

This file was downloaded from BI Brage,
the institutional repository (open access) at BI Norwegian Business School
<http://brage.bibsys.no/bi>

Series of Dissertations 4/2014
BI Norwegian Business School

Christian Enger Gimsø

Narcissus and Leadership Potential: The measurement and implications of narcissism in leadership selection processes

The papers of this dissertation are not available in BI Brage, due to copyright matters:

Article 1:

Narcissus in the leader selection process: The relationship between narcissism, interview ratings, and officer academy admission

Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 119th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 2011

Article 2:

Narcissism and selection: A randomized field experiment testing the predictive validity of a dichotomous and Likert-scored narcissistic personality inventory

Gimsø, C. E., & Martinsen, Ø. L.

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 120th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Orlando, Florida, 2012.

Article 3:

Factor stability of the narcissistic personality inventory: Case lost?

Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.

An earlier draft of this paper was accepted for poster presentation at the 121st Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2013.

A complete version of the dissertation (print copy) may be ordered from BI's website:

<http://www.bi.edu/research/Research-Publications/>

Narcissus and Leadership Potential

The measurement and implications of narcissism
in leadership selection processes

by

Christian Enger Gimsø

A dissertation submitted to BI Norwegian Business School
for the degree of PhD

PhD specialization: Leadership and Organizational Behavior

Series of Dissertations 4/2014

BI Norwegian Business School

Department of Leadership and Organizational Behavior

Christian Enger Gimsø
Narcissus and Leadership Potential -
The measurement and implications of narcissism in leadership selection processes

© Christian Enger Gimsø
2014

Series of Dissertations 4/2014

ISBN: 978-82-8247-086-5
ISSN: 1502-2099

BI Norwegian Business School
N-0442 Oslo
Phone: +47 4641 0000
www.bi.no

Printing: Allkopi

The dissertation may be ordered from our website www.bi.no
(Research – Research Publications)

Acknowledgements

First and foremost this dissertation is dedicated to my parents for giving me the essential tools in life to make this PhD possible. Although my father is no longer with us, their constant belief in me and their support made the effort possible.

I am also grateful for the help and support my supervisor Øyvind L. Martinsen has provided. I would not have been able to write this dissertation had it not been for his help and encouragement. I would also like to thank my second supervisor Jan-Ketil Arnulf for discussion of the most relevant themes for this dissertation. He also opened my eyes to the art and science of what leadership is. I would also like to thank Monica Martinussen and Lars Glasø on my pre-doctoral committee for providing advice and useful guidance towards the final dissertation. I am also grateful for the support that the Department of Leadership and Organizational Behavior at the BI Norwegian Business School has given me. Had it not been for this institution, I would not have been able to pursue this work.

I would also like to send my sincere gratitude to Ole-Christian Lang-Ree at the Norwegian Defense University College, for his help and guidance in the entire process of accessing participants for my studies. I am also grateful for the support and help of the officers and personnel at the Kjevik Norwegian Officer Candidate School, who allowed me to be a fly on the wall through several of their selection processes.

Christian Enger Gimsø
Asker, October 31, 2013

List of articles

- Article 1** **Narcissus in the leader selection process: The relationship between narcissism, interview ratings, and officer academy admission**
Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.
An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 119th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 2011
- Article 2** **Narcissism and selection: A randomized field experiment testing the predictive validity of a dichotomous and Likert-scored narcissistic personality inventory**
Gimsø, C. E., & Martinsen, Ø. L.
An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 120th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Orlando, Florida, 2012.
- Article 3** **Factor stability of the narcissistic personality inventory: Case lost?**
Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.
An earlier draft of this paper was accepted for poster presentation at the 121st Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2013.

Table of contents

Introduction and purpose.....	13
From Narcissus to the narcissistic personality disorder	15
Narcissism as a personality trait.....	17
The measurement of narcissism	18
Current validity issues with the NPI	19
Assessing narcissism with the NPI using different response scales.....	21
Narcissism and leadership.....	22
Leadership selection.....	24
Selection interviews	25
Interview assessment of psychological constructs	26
Narcissism and leader selection	28
Overall research purposes	30
Study 1: Narcissus in the leader selection process: The relationship between narcissism, interview ratings, and officer academy admission	33
Study 2: Narcissism and Selection: A Randomized Field Experiment Testing the Predictive Validity of a Dichotomous and Likert-Scored Narcissistic Personality Inventory	69
Study 3: Factor stability of the narcissistic personality inventory: Case lost?.....	93
General discussion.....	127
Narcissism and appearance in selection interviews	128
Narcissism and perceptions of leadership	129
The measurement of narcissism with the NPI.....	131
Implications	135
Limitations and future directions	137
Conclusion.....	140
References	141

Narcissus on the grassie verdure lyes:
But whilst within the chrystal fount he tries
To quench his heat, he feels new heats arise.
For as his own bright image he survey'd,
He fell in love with the fantastick shade;
And o'er the fair resemblance hung unmov'd,
Nor knew, fond youth! it was himself he lov'd.
The well-turn'd neck and shoulders he descries,
The spacious forehead, and the sparkling eyes;
The hands that Bacchus might not scorn to show,
And hair that round Apollo's head might flow;
With all the purple youthfulness of face,
That gently blushes in the wat'ry glass.
By his own flames consum'd the lover lyes,
And gives himself the wound by which he dies.
To the cold water oft he joins his lips,
Oft catching at the beauteous shade he dips
His arms, as often from himself he slips.
Nor knows he who it is his arms pursue
With eager clasps, but loves he knows not who.

"Ah wretched me! I now begin too late
To find out all the long-perplex'd deceit;
It is my self I love, my self I see;
The gay delusion is a part of me.
I kindle up the fires by which I burn,
And my own beauties from the well return.
Whom should I court? How utter my complaint?
Enjoyment but produces my restraint,
And too much plenty makes me die for want.
How gladly would I from my self remove!
And at a distance set the thing I love.
My breast is warm'd with such unusual fire,
I wish him absent whom I most desire.
And now I faint with grief; my fate draws nigh;
In all the pride of blooming youth I die.
Death will the sorrows of my heart relieve.
Oh might the visionary youth survive,
I should with joy my latest breath resign!
But oh! I see his fate involv'd in mine."

- Publius Ovidius Naso ("Ovid") (Sir S. Garth [trans.])

Summary

Incorporating theoretical and empirical work from the literature on narcissism, it is postulated that narcissism poses a particular risk in leader selection settings. By appearing confident, charismatic, intelligent, and with a high self-esteem and authority, narcissists will slip through normal selection processes by resembling an implicit image of a prototypical leader for those that select and hire them. In three independent, yet connected studies, the role played by trait narcissism is explored among applicants in three leadership selection processes for non-commissioned officers training in the Norwegian Armed Forces.

In Study 1 it was hypothesized that narcissists should receive higher leadership interview ratings. In addition, since interviews are usually weighted highly in final selection decisions, it was also postulated that narcissism should have an indirect effect upon final admission. Replicated support was found in two samples, demonstrating that narcissism had a positive effect on interview ratings, and that through relatively higher interview ratings, narcissists also had a higher probability of being selected. In Sample Two, it was also demonstrated that the effect of narcissism went beyond interview ratings. In addition, an interaction effect of narcissism and extraversion predicting interview ratings was also found.

Study 2 replicated and extended the findings of Study 1 and demonstrated that in interviews assessing leadership potential, narcissists could be given an opportunity to self-enhance and appear leader-like. In contrast, it was demonstrated that narcissism was unrelated to the ratings when interviews assessed future school potential on more objective information about the applicants, such as past academic results, study habits, motivation and the ability to acquire new knowledge. Study 2 was also conducted as a field experiment, and participants were randomly given a narcissism inventory with either a dichotomous response format or a five-point Likert response format. I hypothesized that a multicategorical response format should be more able to reflect the degree of narcissism and would therefore also provide stronger predictions. The results showed that, irrespective of response format, narcissism was positively related to the interview leadership potential ratings, but unrelated to the school potential ratings. In addition, irrespective of the response format, narcissism also had an indirect effect upon final admission, through higher leadership potential interview ratings. However, only the dichotomously assessed narcissism was directly and significantly related to the final admission criterion. In Study 2, as in Study 1, an interaction effect between narcissism and extraversion was found when predicting leadership potential ratings but with only dichotomously assessed narcissism.

Taken together Study 1 and Study 2 demonstrated that narcissism can jeopardize the leadership selection processes by making candidates appear leader-like. In addition, assessing narcissism with a dichotomous response format instead of a Likert response format is still preferable. However, differences in predictions according to the two assessments of narcissism were small and could be attributed to method-specific variance.

Since the factor structure of the commonly used measure of narcissism, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988) has not been consistent across previous studies, Study 3 sought to test whether it was possible to find a stable and replicable factor structure among the common items from Emmons' (1987) 37 item

version and Raskin and Terrys (1988) 40 items version. The results supported the extraction of a five factor solution, and the content of these five factors suggested they assessed exploitativeness, authority, exhibitionism, vanity, and superiority. The five-factor solution was later supported in a subsequent sample with confirmatory analysis relative to two, three, and four factor solutions. In addition, the five factor solution was also replicated in a sample where participants were assessed with a Likert response format, suggesting that these five factors are stable irrespective of response format. In addition, the five factors also showed many of same associations with the five-factor model of normal personality in all three studies.

Introduction and purpose

The empirical-based search for the constituents of effective leaders is not a new endeavor, and has been a research topic and concern for I/O psychologists for the past century (Barrick, Mount, & Judge, 2001). In the empirical literature, the organizational effects of leadership have swung from the negligible (Lieberson & O'Connor, 1972) to the substantial (Thomas, 1988). Nonetheless, in modern leadership literature, there is consensus that leadership is not a mystical concept, but “an observable, learnable set of practices [...and that] leaders [can] make a difference” to the organization they lead (Bass, 2008, p. 10). One of the challenges facing the psychological study of leaders and leadership is that the vast amount of literature has focused on finding psychological attributes of those leaders that succeed, but some believe that there exists little consensus or convergence among researchers regarding any psychological characteristics of good or effective leaders (Hogan, 2007; Hogan, Hogan, & Kaiser, 2011). In contrast, there is substantial agreement regarding the dysfunctional aspects of flawed leaders (Hogan & Hogan, 2001). Those leaders are responsible for poor morale, excessive turnover and reduced productivity (Hogan, Raskin, & Fazzini, 1990). We may ask about the reasons behind this managerial incompetence, and why so many leaders ultimately fail. The most obvious reason seems to be that leaders who fail share the same process as leaders who succeed: they are both selected and hired. Nevertheless, the question remains, how can we avoid selecting leaders who ultimately fail?

