow, L. Cosmides, & J. Tooby (Eds.), *The adapted mind: Evolutionary psychology and the generation of culture* (pp. 19-136). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2005). Conceptual foundations of evolutionary psychology. In D. M. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 5-67). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Martens, J. P., & Robins, R. W. (2011). The emotional dynamics of narcissism: Inflated by pride, deflated by shame. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 146-152). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Tracy, J. L., & Robins, R. W. (2007). The psychological structure of pride: A tale of two facets. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *92*, 506-525. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.92.3.506
- Tracy, J. L., Shariff, A. F., & Cheng, J. T. (2010). A naturalist's view of pride. *Emotion Review*, *2*, 163-177. doi: 10.1177/1754073909354627

- Trivers, R. L. (1971). The evolution of reciprocal altruism. *Quarterly Review of Biology*, *46*, 35-57.  
doi: 10.1086/406755
- Tschanz, B. B., Morf, C. C., & Turner, C. M. (1998). Gender differences in the structure of narcissism: A multi-sample analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Sex Roles*, *38*, 863-870. doi: 10.1023/A:1018833400411
- Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B. J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A cross-temporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality*, *76*, 875–901. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00507.x
- Uhl-Bien, M., & Marion, R. (2009). Complexity leadership in bureaucratic forms of organizing: A meso model. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *20*, 631-650. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.04.007
- Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., & McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity leadership theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *18*, 298-318. doi: 10.1016/j.leaqua.2007.04.002
- van Buuren, S., & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, K. (2011). mice: Multivariate imputation by chained equations in R. *Journal of Statistical Software*, *45*, 1-67.
- Van Damme, C., Hoorens, V., & Sedikides, C. (2015). Self-enhancement provokes dislike: The hubris hypothesis and the aversiveness of explicit self-superiority claims. *Self and Identity*. doi: 10.1080/15298868.2015.1095232
- Van Vugt, M. (2006). Evolutionary origins of leadership and followership. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 354-371. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1004\_5
- Van Vugt, M., & De Cremer, D. (1999). Leadership in social dilemmas: The effects of group identification on collective actions to provide public goods. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, *76*, 587-599. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.76.4.587

- Van Vugt, M., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2008). Leadership, followership, and evolution: some lessons from the past. *American Psychologist*, *63*, 182–96. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.63.3.182
- Van Vugt, M., & Ronay, R. (2014). The evolutionary psychology of leadership: Theory, review, and roadmap. *Organizational Psychology Review*, *4*, 74-95. doi: 10.1177/2041386613493635
- Van Vugt, M., & Schaller, M. (2008). Evolutionary approaches to group dynamics: An introduction. *Group Dynamics*, *12*, 1–6. doi: 10.1037/1089-2699.12.1.1
- Varella, P., Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A. (2012). A model of instrumental networks: The roles of socialized charismatic leadership and group behavior. *Organization Science*, *23*, 582–595. doi: 10.1287/orsc.1100.0604
- Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 154–165. doi: 10.1207/s15327957pspr1002\_4
- Vazire, S., Naumann, L. P., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Portrait of a narcissist: Manifestations of narcissism in physical appearance. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*, 1439–1447. doi: 10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.007
- Vernon, P. A., Villani, V. C., Vickers, L. C., & Harris, J. A. (2008). A behavioral genetic investigation of the Dark Triad and the Big 5. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 445–452. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2007.09.007
- von Hippel, W., & Trivers, R. (2011). The evolution and psychology of self-deception. *The Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *34*, 1–16. doi: 10.1017/S0140525X10001354
- Vreeke, G. J., & van der Mark, I. L. (2003). Empathy: An integrative model. *New Ideas in Psychology*, *21*, 177-207. doi: 10.1016/j.newideapsych.2003.09.003



- Wai, M., & Tiliopoulos, N. (2012). The affective and cognitive empathic nature of the dark triad of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*, 794–799. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2012.01.008
- Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 82*, 819–834. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.819
- Wallace, H. M., Ready, C. B., & Weitenhagen, E. (2009). Narcissism and Task Persistence. *Self and Identity, 8*, 78–93. doi: 10.1080/15298860802194346
- Watson, P. J., Grisham, S. O., Trotter, M. V., & Biderman, M. D. (1984). Narcissism and empathy: Validity evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 301-305. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4803\_12
- Watson, P. J., & Morris, R. J. (1991). Narcissism, empathy and social desirability. *Personality and Individual Differences, 12*, 575–579. doi: 10.1016/0191-8869(91)90253-8
- Watts, A. L., Lilienfeld, S. O., Smith, S. F., Miller, J. D., Campbell, W. K., Waldman, I. D., ... Faschingbauer, T. J. (2013). The double-edged sword of grandiose narcissism: Implications for successful and unsuccessful leadership among U.S. presidents. *Psychological Science, 24*, 2379 –2389. doi: 10.1177/0956797613491970
- 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*, 5-32. doi: 10.1177/1052562911408097
- White, I. R., Royston, P., & Wood, A. M. (2011). Multiple imputation using chained equations: Issues and guidance for practice. *Statistics in Medicine, 30*, 377–399. doi: 10.1002/sim.4067

Williams, G. C. (1966). Natural selection, the costs of reproduction, and a refinement of Lack's principle. *American Naturalist*, 100, 687-690.

Woodman, T., Roberts, R., Hardy, L., Callow, N., & Rogers, C. H. (2011). There is an "I" in TEAM: Narcissism and social loafing. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 82, 285-290. doi: 10.1080/02701367.2011.10599756

## Leadership in Team Sport Study

Sex: **MALE** / FEMALE (Please circle)      Date of Birth (dd/mm/yy): \_\_\_\_\_

Have you either previously been or are currently involved in team sports (e.g., football, rugby, lacrosse, etc)? YES/NO (Please circle)

Have you either previously been or are currently playing in a football (soccer) team? YES/NO (Please circle)

### André

You are a footballer who has just joined a team that has been touted as a strong contender for the league title this season. You have settled in quickly to your new sporting environment and it has not taken you long to get yourself acquainted with your new teammates. One of your new teammates is André:

André, a centre forward, is one of the biggest characters in the dressing room. He is a highly-driven individual who often speaks inspirationally about the team's chances of winning the league title; André also tells a good joke and engages well with almost everyone on the team. On the pitch, André is a supremely confident football player who has a reputation for being "flashy". He has been able to make difficult, spectacular plays at crucial times in important games. When the stakes are high and the spotlight is bright, André is at his best.

André has also developed a reputation as a moaner who complains when the ball is not passed to him. On one infamous occasion, André who feels he is the main attacking threat of the team, started an argument with his teammate for passing the ball to another player — even though the pass resulted in a goal that won the game.

André also tends to blow easy plays, especially during practice and in games that are less competitive. One of his teammates once explained to a reporter, "André is a real pain in the neck. He's chronically late to practice, he struts around like he's God's gift to football, and I don't think I've ever seen him track back to cover for another player. But when the game is on the line, we're all happy to have André on our team."

Your team had a good pre-season and has started the season well. Hard work has been put in all week at training and your team is well-prepared for the next match.

**Please turn over to proceed to the team meeting, on the evening of match day.**

## **Team Meeting**

It is part of your team's preparatory routine to have a team meeting on the evening of a game. It is almost 7pm and everyone has arrived except for Jack. It is unusual for Jack to be late, as he is usually always on time. Jack is the captain of your team. Just then the coach whips out his mobile phone...

It is a call from Jack's girlfriend at the hospital. The coach is told that Jack had a car accident on the way to the team meeting and is currently being examined by the doctor. The extent of his injuries is still unknown.

The coach then turns to the team and passes on the bad news. The team is in shock. The coach admits it is unfortunate and untimely news but reminds the team that they need to regroup and refocus for tomorrow's match. The coach says the first thing that the team needs to decide is who is going to take over as captain.

No one else in the team apart from Jack has been captain before.

You run through the team list to mentally analyse each of your teammates. Soon you come across André's name and started thinking whether he will make a good captain.

At the same time, you overhear some of your teammates discussing about the possibility of André assuming the leadership role of team captain. They also contemplated how André might perform as captain.

**The following pages depict two different scenarios whereby André may be expected to lead your team as captain. These are followed by a series of items describing how you think of André as a leader in each scenario. Please note that these two scenarios are separate and independent from each other.**

**Remember that the responses you give are completely confidential. There are no right or wrong answers, so please respond honestly to all the items across the three scenarios.**

**Please turn over to proceed with Scenario 1.**

## Scenario 1:

The match/situation now is.... an important cup tie against a team that is currently top of the league.

Your team are slight **underdogs** against an in-form opposition and need to be playing at their best if your team are to progress to the next round of the cup competition.

If André takes over as captain **for this match**, to what extent will you agree to the following statements? Please circle your responses on the scale provided.

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		
1.	He would talk in a way that makes me believe I can succeed in this match	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	He would be an effective leader in this match	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	He would express confidence that high levels of performance can be achieved in this match	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	He would talk optimistically about the outcome of this match	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	He would talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in this match	1	2	3	4	5	

**Please turn over to proceed with Scenario 2.**

## Scenario 2:

Now imagine that Jack has suffered a broken leg and has been ruled **out for the remainder of the season**.