There are indeed several reasons for managerial failure. Among these reasons, we may find bad strategic choices for their companies, failure to build a successful team, to delegate tasks, and even failure to understand the demands of markets and in technical competence in the products they make. All these causes, and more, could result in leader derailment. However, one common characteristic of leaders who fail is that they all have interpersonal problems, that is, problems in building interpersonal relationships, the way they relate to and manage others (Hogan et al., 2011). The issue of interpersonal skills seems also to tap the very essence of leadership as it is defined today, as requiring people who intentionally influence “guide, structure, and facilitate activities and relationships in a group or organization” (Yukl, 2005, p. 3, see also Northouse, 2004, & Bass, 2008). Essentially, leaders who derail seem to be poor people managers, and this has led to speculation that narcissism may be one of the more significant causes of flawed and even dangerous leadership (Furnham, 2010), and the most serious cause of leader character pathology (Kernberg, 1979). As Kets de Vries and Miller (1997) put it, “if there is one personality constellation to which leaders tend to gravitate it is the narcissistic one” (p. 197). Since little research has been devoted to the intrapsychic inner world of leaders, and what leaders seem to have in common is the ability to generate or activate primitive emotions in their followers (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1997), it also seems pertinent to investigate the personality profiles of leaders who go beyond the range of normal personality.

Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) is described in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (DSM-IV-TR) as a grandiose sense of own importance, preoccupation with thoughts of success and power, requirement of excessive admiration, a sense of entitlement and lack of empathy for others (American Psychiatric Association, 2000).

Although the prevalence of people diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder is relatively low in the Norwegian population (e.g. Torgersen, Kringlen, & Cramer, 2001), it has been regarded as an individual difference variable, found in various degrees in the normal population (Brunell et al., 2008). In personality and social psychology, the personality measure frequently used to assess individuals' narcissistic tendencies or narcissistic traits is the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979; Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988). If not otherwise indicated, in the remainder of this dissertation the terms 'narcissism', 'narcissists', 'narcissistic leaders' or 'narcissistic leadership' will be used to refer to those with high narcissistic tendencies, that is, those scoring relatively highly on the NPI.

Although this dissertation relies heavily upon a trait perspective of personality and of narcissism, Rosenthal & Pittinsky (2006) use the term narcissistic leadership as something that "occurs when leaders' actions are primarily motivated by their own egomaniacal needs and beliefs, superseding the needs and interests of the constituents and institutions they lead" (p. 629). As such, narcissistic leadership can fit within the current conceptual model of destructive leadership proposed by Einarsen, Aasland, and Skogstad (2007). Here, they define destructive leadership as "[t]he systematic and repeated behavior by a leader, supervisor or manager that violates the legitimate interest of the organization by undermining and/or sabotaging the organization's goals, tasks, resources, and effectiveness and/or the motivation, well-being or job satisfaction of subordinates" (p. 208). In their conceptual model, Einarsen et al. place destructive leadership behavior along two dimensions, subordinate and organizational oriented behavior, where both dimensions range from anti- to pro-organizational or subordinate behavior. Thus, narcissistic leaders can be fitted along both these dimensions, according to their personal agenda and what serves this agenda best, but this model is constrained by focusing on leader behaviors, rather than the antecedents of that behavior.

If narcissism may be *one* of the personality characteristics associated with leader derailment, it is essential to investigate whether people with narcissistic characteristics jeopardize normal selection procedures and eventually end up being hired. Early detection of those individuals during selection is critical if we want to avoid bad leaders. In addition, and equally importantly, is how we can detect them. It is therefore important that the measurement of narcissism is made with a valid and stable instrument. Through three independent studies, this dissertation seeks to address these issues. Study 1 aims to identify the role played by narcissism among applicants in a real life selection process for non-commissioned officers (NCO) in the Norwegian Armed Forces. In the first sample in Study 1, it is hypothesized and tested empirically, that narcissism will have a direct effect upon interview ratings in a selection process, and that in the way interviews are generally weighted, higher interview ratings would also mean an increased probability of being selected. Thus, narcissism should also have an indirect effect upon the final selection decision through interview ratings. The second sample in Study 1 seeks to replicate the results from the first study and extend this by including additional personality variables.

The second study in this dissertation uses applicants from the same context as Study 1, and through a randomized field experiment tries to fulfill two purposes. First, it tries to

replicate the results from Study 1 and expand the study by implementing two different interview ratings, an officer school potential rating, and a leadership potential rating. Secondly, it tries to test the predictive validity of two used response scales in the assessment of narcissism. In Study 3 the main purpose is to find a consistent and replicable factor structure among the commonly used items from the NPI (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988) across three samples with the two response formats used in Study 2.

Before presenting these three studies, some of the empirical and theoretical arguments behind narcissism and its relationship to leadership are presented, together with a framework to clarify why narcissism can jeopardize selection. Thereafter, the empirical studies are presented and there is a general discussion, followed by consideration of the implications and limitations.

From Narcissus to the narcissistic personality disorder

The concept of narcissism stems from ancient Greek mythology and was described in the Homeric hymns, and later popularized through Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (Publius Ovidius Naso). The myth tells the story of Narcissus, who refrained from loving others and was doomed by the Gods to fall in love with his own reflection in the water. Narcissus, not able to reach down and kiss his own reflection, later withers and dies. A popular interpretation of the myth of Narcissus describes an obsessive self-love which is detrimental to normal functioning. One of the first notations of Narcissus in the discipline of psychology was in the writings of Havelock Ellis (1898). Ellis, a psychologist and sexual researcher, described a tendency in which an individual's sexual emotions are entirely lost or absorbed in self-admiration. Some of his studied subjects experienced intense pleasure and an overwhelming sense of sexual attraction when they looked at themselves in a mirror. This sexual arousal represents what he termed 'auto-eroticism', of which narcissism is an extreme form. The narcissistic or Narcissus-like tendency is an emotion that goes beyond anything ever experienced and nothing is "stronger than... [one's] ...own pleasure in [oneself]" (p. 281). Ellis later published (1927) an elaborate review where he described the conditions of narcissism as a "rare and not especially profitable aspect of human invention" (p. 153). The concept of narcissism caught Sigmund Freud's attention at the time of Ellis' publications, but it was not until 1914 that he published a more thorough discussion. To Freud, narcissism was a normal part of human development and he believed that narcissism is "the libidinal complement to the egoism of the instinct of self-preservation" (Freud, 1914/1957, p. 73–74). This primary narcissism as Freud calls it is a libidinal energy that is directed towards two objects, either himself or the woman who nurses him. A healthy development of the ego consists of a departure from this primary narcissism, in which the ego-love is directed towards object-love, that is, the ability to love others. Thus, unhealthy narcissism develops because the libido is fixated towards the ego and the person is unable to direct the libido from ego-love to object love.

In modern psychiatry and psychology, Heinz Kohut (1971) and Otto Kernberg (1975) influenced the modern conception and treatment of narcissism. Although Kohut and Kernberg had similar psychoanalytic backgrounds, their therapeutic and etiologic perspectives on

narcissism diverged. While Kohut maintained that narcissism could develop into both healthy and unhealthy forms, Kernberg maintained that narcissism operates in a borderline area between neurosis and psychosis. Kohut believed that pathological narcissism develops because of the environment's failure to provide an accurate empathetic response to the needs of the infant, to be responsive for mirroring the infant's need for admiration, and the infant's later need to idealize the parent (Cooper, 1986, p. 135). Although Kernberg (1975) also gives examples of normal narcissism, he believed pathological narcissism is the result of "a defense against paranoid traits related to the projection of oral rage" (p. 17). Kernberg views the inflated self-concept of the narcissist as the result of a defense mechanism in which the actual self (one's belief of the self), the ideal self (idealized image of self) and the ideal object (idealized image of the parent) are confused. This self-concept inflation arises because of the tension between the actual self on the one hand, and the ideal self and the ideal object on the other, and when unacceptable self-images are repressed and projected to devaluated external objects. A passage from Kernberg (1975, p. 231) helps to exemplify this:

"I do not need to fear that I will be rejected for not living up to the ideal of myself which alone makes it possible for me to be loved by the ideal image of that person I imagine would love me. That ideal person and my ideal image of that person and my real self are all one, and better than the ideal person whom I wanted to love me, so that I do not need anybody else any more."

What seems to unite both Kernberg and Kohut's theories of the development of narcissism is that they both emphasize the parent's role in the child's development. Having cold and unempathetic, unresponsive parents who, unwillingly or deliberately, either overtly or covertly hinder the child's needs and development of a healthy ideal self may cause the child to develop an unhealthy self-love. Later empirical work suggested that the behavior of parents or their parenting style may play a role in the development of children who later score highly for narcissism (Horton, Bleau, & Drwecki, 2006). Horton et al. suggest that psychological control mechanisms such as love, withdrawal and guilt induction may later "color a child's interpretation of a parent's support and leniency" (p. 370). Further, they also found that parental control in childhood, in particular, later developed into unhealthy narcissism.

In the modern diagnosis system, influenced by Kohut's and Kernberg's theories, narcissistic personality disorder first appeared in DSM-III. Here, narcissism, as with the other personality disorders, is described with a set of criteria to be used for diagnosing patients. Although the diagnostic system has evolved into newer versions such as DSM III-TR, IV and IV-TR, there were only minor changes in the diagnostic criteria for narcissism (Sperry, 2003). In the DSM (IV-TR, APA, 2000, p. 717), the guidelines for diagnosing individuals with NPD must comply with the following diagnostic criteria:

A pervasive pattern of grandiosity (in fantasy or behavior), need for admiration, and lack of empathy, beginning by early adulthood and present in a variety of contexts, as indicated by five (or more) of the following:

1. Has a grandiose sense of self-importance (e.g. exaggerates achievements and talents, expects to be recognized as superior without commensurate achievements)
2. Is preoccupied with fantasies of unlimited success, power, brilliance, beauty, or ideal love
3. Believes that he or she is 'special' and unique and can only be understood by, or should associate with, other special or high-status people (or institutions)
4. Requires excessive admiration
5. Has a sense of entitlement, i.e. unreasonable expectations of especially favorable treatment or automatic compliance with his or her expectations
6. Is interpersonally exploitative, i.e. takes advantage of others to achieve his or her own ends
7. Lacks empathy: is unwilling to recognize or identify with the feelings and needs of others
8. Is often envious of others or believes that others are envious of him or her
9. Shows arrogant, haughty behaviors or attitudes.