If André takes over as captain for **the rest of the season**, to what extent will you agree to the following statements? Please circle your responses on the scale provided.

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		
1.	He would talk in a way that makes me believe I can succeed in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	He would be an effective leader in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	He would express confidence that high levels of performance can be achieved in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	He would talk optimistically about the outcome of this season	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	He would talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in this season	1	2	3	4	5	

**Note: Item below used for pilot testing**

		Not at all					Very much				
1	André is an individual you would describe as a narcissist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**End of questionnaire.**

**Thank you for participating in this study.**

**Scoring Key**

Item 2: Leader effectiveness

Items 1, 3, 4, 5: Inspirational motivation (DTLI; Callow et al., 2009)



## Leadership in Team Sport Study

Sex: MALE / **FEMALE** (Please circle)      Date of Birth (dd/mm/yy): \_\_\_\_\_

Have you either previously been or are currently involved in team sports (e.g., football, rugby, lacrosse, etc)? YES/NO (Please circle)

Have you either previously been or are currently playing in a football team? YES/NO (Please circle)

## Andrea

You are a footballer who has just joined a team that has been touted as a strong contender for the league title this season. You have settled in quickly to your new sporting environment and it has not taken you long to get yourself acquainted with your new teammates. One of your new teammates is Andrea:

Andrea, a centre forward, is one of the biggest characters in the dressing room. She is a highly-driven individual who often speaks inspirationally about the team's chances of winning the league title; Andrea also tells a good joke and engages well with almost everyone on the team. On the pitch, Andrea is a supremely confident football player who has a reputation for being "flashy". She has been able to make difficult, spectacular plays at crucial times in important games. When the stakes are high and the spotlight is bright, Andrea is at her best.

Andrea has also developed a reputation as a moaner who complains when the ball is not passed to her. On one infamous occasion, Andrea who feels she is the main attacking threat of the team, started an argument with her teammate for passing the ball to another player — even though the pass resulted in a goal that won the game.

Andrea also tends to blow easy plays, especially during practice and in games that are less competitive. One of her teammates once explained to a reporter, "Andrea is a real pain in the neck. She's chronically late to practice, she struts around like she's God's gift to football, and I don't think I've ever seen her track back to cover for another player. But when the game is on the line, we're all happy to have Andrea on our team."

Your team had a good pre-season and has started the season well. Hard work has been put in all week at training and your team is well-prepared for the next match.

**Please turn over to proceed to the team meeting, on the evening of match day.**

## Team Meeting

It is part of your team's preparatory routine to have a team meeting on the evening of a game. It is almost 7pm and everyone has arrived except for Joan. It is unusual for Joan to be late, as she is usually always on time. Joan is the captain of your team. Just then the coach whips out his mobile phone...

It is a call from Joan's boyfriend at the hospital. The coach is told that Joan had a car accident on the way to the team meeting and is currently being examined by the doctor. The extent of her injuries is still unknown.

The coach then turns to the team and passes on the bad news. The team is in shock. The coach admits it is unfortunate and untimely news but reminds the team that they need to regroup and refocus for tomorrow's match. The coach says the first thing that the team needs to decide is who is going to take over as captain.

No one else in the team apart from Joan has been captain before.

You run through the team list to mentally analyse each of your teammates. Soon you come across Andrea's name and started thinking whether she will make a good captain.

At the same time, you overhear some of your teammates discussing about the possibility of Andrea assuming the leadership role of team captain. They also contemplated how Andrea might perform as captain.

**The following pages depict two different scenarios whereby Andrea may be expected to lead your team as captain. These are followed by a series of items describing how you think of Andrea as a leader in each scenario. Please note that these two scenarios are separate and independent from each other.**

**Remember that the responses you give are completely confidential. There are no right or wrong answers, so please respond honestly to all the items across the three scenarios.**

**Please turn over to proceed with Scenario 1.**

## Scenario 1:

The match/situation now is.... an important cup tie against a team that is currently top of the league.

Your team are slight **underdogs** against an in-form opposition and needs to be playing at their best if your team are to progress to the next round of the cup competition.

If Andrea takes over as captain **for this match**, to what extent will you agree to the following statements? Please circle your responses on the scale provided.

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree	
1.	She would talk in a way that makes me believe I can succeed in this match	1	2	3	4	5
2.	She would be an effective leader in this match	1	2	3	4	5
3.	She would express confidence that high levels of performance can be achieved in this match	1	2	3	4	5
4.	She would talk optimistically about the outcome of this match	1	2	3	4	5
5.	She would talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in this match	1	2	3	4	5

**Please turn over to proceed with Scenario 2.**

## Scenario 2:

Now imagine that Joan has suffered a broken leg and has been ruled **out for the remainder of the season**.

If Andrea takes over as captain for **the rest of the season**, to what extent will you agree to the following statements? Please circle your responses on the scale provided.

		Strongly Disagree			Strongly Agree		
1.	She would talk in a way that makes me believe I can succeed in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
2.	She would be an effective leader in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
3.	She would express confidence that high levels of performance can be achieved in this season	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	She would talk optimistically about the outcome of this season	1	2	3	4	5	
5.	She would talk enthusiastically about what needs to be accomplished in this season	1	2	3	4	5	

		Not at all					Very much				
1	Andrea is an individual you would describe as a narcissist	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

**End of questionnaire.**


**Thank you for participating in this study.**

**Scoring Key**

Item 2: Leader effectiveness

Items 1, 3, 4, 5: Inspirational motivation (DTLI; Callow et al., 2009)

Appendix C: Study 1 - Team Information Sheet - Week 1<sup>13</sup>

<p>Ysgol Gwyddorau Chwaraeon, Iechyd ac Ymarfer Prifysgol Bangor</p> <p>Adeilad y George Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Ffôn: (01248) 382756/383491 Swyddfa Gyffredinol Ffacs: (01248) 371053 e-bost: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>	 <p>PRIFYSGOL <b>BANGOR</b> UNIVERSITY</p> <p>1884</p>	<p>School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences Bangor University</p> <p>George Building Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Tel: (01248) 382756/383491 General Office Fax: (01248) 371053 e-mail: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>
--	---	---

## Group Dynamics Project 2012 – Team Information

### Introduction

A very warm welcome to SSHEs and to the 'Psychomotor Behaviour' module. We hope all of you are settling in well into University life and enjoying every minute of it so far. Besides learning more about sport science through the content taught in this module, you will also have the opportunity to experience first-hand how sport science research is carried out within the department by participating in this group dynamics project. Your participation in this project also provides you experiential learning opportunities that will help inform the module assessment at the end. More information about what is required of you as a participant for this study will be on the information sheet. In addition, the fact that this project involves working together in teams on fun activities provides for an excellent environment for you to get to know more about your course mates.

### Structure

- Teams of 4-6 will be randomly selected from all the students who are taking this module. Your team will then compete with the other teams throughout the module for the attractive cash prize on offer.
- The activities have been planned to take place each week and would typically last not more than 5 minutes.
- Scores from each week's activity will be updated and team performances will be ranked on a league table. A more detailed description of scoring can be found below.

### Scoring

---

<sup>13</sup> The team Information sheet and questionnaires used in Study 2 are presented in the appendix. Apart from the exclusion of the HSNS, and utilising two peer-rated time points instead of four (i.e., Weeks 2 and 11), the material used in Study 3 is similar to Study 2 and therefore not presented in the appendix to reduce repetition.

The points on offer will be presented prior to each week's activity. Since different activities will be attempted each week, it is possible that for calculation purposes the total points offered each week will be different. However, it should be noted that all the weekly points are weighted equally throughout the 12 week period.

### **Double up cards**

- Double up cards enable teams the chance to double their score of a particular week's activity when used.
- Each team will be issued with 2 double up cards and can decide which week they want to use it.
- Teams should alert anyone on the research team prior to the commencement of the activity that they would like to use their double up card.
- Only one double up card can be used each week.

### **Compound score**

- Compound score – less team members, less score (More details found under Absenteeism).

## **Rules**

### **Use of Internet on mobile devices**

- The use of the mobile electronic devices in conjunction with the weekly tasks is strictly not allowed UNLESS otherwise stated in the specific task instructions.
- Teams caught using mobile electronic devices will be disqualified from that week's activity.

### **Cheating**

- Cheating of any form during the weekly tasks will not be tolerated and will result in disqualification from that week's activity.

### **Completing task within the time limit**

- The time limit for the tasks each week will be announced prior to the commencement of the task.
- Failure to adhere to the stipulated time limit will result in 10% reduction of score for each minute of delay.

### **Absenteeism**

- The weekly tasks are designed to encourage members to work together in teams. This can only be maximised when all team members are available and fully engaged in the activities.
- To reward teams with full attendance, and penalise teams with absentees, a compound score will be calculated based on the attendance of the team members. However, final scores might not be penalised if team members are absent for reasons considered to be valid by the organisers.
- The final score is determined using the formula below:
  - Final score = Raw score x (No. of team members present/Total no. of designated members in team)

## **Prize**


- Cash prizes will be awarded to the top 3 teams



- 1<sup>st</sup>: £50
- 2<sup>nd</sup>: £30
- 3<sup>rd</sup>: £20

We hope everyone is looking forward to the 'Psychomotor Behaviour' module and will actively engage and enjoy the group activities. If there are any questions related to this study, please feel free to approach me in person or contact me via email (Chin Wei; [pepe1c@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:pepe1c@bangor.ac.uk)). Thank you!