The prevalence of those diagnosed with the NPD in the general population has varied according to country and study methods. In an epidemiologic study in the United States with almost 35,000 face to face interviews, the total prevalence rate was 7.7% for men and 4.8% for women (Pulay, Goldstein, & Grant, 2011). Another prevalence study conducted in Norway suggests that the prevalence of NPD is only 0.8% (Torgersen et al., 2001). However, due to the latter study response rate of 57% and small sample size, the numbers could be higher. A study by Pulay et al. (2011) also suggests that the prevalence of NPD declines with age, at 8.9% for those between the ages of 20-34, 6.5% between the ages of 35-59, and 4.4% for age 50 and above. Even though there do not seem to be any studies that have surveyed the prevalence of narcissism among leaders in organizational settings, Skogstad and Einarsen (2009) have attempted to estimate the prevalence of those who potentially would meet the clinical criteria for an NPD diagnosis among Norwegian leaders. Skogstad and Einarsen estimated that almost 3,700 leaders in Norway would at one point in their career meet the NPD clinical criteria. These numbers are estimates, and should be interpreted with caution. However, as “[m]any highly successful individuals display personality traits that might be considered narcissistic [o]nly when these traits are inflexible, maladaptive, and persisting and cause significant functional impairment or subjective distress do they constitute Narcissistic Personality Disorder” (APA, 2000, p. 717). This illustrates that the transition from normal to pathological may not necessarily be categorical.

Narcissism as a personality trait

Although this dissertation focuses on assessing narcissism in the general population, the rationale for incorporating research, experience and theories from the clinical literature on narcissism is that those diagnosed with this personality disorder show similar but extreme attitudes and behavioral manifestations that are also present in the non-pathological population. Individuals diagnosed with NPD show “extreme forms which are manifested to a lesser extent in normal individuals” (Raskin & Hall, 1981, p. 159), and when these behaviors

are exhibited in less extreme forms, they could be regarded as a narcissistic personality trait (Emmons, 1987). Moreover, narcissism seems to be “structured similar to other aspects of general personality” (Foster & Campbell, 2007, p. 1321). When studying the normal, non-pathological or sub-pathological segment of the population, it is assumed “that abnormality is continuous with normality” (Raskin & Hall, 1981, p. 159). This continuum stretches from a disorder on one side to the narcissistic personality style on the other (Sperry, 2003). A passage from Kets de Vries and Miller (1997, p. 199) gives a good example of the transition from normal to pathological narcissism:

It must be emphasized, however, that these characteristics occur with different degrees of intensity. A certain dose of narcissism is necessary to function effectively. We all show signs of narcissistic behavior. Among individuals who possess only limited narcissistic tendencies, we find those who are very talented and capable of making great contributions to society. Those who gravitate toward the extremes, however, give narcissism its pejorative reputation. Here we find excesses of rigidity, narrowness, resistance, and discomfort in dealing with the external environment. The managerial implications of narcissism can be both dramatic and crucial.

Contemporary dimensional views on personality disorders do not regard individuals with a personality disorder as being qualitatively distinct from individuals with a normal psychological function; however, they have extreme and maladaptive forms of the same personality that is inherent in all of us (Widiger & Trull, 2007). Studying narcissism in the normal population as a personality trait with dimensional and continuous properties seems justified, and adopting this view is important for the understanding and measurement of narcissism.

The measurement of narcissism

Many attempts have been made to measure narcissism. Early tests were projective, such as the Thematic Apperception Test or the Rorschach (Harder, 1979) or based on information obtained in clinical interviews (e.g. Gunderson, Ronningstam, & Bodkin, 1990). In addition, self-report instruments have also been developed to assess pathological narcissism, such as the Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI; Pincus, et al., 2009). There have also been attempts to create a narcissistic profile from measures of personality through the use of the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI; Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Rathvon & Holmstrom, 1996), the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Wink & Gough, 1990), the Hogan Development Survey (Hogan & Hogan, 2001), and the Five-Factor Model (e.g. Corbitt, 2005). However, it was not until the emergence of the NPI (Raskin & Hall, 1979) that psychological research into non-clinical narcissism increased (del Rosario & White, 2005) and flourished (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). The NPI is, up to the present, the most frequently used (Judge, LePine, & Rich, 2006) measure of non-clinical narcissism, and it seems that it “has achieved acceptance as a measure of subclinical narcissism” (del Rosario & White, 2005, p. 1076).

During the late 1970s, the NPI was developed to explore individual differences in narcissism as they were expressed in the normal population, using the internal consistency and item-total correlation method of test construction (Raskin & Terry, 1988). The NPI was developed from a list of 223 rationally chosen dyadic statements, which were derived from the clinical criteria for NPD described in the DSM-III (Raskin & Hall, 1979). Test takers had to choose between a narcissistic statement and one that was not. An example of one of the dyadic sets of statements is given below, where A is the narcissistic statement.

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

Using item analysis, Raskin and Hall compared each item from the 20 highest-scoring individuals with the 20 lowest-scoring individuals, who both chose the narcissistic alternative. As a result of this analysis, an 80-item inventory was developed. Later, after a series of both published and unpublished studies, a 54-item inventory was developed, measuring a general narcissistic construct (Raskin & Terry, 1988). However, since narcissism seems to be a multifaceted construct, and test development based on the internal consistency approach ignores any subfactors that may arise in complex mental and behavioral phenomena, Raskin and Terry initiated a research agenda to refine the instrument, incorporating multivariate procedures. The result of these analyses was a 40-item instrument with seven interrelated yet distinct factors relating to authority, self-sufficiency, superiority, exhibitionism, exploitativeness, vanity and entitlement.

Other researchers also incorporated the NPI in their research. Emmons (1984, 1987) extracted a 37-item NPI consisting of four factors in his psychometric studies. He labeled the factors exploitativeness/entitlement, leadership/authority, superiority/arrogance and self-absorption/self-admiration. Since then, several other versions have also been extracted, e.g. a 29-item version (Svindseth et al., 2009) and a 16-item version (Ames, Rose, & Anderson, 2006). Recent research has also developed a 13-item NPI (Gentile et al., 2013) to assess narcissism when time or other constraints make it difficult to administer a longer version. However, the most commonly used measures in research into sub-clinical or non-pathological narcissism are the 40-item version (Raskin & Terry, 1988) and the 37-item version (Emmons, 1987).

Current validity issues with the NPI

Later factor analytic studies of the NPI revealed that the instrument did not conform to the previous four- or seven- factor solutions. Kubarych, Deary, and Austin (2004) found in their study two or three factors relating to power, exhibitionism and being a special person, while Corry, Merritt, Mrug, and Pamp (2008) found two factors relating to leadership/authority and exhibitionism/entitlement. In one of the more recent factor studies of the NPI, Ackerman et al. (2011) extracted three factors relating to leadership/authority, grandiose exhibitionism, and entitlement/exploitativeness. This latter factor structure was also supported a priori in Gentile et al.'s (2013) 13 item version. In addition to these studies, others have found support for a two or a single factor (e.g. Barelds & Dijkstra, 2010), or a four factor

solution (e.g. Kansi, 2003; Svindseth et al., 2009). Thus, despite efforts, the NPI has not generated a stable factor structure. Even if the total score of the NPI shows good convergence with NPD (Miller, Gaughan, Pryor, Kamen, & Campbell, 2009) and the prototype of NPD held by experts (Miller & Campbell, 2008), a reliance on a total NPI score also will reduce the complexity of narcissism into a single trait score (Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). As a replicable and stable factor structure is one of the validity requirements of multidimensional personality instruments (Cronbach & Meehl, 1955), it is absolutely vital that the NPI generates a consistent and replicable factor structure across studies. Understanding the dimensionality of narcissism measured with the NPI is also important if one is to understand the construct itself (Brown, Budzek, & Tamborski, 2009) and predicting various outcomes with any of the past factors may potentially be incorrect.

The use of factor analysis to uncover the underlying factors of an instrument to measure a multidimensional personality is an important endeavor and can be traced to Guildford's (1946) term 'factor validity'. Guildford meant that the factorial validity of a test answers the question "[w]hat does this test measure" with "in terms of factors and their loadings" (p.428). Thus, factor analysis can play a role in the construct validity of a measure since the factors can point "out profitable ways of dividing the construct into more meaningful parts" (Cronbach & Mehl, 1955, p. 287), and can "function as constructs" (p. 287). Thus, one way of establishing construct validity is by defining the internal structure of the measure (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). As such, a factor structure identifies the theoretical underlying structure of a construct (Steger, 2006) and what it is supposed to measure (Floyd & Widaman, 1995). Content validity is one important part of the overall construct validity because it can provide evidence about individual elements and whether they are representative of the construct under consideration (Haynes, Richard, & Kubany, 1995). In relation to the factor structure of NPI, identification of a stable and consistent factor solution can support both construct and content validity through the factor's correspondence to the criteria in the DSM from which it was derived. In addition, if it is also possible to replicate an extracted factor structure in subsequent samples, it will help strengthen the structural validity of the instrument (Steger, 2006).

As well as stable factor structure, there are presently two versions of the NPI with different items being used to assess narcissism. These two are Emmons' (1987) 37 item version and Raskin & Terry's (1988) 40 item version. These two versions of the NPI have 31 items in common. That is, 6 are unique to Emmons' version, and 9 items are unique to Raskin and Terry's version. Even though the psychometric studies reviewed here have used Raskin & Terry's 40 item version, Emmons' 37 item version is also being used in research (e.g. Judge et al., 2006; Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010). As a consequence, the different items might have their own specific variance, and may also create slightly different results. Since these are the most commonly used NPI versions, the shared items should have high content validity as content validity can be thought of as the degree of agreement on definitions and item selections among experts (Messick, 1995). Messick goes on and argues that expert agreement will also address the content aspect of construct validity by defining representativeness, relevance, and the boundaries of the construct or test under consideration. Instead of a continuous use of

preferring one version over the other, common items could reflect a baseline of narcissistic items based on expert agreement.