## Appendix D: Study 1 - Demographics, NPI and HSNS - Week 1

<p><b>Ysgol Gwyddorau Chwaraeon, Iechyd ac Ymarfer</b> Prifysgol Bangor</p> <p>Adeilad y George Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Ffôn: (01248) 382756/383491 Swyddfa Gyffredinol Ffacs: (01248) 371053 e-bost: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>	<p>PRIFYSGOL <b>BANGOR</b> UNIVERSITY</p> 	<p><b>School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences</b> Bangor University</p> <p>George Building Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Tel: (01248) 382756/383491 General Office Fax: (01248) 371053 e-mail: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>
---	---	--

## Group Dynamics Project 2012

### Personality Measures

#### Demographics

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

User Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Team Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: MALE / FEMALE

Is English your First Language? YES / NO

Part 1/2

Read each pair of statements and then choose the one that is closer to your own feelings and beliefs. Indicate your answer by circling the letter "A" or "B" to the left of each item. 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 sometimes get embarrassed.  
       B I know that I am good 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 much 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 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 that I deserve.
15. A I don't particularly like to show off my body.  
B I like to display 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 am apt to show off if I get the chance.
21. A I always know what I am doing.  
B Sometimes I am not sure of 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 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 very much care about new fads and fashions.  
B I like to start new fads and fashions.
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 in any way I want to.  
B People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want.
32. A Being an authority doesn't mean that 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 anybody 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 somebody 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 that I can learn from other people.
40. A I am much like everybody else.  
B I am an extraordinary person.

Part 2/2

Please answer the following questions by deciding to what extent each item is characteristic of your feelings and behaviour. Select your responses for each item by circling a number from the corresponding scale printed below.

1 = very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree

2 = uncharacteristic

3 = neutral

4 = characteristic

5 = very characteristic or true, strongly agree

1	I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares or my relations to others.	1	2	3	4	5
2	My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or the slighting remarks of others.	1	2	3	4	5
3	When I enter a room I often become self-conscious and feel that the eyes of others are upon me.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I feel that I am temperamentally different from most people.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I often interpret the remarks of others in a personal way.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I dislike being with a group unless I know that I am appreciated by at least one of those present.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I am secretly "put out" or annoyed when other people come to me with their troubles, asking me for my time and sympathy	1	2	3	4	5

## Appendix E: Study 2 - Peer-rated Leadership Questionnaire - Weeks 2, 4, 8, 11

Peer Rating and Evaluation

We would like to know your perceptions of each group member. In the following section, please indicate how accurately each statement describes each group member. Please use the following rating scale and carefully record the letter that corresponds to the letter on the scale.

**Remember that this questionnaire is completely confidential, only the research team will have access to this questionnaire. The data will be presented in such a way that no one individual will be indefinable. We ask for your user name so we can match your responses to other questionnaire.**

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Neutral	Somewhat Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

Please carefully write the name of each person in your group in gaps provided. The first one should be for yourself. Please enter the corresponding ratings for each member on the blank on the extreme left.

RATING      NAME

\_\_\_\_\_ 1. I \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ 2. \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ 3. \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ 4. \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ 5. \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group.

\_\_\_\_\_ 6. \_\_\_\_\_ assumed a leadership role in the group



Please use the following rating scale and carefully record the letter that corresponds to the letter on the scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Neutral	Somewhat Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

\_\_\_\_\_ 7. \_\_\_\_\_ **I** \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 8. \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 9. \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 10. \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 11. \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 12. \_\_\_\_\_ motivated other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 13. \_\_\_\_\_ **I** \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_ 14. \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_ 15. \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_ 16. \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_ 17. \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

\_\_\_\_\_ 18. \_\_\_\_\_ helped organize the groups' thinking.

Please use the following rating scale and carefully record the letter that corresponds to the letter on the scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Neutral	Somewhat Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

\_\_\_\_\_ 19. \_\_\_\_\_ **I** \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 20. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 21. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 22. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 23. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

\_\_\_\_\_ 24. \_\_\_\_\_ was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.

Please use the following rating scale and carefully record the letter that corresponds to the letter on the scale.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Very Inaccurate	Moderately Inaccurate	Somewhat Inaccurate	Neutral	Somewhat Accurate	Moderately Accurate	Very Accurate

\_\_\_\_\_ 25. \_\_\_\_\_ **I** \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 26. \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 27. \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 28. \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 29. \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 30. \_\_\_\_\_ influenced the group as a whole.

\_\_\_\_\_ 31. \_\_\_\_\_ **I** \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_ 32. \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_ 33. \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_ 34. \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_ 35. \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

\_\_\_\_\_ 36. \_\_\_\_\_ exemplified strong leadership.

**THE END**

**THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.**

Appendix F: Study 1 - Peer-rated Transformational Leadership Questionnaire - Weeks 2, 4, 8, 11

**Group Member Leadership Scale**

The following questionnaire describes the leadership style of the people in your group as you perceive it to be **in this group**. Please answer all the questions indicating how often the group member does these things.

**Remember that this questionnaire is completely confidential, only the research team will have access to this questionnaire. The data will be presented in such a way that no one individual will be identifiable. We ask for your user name so we can match your responses to this questionnaire with other questionnaires.**

Please write the names (or initials) of your group members in the space provided below. It is important that you do this for each of the questions. Please keep the order in which you write your group members the same. For example, if you put John Harris in number 1 for question 1, John Harris should be number 1 for all the questions.

	Name or Initials of Person Being Rated	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently if not
1. Goes beyond self-interest for the good of the group	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4

	Name of Person or Initials Being Rated	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently if not
2. Emphasises the importance of having a collective sense of mission	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4
3. Expresses confidence that goals will be achieved	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4
4. Talks optimistically about the future	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4

	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4

	Name or Initials of Person Being Rated	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently if not
5. Helps others develop their strengths	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4
6. Considers each individual as having different needs, abilities, and aspirations from others	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4


7. Expresses satisfaction when others meet expectations	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4



	Name or Initials of Person Being Rated	Not at all	Once in a while	Sometimes	Fairly often	Frequently if not
8. Provides others with assistance in exchange for their efforts	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4
9. Seek differing perspectives when solving problems	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4



	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4
10. Suggests new ways of looking at how to complete assignments	1.	0	1	2	3	4
	2.	0	1	2	3	4
	3.	0	1	2	3	4
	4.	0	1	2	3	4
	5.	0	1	2	3	4





## Appendix G: Convergence plots of imputed variables in Study 3





































































Iteration

## Appendix H: Study 3 - Team Information Sheet - Week 1

<p>Ysgol Gwyddorau Chwaraeon, Iechyd ac Ymarfer</p> <p>Prifysgol Bangor</p> <p>Adeilad y George</p> <p>Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Ffôn: (01248) 382756/383491 Swyddfa Gyffredinol</p> <p>Ffacs: (01248) 371053</p> <p>e-bost: shes@bangor.ac.uk</p> <p>shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>	 <p>PRIFYSGOL <b>BANGOR</b> UNIVERSITY</p> <p>1884</p>	<p>School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences</p> <p>Bangor University</p> <p>George Building</p> <p>Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Tel: (01248) 382756/383491 General Office</p> <p>Fax: (01248) 371053</p> <p>e-mail: shes@bangor.ac.uk</p> <p>shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>
---	---	--

## Group Dynamics Project 2014 – Team Information

### Introduction

A very warm welcome to the 'Group Dynamics' module. Besides receiving lectures on the topics integral to the understanding of group dynamics in sport, a unique feature of this module in the past few years would be your participation in a project which would provide you with experiential learning opportunities that will not only help inform the module assessment at the end, but also equip you with valuable experience/practical skills that you can apply while working in groups after your degree. The activities are good fun to get involved in, which puts a bit of stress off what is a final year module. We have continued to receive excellent feedback in previous years about how fun and educational this module is so let's hope this year will be no different! More information about what is required of you as a participant for this study will be on the information sheet.

### Structure

- Teams of 4/5 will be randomly selected from all the students who are taking this module. Your team will then compete with the other teams throughout the module for the attractive cash prizes on offer.
- The activities have been planned to take place each week and would typically last not more than 5 minutes.
- Scores from each week's activity will be updated and team performances will be ranked on a league table. A more detailed description of scoring can be found below.

### Scoring

The points on offer will be presented prior to each week's activity. Since different activities will be attempted each week, it is possible that for calculation purposes the total points offered each week will be different. However, it should be noted that all the weekly points are weighted equally throughout the 12 week period.

### **Double up cards**

- Double up cards enable teams the chance to double their score of a particular week's activity when used.
- Each team will be issued with 2 double up cards and can decide which week they want to use it.
- Teams should alert anyone on the research team prior to the commencement of the activity that they would like to use their double up card.
- Only one double up card can be used each week.

#### **Compound score**

- Compound score – fewer team members, lower score (More details found under Absenteeism).

#### **Rules**

##### **Use of Internet on mobile devices**

- The use of the mobile electronic devices in conjunction with the weekly tasks is strictly not allowed UNLESS otherwise stated in the specific task instructions.
- Teams caught using mobile electronic devices will be disqualified from that week's activity.