Assessing narcissism with the NPI using different response scales

As well as the issues regarding a stable factor structure, several studies report using a response format other than the traditional forced choice when assessing narcissism with the NPI. Both a four-point Likert scale (e.g. Egan & McCorkindale, 2007), and a five-point Likert scale (e.g. de Zavala, Cichocka, Eidelson, & Jayawickreme, 2009; Barelds & Dijkstra, 2010), have been used in research with the NPI. Using different response formats with the same instrument may create different predictive validities especially since other response formats than the traditional forced choice are not widely used and validated (Ackerman et al., 2011). It is therefore important to test whether there are any differences in predictions and association with other personality measures between the different response formats.

Both Kubarych et al. (2004) and Corry et al. (2008) have argued that the forced choice format of the NPI may be replaced on a rating scale to allow respondents to express the degree of their narcissistic traits. Instead of using the traditional forced choice or dichotomy, other methods of scale construction are available. From both stimulus centered and subject centered scale methods we find Thurstone, Q-sort, rank-order, semantic differential, Guttman, Rasch, and external criterion methods (Dawis, 1987). However, probably the most popular and commonly used method in personality assessment is the Likert scale (Likert, 1932). Likert scales let respondents choose and “assign values to entities based on an underlying continuum defined by the anchors on the scale” (Meyers, Gamst, & Guarino, 2006, p. 20). A Likert response format might be a good alternative, both theoretically and statistically. In theory, a nuanced response scale might better reflect the degree of narcissism, as personality is seldom, if ever, categorical. Statistically, a dichotomous response scale faces statistical limitations at the item level when analyzing items with Pearson correlations, as most statistical programs do (e.g. Kubinger, 2003). Although tetrachoric correlations are usually recommended for dichotomous data, they might in some cases lead to an incorrect number of factors (e.g. Muthén, 1989). Conversely, a Likert scale would provide higher correlations and variances among the items (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994) and may also represent an underlying continuum for the dimensionality of a trait (Pantern, Swygert, Dahlstrom, & Tanaka, 1997). Likert scale scoring has also been superior to dichotomous scoring in other personality measures (e.g. Stöber, Dette, & Musch, 2002).

In conclusion, there do not seem to be any studies that have found a replicable and stable factor structure for the common NPI items from Emmons’ 37 item NPI (1987) and Raskin and Terry’s 40 item NPI (1988), and whether this factor structure replicates across samples and response format. In addition, there do not seem to be any studies that have investigated the predictive validity of the NPI with the traditional dichotomous response scale and a Likert response scale in the same study.

Narcissism and leadership

While narcissism may be one of the constituents of derailed leadership, it is also one of the traits of many of today's business leaders (Furnham, 2008). Leaders with narcissistic tendencies have been described in business as CEOs (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007), and as political and state leaders (Deluga, 1997; Post, 1986, 1993). Among those leaders described with narcissistic traits we find direct tyrants such as Saddam Hussein, Josef Stalin and Adolf Hitler (Glad, 2002), Mao Zedong (Sheng, 2001) and other political leaders such as Benjamin Netanyahu (Kimhi, 2001). In business, we find leaders such as Steve Jobs (Robins & Paulhus, 2001), Jack Welch, Bill Gates (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), Pehr Gyllenhammar and Jan Carlzon (Maccoby, 2003). In the business setting, these leaders may not meet the criteria to be psychiatrically diagnosed, but have instead been described as "PR-hungry superstars with stimulating personalities", working for admiration rather than being loved (Rosenthal, 2006, p. 47). One common factor that unites them, though, is that people with narcissistic traits often prefer positions of power.

As narcissists are usually domineering people (Emmons, 1984), primarily driven by power and glory (Maccoby, 2000), "generally acknowledged to be high in the need for control, status, [...] and achievement" (Paunonen, Lönnquist, Verkasalo, Leikas, & Nissinen, 2006, p. 476), they will often prefer leadership positions. A leadership position will also provide many of the gratifications a narcissist seeks, such as success, prestige and admiration (Kernberg, 1979). The constant flow of admiration many leaders experience will help to foster the narcissist's internally weak self (Post, 1986), which makes a leadership position especially desirable. This persistence or drive for leadership positions may not always lead to a deterioration in organizational performance, but performance and company strategy development tend to swing from extreme lows to extreme highs (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007) without any clear advantages. As such, any achievements the narcissistic leader experiences will also feed their grandiosity (Maccoby, 2000) which may again inspire even further overconfidence and risk taking for the companies they lead.

This narcissistic overconfidence was exemplified in a study by Campbell, Goodie, and Foster (2004) where participants could bet on the accuracy of their knowledge. The results showed that narcissists overrated their knowledge, and that their knowledge was not associated with actual accuracy. When they bet on their knowledge accuracy, they did so with higher and riskier bets and thus ended up losing more of the bets. In an organizational setting, Chatterjee and Hambrick (2007) compared the performance of a narcissistic CEO with a roller-coaster ride, and suggested that when the stakes are high, they also tend to bet highly. This might in some instances result in high returns, but when their decisions rely on overconfidence, their decision base may be highly uncertain, and will as a result lead to extreme losses in many situations.

Even if having a narcissistic boss can lead to extreme up and downsides, one of the challenges of selecting leaders today is that the business world often encourage arrogant, self-confident and self-important people (Furnham, 2008). Paradoxically, a leadership position is also the most socially acceptable place to practice power and authority, and as such, narcissists may sometimes correspond to what we as followers expect from our leaders, and

match our implicit theory of leadership. When they are hired, the group surrounding them usually offers no real opposition and will not question their grandiose ideas (Kernberg, 1979). This group of admirers will play into the narcissist's needs and will further degenerate their leadership. The outcome may be a deterioration of organizational performance, a poor forum for problem solving, loss of creativity, and sick and unmotivated staff. Those that offer opposition will often be pushed aside and left as a silent dissatisfied group.

Previous empirical studies have reported that narcissism is negatively related to contextual and overall job performance (Moscoso & Salgado, 2004) and Judge et al. (2006) found support for the theory that narcissists not only receive more negative ratings for contextual performance and supervisors' ratings of leadership, but narcissism was also positively related to workplace deviance. After several sessions of group discussions, Paulhus (1998) found that narcissists appeared unenjoyably, arrogant and hostile, and were perceived by the others in the group as braggarts and as over-estimators of their own abilities.

Furthermore, as narcissists have low levels of empathy (Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984; APA, 2000), they should not be associated with leadership. Emotional abilities and especially empathy have predicted perceived leadership ability (Kellet, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2002), in addition to peer rated relations leadership and task leadership (Kellet, Humphrey, & Sleeth, 2006). Those leaders that respect, support, and are interested in the welfare of their employees, seem to be better leaders. Narcissists tend instead to revolve around their own success, power, glory, and adoration from others (Raskin & Novacek, & Hogan, 1991). They are guided by an idiosyncratic, self-centered view of the world (Rosenthal & Pittinsky, 2006), and are exploitive individuals that will devalue and criticize others (Lubit, 2002). In addition, narcissists have problems with intimacy (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002) and emotional closeness (Brunell et al. 2008), which can imply that they will also have problems creating stable interpersonal relationships at work. This may endanger their ability to lead and guide their employees, to listen and respond to constructive feedback, and cause conflicts with and among coworkers. Feedback from others is attributed as a threat to the ego and the narcissist response is often aggression (Vazire & Funder, 2006), which in organizations may be manifested in behavior such as bullying, attacking others verbally, taking credit for the work of others, or attempts to destroy a coworker's career.

The consequence of selecting people with high narcissistic tendencies for leadership position seems obvious. But the effects of such leadership can reach further than their immediate subordinates. Usually a leader has not only subordinates, but also colleagues and supervisors. That is, as well as those below them, two other groups of employees can be affected by a narcissist's leadership in an organization. However, the reach of their consequences is not constrained to being an intraorganizational issue, others outside the organization can also be affected. Customers or collaborating partners working with the narcissistic leader can also be affected. These are the visible costs, but there are hidden costs as well. The loss of employees is a major concern, as well as sick leave, loss of creativity, and lower moral and well-being among the workers.

In conclusion, the effect of narcissistic leadership is not always direct and measureable, but also brings hidden costs. Narcissists will be found in leadership positions where they can practice and gain recognition for authority, power and admiration. Their strong self-

confidence, beliefs of superiority and lack of introspective qualities will also lead to self-nomination (Hogan et al., 1990). As such, narcissists are not only attracted to leadership positions, and also hired, and the reason why they are able to slip through selection procedures is by appearing more leader-like.

Leadership selection

“The question of the best combinations of character qualities for success in different occupations has long been of interest” (Achilles & Achilles, 1917, p. 305) and accumulating empirical evidence suggests that some leaders perform better than others. Among the several criteria for success in leadership, there is transformational leadership (Judge & Piccolo, 2004; Judge, Piccolo, & Ilies, 2004; Dvir, Eden, Avolio, & Shamir, 2002) and Leader-Member Exchange (e.g. Gerstner & Day, 1997). However, how others perceive individual leadership may not necessarily lead to leadership effectiveness (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008), which makes more objective and standardized measures in leadership selection processes important for organizations. Although current research has not been devoted especially to executive selection (Thornton, Hollenbeck, & Johnson, 2010), much of the current knowledge of leader selection relies on results from personnel and lower leadership selection.

The different criteria to assist recruiters in making informed choices among potential candidates includes biodata, tests of cognitive ability, personality inventories, interviews, and use of assessment centers (Hough & Oswald, 2000). Although a collection of different selection methods will increase prediction accuracy, more tests will also increase the need for external professional support and the cost of selection.

One valid individual predictor of future overall job performance is intelligence or general mental ability (GMA) (Schmidt & Hunter, 1998). GMA is usually defined in the literature “as any measure that combines two, three, or specific aptitudes, or any measure that includes a variety of items measuring specific abilities (e.g. verbal, numerical, spatial)” (Salgado et al., 2003, p. 1068). GMA is also a better predictor of job performance than job experience (Schmidt & Hunter, 2004). Despite the usefulness of GMA testing, intelligence tests are seldom used in selection as a standardized HR practice. One reason might be that HR practitioner journals have seldom reported their benefits (Rynes, Giluk, & Brown, 2007). Instead, organizations and recruiters have utilized other predictors of stable individual differences such as personality tests, which yield a higher correlation with leadership (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002) than intelligence (Judge, Colbert, & Ilies, 2004). In addition to personality testing, job interviews are the most common of all selection methods (Posthuma, Morgeson, & Campion, 2002; Hogan & Kaiser, 2005; Macan, 2009; Ryan, McFarland, Baron, & Page, 1999). Questions thus arise about the validity of the job interview, and whether interviews can distinguish between preferable and less preferable candidates.

Selection interviews

A job interview is defined as a “selection procedure designed to predict future job performance on the basis of applicants’ oral responses to oral inquiries” (McDaniel, Whetzel, Schmidt, & Maurer, 1994). Broadly speaking, selection or employment interviews can be divided into two groups, structured and unstructured. In their pure form, unstructured interviews are an informal conversation between the interviewee and the interviewer/s. On the other hand, structured interviews are defined as “any enhancement of the interview that is intended to increase psychometric properties by increasing standardization or otherwise assisting the interviewer in determining what questions to ask or how to evaluate responses” (Campion, Palmer, & Campion, 1997, p. 656). In practice however, job interviews seldom belong to either a structured or unstructured category, but interviews are structured along a continuum from unstructured through semi-structured to structured (e.g. Chamorro-Premusic & Furnham, 2010). Therefore, the degree of interview structure is based on the degree of standardization of the questions, and the standardization of the evaluation of the answers (Macan, 2009). However, there is little agreement over the nature of the dimensionality and what constitutes interview structure (Dipboye, Macan, & Shahani-Denning, 2012). For example, Campion et al. (1997) identified 15 components relating to the nature of the questions and the evaluations of the responses in structured interviews.

With this consideration in mind, of the two broad forms of interviews, structured interviews have proved to be the best predictors of future job performance (e.g. McDaniel et al., 1994), and structured interviews have twice the predictive validity of unstructured interviews (Wiesner & Cronshaw, 1988). One reason for the higher predictive validity of structured interviews are that they rate constructs such as job relevant knowledge and skills, which tend to be better predictors of job performance than education, experience, and interests, which are more frequently rated in low or unstructured interviews (Huffcutt, Conway, Roth, & Stone, 2001). Other reasons for the higher validity of structured interviews, over that of unstructured interviews, are that they may be less open to interviewer bias. In this respect, pre-planning the interview such that each applicant receives the same questions and in the same order, standardizing the evaluation of the responses, and ensuring that the interviewer has little autonomy in the administration and coding of the interview may help to decrease interviewer bias (Chamorro-Premuzic & Furnham, 2010).

The questions asked are one of the many important components or characteristics, and determinants of the different sub-types of structured interviews. Campion et al. (1997) identified four types of questions in their extensive review: situational questions, past behavior questions, background questions, and job knowledge questions. Situational questions ask candidates to explain what they would do or how they would behave in a hypothetical situation, which may occur in the job. Past behavior questions ask candidates about what they have done in the past that might be relevant for the job for which they are applying. Thus, past behavior questions focus on past behavior, whereas situational questions focus on future behavior. The third types of structured questions are background questions. Background questions usually focus on a candidate’s experiences, education, and other qualifications, which may be important for the job. Job knowledge questions allow candidates to demonstrate their job knowledge by asking what they would do if they were confronted with a

particular challenge that is relevant to the job. Of these types of different questions, there seems to be a preference for investigating the validity of past behavior, and for situational interviews.

In one of the early meta-analysis of employment interviews, McDaniel et al. (1994) showed that situational interviews were a better predictor of job performance than job related or psychological interviews (interviews conducted by a psychologist), although psychological interviews were slightly better predictors of training performance than situational interviews. In a study of managers, only the past behavior structured interview significantly predicted job performance, while a situational interview did not (Krajewski, Goffin, McCarthy, Rothstein, & Johnston, 2006). Past behavioral interviews are also more resilient to fakery than situational interviews (Levashina & Campion, 2007).

Interview assessment of psychological constructs

Although the emphasis in research has been on the reliability and validity of different interviews, there has been less research on the kind of psychological constructs assessed in the interview (Huffcutt et al., 2001). Moreover, few studies have been devoted to investigating whether interviews actually measure the construct they were designed to measure (Posthuma et al., 2002). In a meta-analysis of the construct validity of the employment interviews, Salgado and Moscoso (2002) studied two forms of interviews, conventional and behavioral interviews, and their relationships with a wide variety of individual characteristics. Although they did not classify the interviews as either structured or unstructured, conventional interviews typically ask questions relating to self-evaluation, checking credentials, and description of experience, whereas behavior interviews are composed of questions relating to on the job experiences and other behavioral components. Their results indicated that not only were the two types of interviews distinct, they also measured different constructs. Conventional interviews were mainly able to assess an interviewee's GMA, the Big-Five personality dimensions, and social skills. On the other hand, behavioral interviews assessed job knowledge, job experience, situational judgment, and social skills.

In a meta-analysis by Huffcutt et al. (2001), the aim was not only to study the degree to which an interview is able to assess psychological constructs, but also whether there is a difference between interview structure and what is assessed. Of the 47 interview studies that were included in the analysis, 19 were coded as low structured interviews and 28 as high structured interviews. Interviews were coded as high structured if the majority of the questions were specified before the interviews were conducted. In the low structured category, the interviews did not have predefined questions. These unstructured interviews were also quite loose in respect to both topics covered and questions asked. Overall, the results showed that personality traits and social skills were among the most rated constructs for both interview categories. Of these traits and skills, conscientiousness, interpersonal skills, mental capability, and knowledge and skills were the most rated constructs. Huffcutt et al. also found that low structured interviews mainly focused on general intelligence, education, interests, and experience, whereas high structured interviews focused on job knowledge and skills, and interpersonal and social skills. These results may indicate that the type of interview has a

different impact on the constructs measured, and may even have an impact upon final selection decisions.

So far, the reviewed studies have focused on meta-analytical approaches to the interview-psychological construct relationship. Few studies have focused on personality saturation in actual employment interviews (Roth, Van Iddekinge, Huffcutt, & Edison Jr. & Schmit, 2005) or on the difference between self-reported measures of personality and interview assessed personality (Van Iddekinge, Raymark, Edison Jr., & Attenweiler, 2004). Van Iddekinge et al. investigated the relationship between applicants' self-reported personality and two highly structured behavior description interviews conducted by two interviewers who independently evaluated each applicant's personality. Their results showed limited support for the idea that interviews are able to measure self-reported personality. Van Iddekinge et al. attributed the predictive validity of structured behavioral interviews to other interviewee characteristics that are unrelated to the construct of interest, and suggested that "structured interviews demonstrate content- and criterion-related validity, but lack construct validity" (p. 90). This lack of construct validity was further supported by Roth et al. (2005), who found that the highest correlations between a behavior description interview and self-reported FFM of personality were openness and extraversion (.12), and they concluded that "most structured interviews are not saturated with a great deal of personality variance" (p. 269). This finding can however be challenged because their interviews, which they developed specifically to assess five personality dimensions, had only 6 items.

If interviews were designed specifically to assess personality, with multiple items per construct, the correlation between self-reported personality and interview ratings might be stronger (Macan, 2009). Van Iddekinge, Raymark, and Roth (2005) developed a structured interview based on only three dimensions from the Revised NEO Personality Inventory, and went to great lengths to ensure that the interview process could tap the constructs of interest. These steps included training interviewers, a laborious question development process to ensure accurate measurement of the constructs, and they made interviewers evaluate respondent's answers immediately after they were given to avoid any impression effects that could arise if evaluation was prolonged. Van Iddekinge et al. reported a valid and reliable correspondence between self-reported NEO ratings and interviewer ratings (the correlations ranged from .20 – .43). Although these results are promising in the sense that they mean personality could be assessed during a highly structured and specific interview, other processes might interfere with the accuracy of personality assessment and other interview ratings of job applicants. One reason for this interference may be that the interpretation of personality constructs in structured interviews relies heavily upon human information processing and that applicant social skills may influence interviewers, making it difficult to measure the content of underlying personality constructs in a reliable and valid way (Roth et al., 2005). For practical selection purposes, a non-personality-based interview is preferred over one designed to assess personality, since the costs involved in administering a well-validated personality inventory are relatively small compared to those of a personality-based interview (Van Iddekinge et al., 2005), and there may be limits to how clinically oriented interviews used for practical selection can be. Using both objective and subjective methods to assess potential job candidates is indeed important, since HRM professionals are found to rely

on intuition to guide their selection decisions (Lodato, Highhouse, & Brooks, 2010), and an interviewer's own personality traits such as openness is also related to their accuracy when they predict an interviewee's personality (Christiansen, Wolcott-Burnam, Jancovics, Burns, & Quirk, 2005).

Although the various selection methods rely on years of scientific results, one of the challenges of today's selection processes is that they are usually designed to tap normal and bright personality dimensions, rather than dark and destructive ones. It is not their bright characteristics that usually separates a good leader from a bad one: usually they are "confident, energetic, and socially skilled" (Hogan, 1994, p. 13). As Hogan further argues, dark-side characteristics are not necessarily pathological, but an extension of normal personality, hard to detect in an interview or in normal personality measures. Thus, candidates that we would otherwise avoid in leadership may mask their dark sides and show only their bright sides during selection.

Narcissism and leader selection

As previously explained, narcissists are attracted to leadership positions because of their inherent need for admiration, power and prestige. Since interviews do not seem to have high associations with personality as suggested above, they may be susceptible to a candidate's impression management. Meta-analytic evidence suggests that impression management tactics and the appearance of the interviewee do affect employment interviews (Barrick, Shaffer, & DeGrassi, 2009), although this effect was reduced by higher structures of the interview. In interviews, the narcissist is given an opportunity to self-enhance and excel (e.g. Hogan & Kaiser, 2005). Oltmanns, Friedman, Fiedler, and Turkheimer, (2004) selected a group of enlisted military personnel because they met the criteria for a personality disorder. They were videotaped during a diagnostic interview and these videotapes were later rated by a group of student colleagues. The videotaped participants who had dispositions toward, and had met the clinical criteria for, NPD were also rated by the students as likeable and attractive. One reason for narcissist popularity ratings may be the way they dress and appear, manifested in physical cues such as choice of clothes and facial expressions (Vazire, Naumann, Rentfrow, & Gosling, 2008), and also in how they verbally express themselves (Back, Schmukle, & Egloff, 2010). However, in Oltmanns et al.'s (2004) study of enlisted military personnel, all participants had the same military uniforms, and had similar short haircuts. Thus, other physical or non-physical cues than cloths and haircuts seem to affect narcissist's popularity ratings.