##### **Cheating**

- Cheating of any form during the weekly tasks will not be tolerated and will result in disqualification from that week's activity.

##### **Completing task within the time limit**

- The time limit for the tasks each week will be announced prior to the commencement of the task.
- Failure to adhere to the stipulated time limit will result in 10% reduction of score for each minute of delay.

##### **Absenteeism**


- The weekly tasks are designed to encourage members to work together in teams. This can only be maximised when all team members are available and fully engaged in the activities.
- To reward teams with full attendance, and penalise teams with absentees, a compound score will be calculated based on the attendance of the team members. However, final scores might not be penalised if team members are absent for reasons considered to be valid by the organisers.
- The final score is determined using the formula below:
  - Final score = Raw score x (No. of team members present/Total no. of designated members in team)

##### **Prize**

- Cash prizes will be awarded to the top 3 teams
  - 1<sup>st</sup>: £50
  - 2<sup>nd</sup>: £30
  - 3<sup>rd</sup>: £20

We hope everyone is looking forward to the 'Group Dynamics' module and will actively engage and enjoy the group activities. If there are any questions related to this study, please feel free to approach me in person or contact me via email (Chin Wei; [pepe1c@bangor.ac.uk](mailto:pepe1c@bangor.ac.uk)). Thank you!

## Appendix I: Study 3 - Demographics, NPI-16 and HSNS - Week 1

<p><b>Ysgol Gwyddorau Chwaraeon, Iechyd ac Ymarfer</b></p> <p><b>Prifysgol Bangor</b></p> <p>Adeilad y George Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Ffôn: (01248) 382756/383491 Swyddfa Gyffredinol Ffac: (01248) 371053 e-bost: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>	<p>PRIFYSGOL <b>BANGOR</b> UNIVERSITY</p> 	<p><b>School of Sport, Health and Exercise Sciences</b></p> <p><b>Bangor University</b></p> <p>George Building Bangor, Gwynedd LL57 2PZ</p> <p>Tel: (01248) 382756/383491 General Office Fax: (01248) 371053 e-mail: shes@bangor.ac.uk shes.bangor.ac.uk</p>
--	---	--

**Group Dynamics Project 2014**  
Personality Measures

**Demographics**

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

User Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Group Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Age: \_\_\_\_\_

Sex: MALE / FEMALE

Read each pair of statements below and place an "X" by the one that comes closest to describing your feelings and beliefs about yourself. You may feel that neither statement describes you well, but pick the one that comes closest. **Please complete all pairs.**

1.    \_\_\_ I really like to be the center of attention  
      \_\_\_ It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention
  
2.    \_\_\_ I am no better or no worse than most people  
      \_\_\_ I think I am a special person
  
3.    \_\_\_ Everybody likes to hear my stories  
      \_\_\_ Sometimes I tell good stories
  
4.    \_\_\_ I usually get the respect that I deserve  
      \_\_\_ I insist upon getting the respect that is due me
  
5.    \_\_\_ I don't mind following orders  
      \_\_\_ I like having authority over people
  
6.    \_\_\_ I am going to be a great person  
      \_\_\_ I hope I am going to be successful
  
7.    \_\_\_ People sometimes believe what I tell them  
      \_\_\_ I can make anybody believe anything I want them to
  
8.    \_\_\_ I expect a great deal from other people

- \_\_\_ I like to do things for other people
9. \_\_\_ I like to be the centre of attention  
\_\_\_ I prefer to blend in with the crowd
10. \_\_\_ I am much like everybody else  
\_\_\_ I am an extraordinary person
11. \_\_\_ I always know what I am doing  
\_\_\_ Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing
12. \_\_\_ I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people  
\_\_\_ I find it easy to manipulate people
13. \_\_\_ Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me  
\_\_\_ People always seem to recognize my authority
14. \_\_\_ I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so  
\_\_\_ When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed
15. \_\_\_ I try not to be a show off  
\_\_\_ I am apt to show off if I get the chance
16. \_\_\_ I am more capable than other people  
\_\_\_ There is a lot that I can learn from other people

Please answer the following questions by deciding to what extent each item is characteristic of your feelings and behaviour. Select your responses for each item by circling a number from the corresponding scale printed below.