In a series of group discussions, Paulhus (1998) investigated how self-ratings of narcissism could be related to interpersonal ratings such as social and intellectual skills, by others in leaderless group discussions. After the first meeting, others in the group rated narcissists as entertaining, confident, and intelligent. Narcissism was also significantly but negatively related to being boring. These initial positive ratings may be a result of that narcissists are confident and extraverted, and will therefore also speak up more frequently and express their opinions and belief, and thus be perceived as competent and effective (Brunell et

al., 2008). Since narcissists need others to maintain their inflated self-view, they have developed skills to help them to initiate relationships with other. Since socially skilled applicants will have a higher possibility of being successful in both conventional and behavioral interviews (Salgado & Moscoso, 2002), narcissists will rise to the occasion and shine. Roulin, Bangerter, and Yerly (2011) showed that candidates who made unique impressions, and gave unique answers to questions, also received higher interview evaluations and had improved chances of receiving a job offer. This uniqueness effect is often exploited by narcissists, as they are the people who “seek to stand out from the crowd” (Paulhus & John, 1998, p. 1045), blinding the interviewer(s) with their enthusiasm, charm and rhetoric (Maccoby, 2000; Lubit, 2002). In a recent study, Paulhus, Westlake, Calvez, and Harms (2013) found that during simulated interviews, those with high narcissism were also given higher hirability ratings. As such, there is a real threat that selection interviews do not detect darker personality traits, and that strong social skills can mask an applicant’s aberrant personality. Reynolds and Clark (2001) found, in a clinical sample consisting of in- and outpatients undergoing treatment, that assertiveness (one of the facets of the extraversion factor in the NEO-PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992)) was positively associated with those who met the clinical criteria for the narcissistic personality disorder. In a meta-study with both clinical and non-clinical samples of the relationship between the five-factor model of personality and personality disorders, narcissism was consistently related to extraversion (Saulsman & Page, 2004). Thus, there seems to be supportive evidence for narcissists having a personality especially associated with extraversion (e.g. Paulhus, 2001), but we could also speculate about whether narcissism could have behavioral manifestations similar to that of extraversion.

Extraversion is the strongest correlate of transformational leadership (Bono & Judge, 2004) and is among the personality traits that have the highest correlation with leader emergence (e.g. Judge et al., 2002), and in particular in studies of leaderless groups (Ensari, Riggio, Christian, & Carslaw, 2011). Thus, among the factors in the five-factor model of normal personality, extraversion seems particularly relevant for leader emergence, and this is probably due to the fact that extraversion may create an impression of being leader-like. During high structured mock interviews, Barrick et al. (2012) found that extraversion and verbal skills were significantly associated with interview ratings, and the same may be the case for narcissism. Osborn, Field, and Veres (1998) found that extraversion was predictive of overall interview performance in so far as the applicants also had a higher self-monitoring score. Here, high self-monitors are defined as people who “control and manipulate images of themselves projected to others. They are sensitive to what behaviors are appropriate in the immediate situation and are willing to change their actions and statements to win approval of others” (p. 145). These tendencies can resemble the self-presentation of a classic narcissist. Interestingly, Osborn et al. also found support for the idea that low self-monitoring extroverts obtained lower interview ratings, suggesting that perhaps narcissistic over-claiming and self-enhancement may be credited in real interviews, rather than their extraversion. Thus, if both extraversion and narcissism make people appear leader-like, how will these two traits work together in predicting leader appearance? Will narcissism add to the effect of extraversion, or will the variables work interactively in predicting leader emergence in an interview situation.

That is, will narcissism have incremental variance beyond the variance explained by extraversion, or will the interaction between these two traits explain additional variance beyond the main effects. In addition to this, support for the leader-like appearance of narcissists has been reported in several studies involving group discussions where the members rate each other's leadership.

Brunell et al., (2008) conducted three studies to investigate whether those scoring highly on narcissism emerged as leaders in leaderless group discussions. Brunell et al. found that narcissism was significantly related to other group member's ratings of leadership in the first two studies with students as participants. In the last study, the participants were managers enrolled in an MBA program and were given an assignment involving the allocation of financial resources. In the latter study, expert raters monitored and later rated the participants to the extent that they emerged as leaders. The results supported the idea that self-reported narcissism was significantly related to leadership ratings. Further supportive evidence for these findings was obtained by Nevicka, De Hoogh, Van Vianen, Beersma, & McIlwain (2011a). Here, the authors speculated as to whether or not narcissists emerged as leaders, dependent on the context. The authors manipulated the teams to be under either a low or high reward interdependence condition, in a team oriented computer simulation task. Under the high reward interdependence condition, each participant had an incentive to interact more often to obtain higher reward, whereas under the low reward interdependence condition, participants had less incentive to work as a group, but could rather work independently to obtain an individual reward. The results supported the idea that narcissistic individuals were chosen as leaders by their team members, irrespective of the context. Other empirical studies also suggest that not only do narcissists emerge as leaders through other group members, they are also perceived as more effective leaders (Nevicka, Ten Velden, De Hoogh, & Van Vianen, 2011b). Consequently, narcissists will not only be present in leadership selection settings, they are also expected to perform well in such settings.

Overall research purposes

Because of the narcissist's intense need for power, admiration, and success, a leadership position may function as a way of fulfilling these needs (e.g. Kernberg, 1979). By appearing confident (Campbell et al., 2004; Paulhus, 1998), authoritative (Nevicka et al., 2011b), and with high self-esteem (Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2004), narcissists may resemble our implicit image of a prototypical leader, appearing leader-like to those who evaluate their leadership potential and recruit them. Thus, they would be able to not only slip through leadership selection processes, but would also be doing well in such settings. Do narcissists jeopardize leadership selection? Through three independent yet interrelated studies, this dissertation's main objective is to demonstrate that narcissists are perhaps over-credited in real-life leadership selection processes, mainly by appearing leader-like.

Study 1 addresses the main focus of this dissertation, and seeks to investigate whether there is a positive relationship between scores on a narcissism inventory and interview ratings

in a selection interview during a NCO admission process. As interviews are, in many selection processes, heavily weighted in the final selection decision, will narcissism also have a positive indirect effect upon final NCO admission? As well as addressing these points in the first sample, we have also speculated above about whether narcissism would have the same effects as extraversion, as extraverts are related to leadership emergence. Sample Two in Study 1 will, in addition to replicating the effects of narcissism on the selection criterion, also include the five-factor model of normal personality to address whether narcissism could explain over and beyond the five-factor model, and if there is any interactive effect between narcissism and extraversion in predicting interview ratings.

The use of different response styles can be an issue regarding the predictive validity of the instrument since a Likert response style has not been frequently used or tested together with the traditional dichotomous scale (e.g. Ackerman et al., 2011). Interviews also tend to assess a range of components, from background questions to more open-ended questions relating to job relevant knowledge (e.g. Campion et al., 1997). Therefore, it may seem as if narcissists will not be associated with more objective assessment, but when they are freer to self-enhance, such as boasting about their accomplishments, they will tend to do better.

Study 2 replicates and extends Study 1 by including two different interview ratings, future school potential and future leadership potential. Including two types of interview ratings makes it possible to explore the types of interviews in which narcissists will successfully self-enhance. Study 2 also tests how narcissism and extraversion will work together in predicting interview ratings, and whether there are any differences in the predictive validity of either a dichotomous or a Likert response scale.

In the introduction above, ample examples were given for the theory that the NPI has an unstable factor structure across studies. The research presented identified a varying number of factors, either one or two (Barelds & Dijkstra, 2010), three (Kubarych et al., 2004; Corry et al., 2008; Ackerman et al., 2011), or four or seven (Emmons, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Whether these results are a consequence of subjective decisions or an unstable instrument is difficult to say, and the continuing use of the total score of the NPI is limited in respect to only investigating an overall narcissism score, rather than being a multidimensional measure of narcissism.

Study 3 tries to test whether it is possible to extract a stable, consistent and theoretically meaningful factor structure with the dichotomous NPI and to further test this with confirmatory approaches in subsequent samples, also including a sample with a Likert response scale. In doing so, only the common items from Emmons (1987) and Raskin and Terry (1988) are chosen to represent narcissism because they should have considerable content validity as judged by expert raters in the field. These factors can be contrasted with the five-factor model of normal personality and inspected for any convergent or divergent correlations between samples.

The papers of this dissertation (pages 32-126) are not available in BI Brage, due to copyright matters:

Article 1

Narcissus in the leader selection process: The relationship between narcissism, interview ratings, and officer academy admission

Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 119th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC, 2011

Article 2

Narcissism and selection: A randomized field experiment testing the predictive validity of a dichotomous and Likert-scored narcissistic personality inventory

Gimsø, C. E., & Martinsen, Ø. L.

An earlier draft of this paper was presented at the 120th Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Orlando, Florida, 2012.

Article 3

Factor stability of the narcissistic personality inventory: Case lost?

Gimsø, C. E., Martinsen, Ø. L. & Arnulf, J. K.

An earlier draft of this paper was accepted for poster presentation at the 121st Annual Convention for the American Psychological Association, Honolulu, Hawaii, 2013.

A complete version of the dissertation (print copy) may be ordered from BI's website:

<http://www.bi.edu/research/Research-Publications/>

General discussion

In the introduction to this dissertation support was provided for the idea that many of the leaders in organizations do not perform as expected. Although various reasons were presented for why these leaders fail, there was also support for the idea that their lack of interpersonal skills was a common denominator. In a job setting, the lack of interpersonal skills can manifest in behavior such as not being able to relate to others and gain stable interpersonal relationships, lack of understanding of subordinates, and of coworkers needs and feelings. As narcissists need power, admiration, and control, it is highly likely that they will be attracted to leadership positions to fulfill these needs. As such, narcissism may be one of the reasons for the high number of leadership failures. As well as having an attraction to, narcissists will also perform well in situations where they can show or brag of their leadership potential. Therefore, the main objective of this dissertation was to learn more about how a few, but potentially destructive, leader candidates may increase their chances of slipping past ordinary leader selection practices by appearing leader-like. Study 1 and one of the objectives of Study 2 aimed to test the effects of narcissism in a real-life selection setting. In both studies, there was replicated support for the idea that narcissism was significantly related to interview ratings, NCO admission, and that narcissism had an indirect effect upon NCO admission through the interview ratings. Study 2 also found support for the idea that narcissism was related to leadership potential ratings, but not to future school ratings.

In Study 2, the predictive validity of both a dichotomous and a Likert scored NPI was tested. Through a randomization of these two response scales to the respondents, the dichotomous NPI provided slightly higher predictive validity. Thus, at least for the total NPI score, a dichotomous NPI seems to be a somewhat better predictor than a Likert based NPI, although the differences in predictions were small. In addition to this, there was also speculation about whether narcissism and extraversion would have interaction effects when predicting interview ratings. Interaction effects were found between narcissism and extraversion in both Study 1 and Study 2, predicting interview and leadership ratings. That is, a low extraversion score was associated with a high interview score when the narcissism score was also high. Conversely, a high extraversion score was associated with a high interview rating only when the narcissism score was low. This interaction effect was not found when narcissism was assessed with a Likert scale.

The results from Study 3 supported the extraction of a five factor solution with factors relating to exploitativeness, authority, exhibitionism, vanity, and superiority, which were later tested with confirmatory analyses. The five factor solution was preferred over that of a 2, 3, and 4 factor solution, and was also preferred irrespective of response format. Convergent correlations were also obtained between the extracted five factors and the five-factor model of personality (i.e. NEO-PI-R and NEO-PI-3) in all three samples, providing support for the extracted factors. Taken together, the results from Study 2 and 3 suggested only small differences in the validity of the NPI scoring with either a dichotomous or a Likert response format.

Narcissism and appearance in selection interviews

First of all, the results from Study 1 indicate that those with narcissistic tendencies are credited in interview situations where one of the assessment criteria is leadership potential. Secondly, these results also tell us that interview ratings are weighted such that high ratings also lead to a higher probability of NCO admission, and narcissists seem to jeopardize selection settings mainly through being credited in the selection interview. Finally, in Sample Two narcissism had a direct effect on NCO admission beyond interview ratings. This last result indicates that there may be other channels in the selection process which narcissists are able to influence to their benefit.

The interview used in the two selection processes in Study 1 was accompanied by an interview guide that gave a clear description of the different aspects for assessment. The interview guide also allowed for additional probing should the interviewer feel that they wanted more knowledge of the individual aspects. As such, the interview was not highly structured but could instead be regarded as semi-structured. As a consequence, the interview could have been affected by applicants' impression management tactics, which tend to be reduced when interview structure is high (e.g. Barrick et al., 2009). A lower structured interview seems thus more open and susceptible to narcissistic self-enhancement, as Barrick et al. found a sample-weighted mean correlation, corrected for criterion unreliability, of .21 between highly structured interviews and impression management, and a correlation of .46 with impression management where interview structure was low. In Study 1 the correlations between narcissism and interview ratings were .11 and .12 (for Samples One and Two respectively). In Study 2 the interview structure was increased compared to that of Study 1. Interviewers received more training before conducting the interviews and the interview guide that accompanied the interview also had a higher degree of structure than in Study 1. This new interview guide had a better description and examples of areas to cover, and concrete examples of how to score applicant responses to the questions. This ensured that each applicant received the same type of questions and was evaluated on the basis of the same criteria. Here, the same correlation of .11 between narcissism and leadership interview ratings was found, irrespective of response format. As such, all the interviews in the present study context seemed to be less open to positive impressions by narcissists than earlier research has suggested. However, we could speculate about whether conventional interviews with a low structure, which may more often be a selection method for higher level leadership positions, are more susceptible to narcissistic self-presentations.

As well as increasing the standardization of the interview in Study 2 compared to that of Study 1, there were also two new dimensions of interview assessment: school prognosis and a leadership prognosis. A school prognosis assessed how each applicant was perceived to perform in the training period, given the great amount of both theoretical and practical education. The leadership prognosis, on the other hand, assessed perceptions of an applicant's potential to become an officer. It was hypothesized that narcissism should relate differently to each of these types of assessments, and it did. Narcissism was significantly related to the leadership interview rating, but not to the school interview rating. These results suggest that narcissists seem to be credited only in particular types of interviews. Narcissism was only rated positively when candidates were questioned about their self-perceived strengths and

weaknesses, stress tolerance, past leadership experience, and interviewer's perceptions of their general appearance and communication skills throughout the interview. When the interviewers asked questions with relatively objective topics, such as about past school performance, motivation to seek military leader training, and past study habits, they did not obtain higher interview ratings than other candidates.

It was suggested that narcissists would shine during interviews where they are given an opportunity to self-enhance (Hogan & Kaiser, 2005), and the results suggest they would do so, as they received higher ratings in interviews assessing leadership potential. Past research has indicated that when narcissists are given a chance to over-claim every day and academic knowledge, they do so consistently, even if they are warned that the knowledge claims are foils, put there by the researchers (Paulhus, Harms, Bruce, & Lysy, 2003). When narcissists were presented with difficult and stressful tasks, they actually improved their performance when they had an opportunity to self-enhance (Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). This over-claiming tendency by narcissists may be a result of their need to demonstrate status and superiority through self-promotion (Wallace, 2011). Similar support was obtained in Paulhus et al. (2013) where the authors found that those with high narcissism increased their self-promotion behavior in simulated interviews when they thought experts as opposed to non-expert evaluated them.

A selection interview not only gives people a chance to present their job-relevant skills and abilities, it is also an arena for self-promotion. Communication skills and appearance also seem to be tied to interview ratings, and in the introduction we speculated about whether high narcissism may have the same effect on interview ratings as high extraversion. In both Study 1 and in Study 2, support for this assumption was found. A significant interaction effect between narcissism and extraversion when predicting interview ratings was found in Sample Two in Study 1, and later replicated in Study 2, when predicting leadership interview ratings, but only for the dichotomous NPI. In these two studies, those with a high narcissism score and a low extraversion score had relatively higher interview ratings than those with low elevations of both traits. These results illustrate that elevated narcissism can compensate for low extraversion as others perceive these people as having leadership potential in an interview situation.

Narcissism and perceptions of leadership

Even though three independent studies showed replicated support for a positive narcissism – interview relationship, narcissism was also significantly and positively related to NCO admission in the second sample in Study 1, and also after controlling for interview ratings. Therefore, it may be that there are other channels besides interviews, where narcissists can jeopardize selection outcomes. One explanation for this finding could be that narcissists are simply perceived as having high leadership potential in selection settings. In addition, narcissists improved their performance in conditions where they were able to self-enhance. Wallace and Baumeister (2002) found that when narcissists are challenged, are under pressure, or are publicly evaluated, they improve their performance in creative tasks. In respect to the selection contexts in Study 1 and Study 2, narcissists were given an arena where self-enhancement seemed possible and beneficial, but the selection process seemed also to

have stimulated their desire to compete when under pressure, in addition to being evaluated on many of the tasks they were given.

Although a clinical narcissist will not be beneficial for any organization or team they might lead, we could speculate whether or not there are curvilinear relationships between narcissism and leadership and explain the positive effects of narcissism in the present studies. As such, it is possible that there exists an optimal level of narcissism in respect to leadership. One of the reasons people seek and hold positions of leadership is that they seem to have a desire for authority or like being able to have influence on others. If so, the authority aspect of NPI should explain the variance in leadership. Examples of these authority items are “I would prefer to be a leader” and “I have a strong will for power”, and these items in isolation do not seem to be pathological. The authority aspect of the NPI has previously been related to other ratings of leadership, whereas items relating to exhibitionism were not (Brunell et al., 2008). As such, there might be a productive side of narcissism in relation to leadership. One of the proponents of this view is Maccoby (2000, 2003). Maccoby proposes that productive narcissists have the capacity for great acts in the institutions they lead. They are charismatic leaders attracting followers with great visions, and creative leaders with bold strategies, which they pursue with great enthusiasm. Productive narcissists do not “try to extrapolate to understand the future – they attempt to create it” (2000, p. 72). It is when the productive narcissist loses contact with reality, lacks self-insight, and becomes isolated in their dream or illusion of grandiosity, that narcissism gets its reputation. Maccoby believes that their downfall becomes apparent when they are sensitive to criticism, when they are poor listeners, lack empathy, have a distaste for mentoring, and an intense desire to compete, not only to win, but also metaphorically as a fear of the “primitive danger of extension “ (p. 75). Others have used the terms ‘charismatic narcissistic leaders’ (Post, 1993) or ‘constructive narcissistic leaders’ (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1997) to describe a less dangerous form of leader with narcissistic tendencies.

If narcissism does not deserve its reputation for being one of the causes of derailed leadership, and the traits of the authority aspect is neither pathological nor harmful for leadership, it is paradoxical that items relating to the darker side of narcissism, such as entitlement and exploitativeness, were positively and significantly related to peer ratings of popularity, whereas items relating to power and authority were not (Back et al., 2010). In addition, in Study 1 and Study 2, no significant curvilinear effects between narcissism and interview ratings were found. Thus, the results still suggest that narcissists appear leader-like in selection. Furthermore, in Study 1 and Study 2 we also tested if those with very high narcissism appeared more leader-like than those with very low narcissism. We had chosen this cutoff of high vs. low narcissism to be 1.5 SD above and below the mean to clearly represent elevations of narcissism and may be considered to be close to a clinical description of the disorder (e.g. Miller et al., 2008. See also De Fruyt, Wille, Furnham, 2013 and De Fruyt et al., 2009 for additional examples). These results suggested that in both samples in Study 1, those with high elevations of narcissism received significantly higher interview ratings than those defined to lack narcissism. In Study 2 these results were replicated, but only for the dichotomous based NPI. Thus, in light of the present results from the three samples investigating the relationship between narcissism and leadership perceptions, having a high

degree of narcissism in these leadership selection processes seems to be advantageous when the assessment criteria is leader potential.