1 = very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree

2 = uncharacteristic

3 = neutral

4 = characteristic

5 = very characteristic or true, strongly agree

1	I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares or my relations to others.	1	2	3	4	5
2	My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or the slighting remarks of others.	1	2	3	4	5
3	When I enter a room I often become self-conscious and feel that the eyes of others are upon me.	1	2	3	4	5
4	I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.	1	2	3	4	5
5	I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles.	1	2	3	4	5
6	I feel that I am temperamentally different from most people.	1	2	3	4	5
7	I often interpret the remarks of others in a personal way.	1	2	3	4	5
8	I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.	1	2	3	4	5
9	I dislike being with a group unless I know that I am appreciated by at least one of those present.	1	2	3	4	5
10	I am secretly "put out" or annoyed when other people come to me with their troubles, asking me for my time and sympathy	1	2	3	4	5

**THE END**

**THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.**

Appendix J: Study 3 - Peer-Rated Leadership (Part 3), Prestige and Dominance (Part 4) Questionnaires - Weeks 2, 4, 7, 10

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Group: \_\_\_\_\_ Sex: MALE/FEMALE (circle one) Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Self & Peer Evaluation

We would like to know your perceptions of each group member. In the following sections, please indicate how accurately each statement describes yourself and each group member.

Remember that this questionnaire is completely confidential, only the research team will have access to this questionnaire. The data will be presented in such a way that no one will be identifiable.

Part 1

If you had to name one person in your group who was the overall leader (yourself included), whose name would it be?	
---	--

Part 2

Item	Group member	Not at all					Extremely
How well did you know each of your group members prior to this module?		1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	
		1	2	3	4	5	



Part 3

As shown in the example below, please carefully write the name of each person in your group in the extreme left column. The first one should be for yourself. Please circle the corresponding ratings for each member using the scale on the extreme right.

EXAMPLE

Group member	Item X	Very Inaccurate			Neutral			Very Accurate
<i>I (ME)</i>	am/is funny.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>BEN</i>		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>JENNIFER</i>		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>SAMUEL</i>		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>LUCY</i>		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 1	Very	Neutral	Very
--------------	--------	------	---------	------

		Inaccurate						Accurate
I (me)	assumed a leadership role in the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 2	Very Inaccurate			Neutral			Very Accurate
I (me)	motivated other group members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 3	Very Inaccurate	Neutral					Very Accurate
I (me)	helped organise the groups' thinking.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 4	Very Inaccurate	Neutral					Very Accurate
I (me)	was able to bring out extra performance in other group members.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 5	Very Inaccurate	Neutral					Very Accurate
I (me)	influenced the group as a whole.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 6	Very Inaccurate	Neutral					Very Accurate
I (me)	exemplified strong leadership.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

**Part 4**

Please carefully write the name of each person in the extreme left column. The first one should be for yourself. Please circle the corresponding ratings for each member on the scale on the extreme right.

Group member	Item 1	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	Members of my peer group respect and admire <u>me</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Members of your group respect and admire him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 2	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	Members of my peer group do NOT want to be like <u>me</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Members of your group do NOT want to be like him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 3	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> enjoy having control over others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	He/she enjoys having control over other members of the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 4	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	Others always expect <u>me</u> to be successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Members of your group always expect him/her to be successful.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 5	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	I often try to get <u>my</u> own way regardless of what others may want.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	He/she often tries to get his/her own way regardless of what others in the group may want.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 6	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	Others do NOT value <u>my</u> opinion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	Members of your group do NOT value his/her opinion.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 7	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> am willing to use aggressive tactics to get my way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	He/she is willing to use aggressive tactics to get his/her way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 8	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> am held in high esteem by those I know.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7



	He/she is held in high esteem by members of the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 9	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> try to control others rather than permit them to control me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	He/she tries to control others rather than permit them to control him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 10	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> do NOT have a forceful or dominant personality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	He/she does NOT have a forceful or dominant personality.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 11	Not at all	Somewhat					Very Much
I (me)	Others know it is better to let me have <u>my</u> way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Members of the group know it is better to let him/her have his/her way.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 12	Not at all	Somewhat					Very Much
I (me)	<u>I</u> do NOT enjoy having authority over other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

	He/she enjoys having authority over other members of the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 13	Not at all	Somewhat					Very Much
I (me)	<u>My</u> unique talents and abilities are recognized by others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	His/her unique talents and abilities are recognized by others in the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 14	Not at all	Somewhat					Very Much
--------------	---------	------------	----------	--	--	--	--	-----------

I (me)	<b>I</b> am considered an expert on some matters by others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	He/she is considered an expert on some matters by members of the group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 15	Not at all	Somewhat				Very Much	
I (me)	Others seek <b>my</b> advice on a variety of matters.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Members of your group seek his/her advice on a variety of matters.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 16	Not at all	Somewhat				Very Much
--------------	---------	------------	----------	--	--	--	-----------

I (me)	Some people are afraid of <u>me</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Members of your group are afraid of him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Group member	Item 17	Not at all			Somewhat			Very Much
I (me)	Others do NOT enjoy hanging out with <u>me</u> .	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
	Others do NOT enjoy hanging out with him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7

THE END

THANK YOU FOR COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