Taken together, instead of a discussion about whether or not a healthy, good or productive form of narcissism exists, those who have characteristics of pathological narcissism and comply with the criteria of the NPD cannot be judged as healthy individuals as per definition, not for themselves and not for those who are close to them. It seems that a distinction between healthy or unhealthy narcissism is difficult to delineate, and the question of whether two forms of narcissism might instead boil down to *how much* narcissism does not compromise leadership. We all share characteristics of narcissism that are essential for our self-worth and self-preservation, but we seldom act on them at the expense of someone else. Although non-narcissistic individuals also like to be praised, approved, and experience success, they are able to balance their efforts to obtain this through “empathy, affection, politeness, realism, humility, and fair play” (Robins, Tracy, & Shaver, 2001, p. 234).

In conclusion, there seems to be no real evidence for disqualifying the use of interviews in selection, but the evidence suggests that interviews may not be suited to detect candidates with high elevations of narcissism. If the goal is to avoid putting narcissistic candidates into leadership positions, the use of highly structured interviews in a selection process is therefore strongly advised. In addition, controlling for high narcissistic tendencies early in the selection process, before any interview/s are conducted, could be one possible way of detecting high scorers, since they seem to slip past normal selection methods.

The measurement of narcissism with the NPI

Although the main purpose of this dissertation was to test whether narcissists appear leader-like and is credited in leadership selection, the second purpose of this dissertation was to scrutinize the current most popular instrument of normal or non-pathological narcissism, the NPI. Several studies have reported using a Likert scale in research with the NPI, alongside the traditional forced choice or dichotomous format. It was therefore important to test whether there were any differences in the predictive validity of these response formats in the same study. In addition to the interchangeable use of response scales, previous psychometric studies with the NPI have not been able to extract a replicable and consistent factor structure. This questions the validity of the previous factors for any practical purposes, but also for theoretical reasons. As such, using the previous factors to delineate a narcissistic personality as a multidimensional trait can potentially be problematic. The second purpose of Study 2 and Study 3 was devoted to these issues.

As well as the traditional and most commonly used dichotomous response scale, a five-point Likert response scale was used to assess narcissism among the participants in Study 2. Through a field experiment, a booklet containing several questionnaires and an NPI with two different response formats was randomly administered to the participants. All other personality questionnaires were identical. The results from Study 2 showed that a dichotomous based NPI showed slightly higher predictive validities than a Likert based NPI. They both predicted leadership potential and global interview ratings and had an indirect effect on the NCO admission. However, they differed in predictions for an interaction effect with extraversion in predicting leadership potential interview ratings, and in the high vs. low

narcissism comparison of leadership potential interview ratings. Here, the dichotomous NPI was significant in the predictions whereas the Likert NPI was not. There was also noted a significant difference between the NPI two response formats and the associations with self-esteem. As well as this, only the dichotomous NPI was significantly related to NCO admission. On the other hand, only the Likert NPI was significantly related to age and sex. These differences were however not significantly different. The differences can be attributed to sample specifics or demographic differences not captured by our data or variables, or even due to measurement error. This may also be the case for the significantly different correlations between the two NPI response formats and self-esteem.

When testing for an interaction effect between narcissism and extraversion in predicting leadership interview ratings, the effect was only significant for the interaction with the dichotomous NPI, not between the Likert NPI and extraversion. Here, the interaction effects were stronger than for the same interaction effect identified in Study 1. This lack of interaction effect for the Likert based NPI could be due to measurement differences, but may also suggest that a dichotomous NPI assesses narcissism more clearly than a Likert scale, which might also explain its significant relation to NCO admission. On the other hand, a dichotomous format might also overrate narcissism in each of the respondents. Sometimes it may be difficult to make a choice, or agree or disagree with statements, especially if some of the statements do not fit the perceived personality of the respondents. In this way, the responses on a Likert scale would allow for a scaled degree of agreement or disagreement and thereby better reflect the underlying personality the instrument tries to assess, as was suggested in the introduction. As well as this, response styles such as acquiescence, the tendency of respondents to agree more than they disagree on statements, or other response bias such as social desirable responding (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994; Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991) may have affected the response formats differently. However, the respondents were informed that their responses were a part of a research project, not to be used in the selection. As such, the effect of socially desirable responding was probably minimized. Taken as a whole, as it was difficult to interpret the result due to small differences, no definitive support for preferring the use of response scale was obtained.

In Study 3 the possibility of finding a stable, interpretable and replicable factor structure across response formats, with the common NPI items, was tested. Of the two versions of the NPI, Emmons' (1987) 37 item and Raskin and Terry's (1988) 40 item version, there was an overlap of only 31 items, meaning that 6 items are unique to Emmons' version, and 9 items are unique to Raskin and Terry's version. Consequently, this difference in item content may have meant that previous studies have extracted different factors, since they may not share the same variance with the other items. Moreover, the item loading criteria for factor inclusion has usually been low (i.e. $\geq .35$ or $.40$). As such, any difference in the items' variance might have resulted not only in a different number of factors, but also meant that the factors included different items.

The results from Study 3 suggested the extraction of a five-factor solution based mainly on theoretical interpretability and clarity. The factors were labeled exploitativeness, authority, exhibitionism, vanity, and superiority, which consisted of 23 items. These five factors were preferred over those of a two, three, and four factor solution, when their relative

model fit was tested with confirmatory analyses in a subsequent sample. This five-factor solution was preferred over other factor solutions in a third sample that used a Likert response scale. Across all three samples the five factors relationships with the five-factor model of normal personality were similar. The negative correlation between the total score of the 23 item NPI and agreeableness, and the positive correlations with extraversion were especially convergent with previous meta-analytic research (Saulsman & Page, 2004). Narcissists have also been dubbed “disagreeable extrovert[s]” (Paulhus, 2001, p. 228). Taken together, these results suggests that, irrespective of response format, the NPI is able to measure narcissism as a multidimensional trait consisting of factors relating to exploitativeness, authority, vanity, exhibitionism, and superiority.

Several similarities were noted between previously identified factors in the NPI and the present five factors. The most consistent similarities were for the authority factor. Many of the same items in this factor were also identified in the leadership/authority factor in Emmons (1987), the authority factor in Raskin & Terry (1988), the power factor in Kubarych et al. (2004), the leadership/authority factor in Corry et al. (2008), and the leadership/authority factor in Ackerman et al. (2011). Thus, items forming a factor relating to authority seem to appear consistently as a factor, irrespective of study, even if authority does not receive much attention in the DSM-IV-TR. This factor has also been related to adaptive and positive outcomes and not to pathological narcissism (Ackerman et al., 2011), and there has been debate about whether or not these items are one of the “core aspects of narcissism” (Rosenthal, Montoya, Ridings, Rieck, & Hooley, 2011, p. 412, see also Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010). Miller and Campbell (2011) have defended the authority items as part of an overall narcissism construct and argue that people who endorse these items also far more often endorse other items related to “entitlement, exhibitionism, exploitativeness, and superiority (p. 148). Secondly, fantasies of power and the need to be associated with high status are parts of two of the criteria for the NPD in the DSM-IV-TR. As such, an endorsement of authority items seems to tap at least a part of the narcissistic construct. However, neither the items nor the authority factor extracted in Study 3 are necessarily pathological in isolation.

There is less consistency for the other factors across studies, but items in the vanity factor replicate Raskin and Terry’s (1988) vanity factor, as did some of the items in Emmons (1987) self-absorption/self-admiration factor. The items in the exhibitionism factor were also consistent with the items in Raskin and Terry’s (1988) exhibitionism factor, but not in the other studies. Although the vanity and exhibitionism factor in the present study was found in Kubarych et al.’s (2004) exhibitionism factor, in Corry et al.’s (2008) exhibitionism/entitlement factor, and in Ackerman et al.’s (2011) grandiose exhibitionism factor, the exhibitionism items in Emmons (1987) did not load on the same factor as his vanity items. In Corry et al. (2008) the exhibitionism and vanity items loaded together with other items to form an exhibitionism/entitlement. Both vanity and exhibitionism may tap into a general feeling self-absorption, admiration and attention seeking. As such these two aspects may capture one of the central themes of the narcissistic personality. Since the correlations between vanity and exhibitionism were .29 in Study 1 and 2, and .45 Study 3, they are only moderately related and seem to measure different aspects of narcissism. It might be that these

two aspects were considered as one in some of the past studies, because few factors were extracted.

The exploitativeness factor, which was comprised of items that are related to exploitative and manipulative aspects, was consistent with Raskin and Terry's (1988) exploitativeness factor, but not to any of the factors in Emmons (1987), Kubarych et al. (2004), and only to one item in Ackerman et al.'s (2011) exploitativeness/entitlement factor. The exploitativeness factor in the present study seems to be related to having a belief that others could be used as tools to serve an own agenda, and may be considered as one of the more maladaptive and interpersonally damaging aspects of narcissism. It may also be that this factor also taps the narcissist's lack of empathy, as it assesses the degree that others can be used to fill own needs, and does not seem to recognize the feelings of others.

The superiority factor, which was the fifth factor extracted in Study 3, consisted of items which were related to what Raskin and Terry (1988) coined as having a "narcissistic ego inflation" (p. 889). Two of the three items in this factor was also found in Raskin and Terry's superiority factor. In addition, these two items were also found in Emmons (1987) self-absorption/self-admiration factor. In Kubarych (2004), all three superiority items were found in the special person factor, were not identified in any of the factors in Corry et al. (2008) or in Ackerman et al. (2011). Thus, this factor was one of the least consistent factors in relation to previous studies, but could nevertheless be important in assessing narcissism. Although this factor only consisted of three items, these items seem to capture a belief of superiority, a belief that one is better than others, and may resemble a form of grandiosity in regard to self-importance.

Taken as a whole, the extracted factors from Study 3 were most consistent with the factors obtained in Raskin and Terry (1988) and least with the factors identified by Corry et al. (2008). Naturally, the items and factors were more closely related to earlier factor studies that had identified a higher number of factors, although there were more similarities between Ackerman et al.'s (2011) three factor solution than Emmons' (1987) four factor solution. The reasons for the differences may be attributed to differences in the item pool. As earlier mentioned, Study 3 was based on 31 items and if the 40 item NPI had been used, another factor structure may have been identified.

Several researchers have questioned the validity of the NPI in its present form (e.g. Brown et al., 2009; Rosenthal et al., 2011; Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010). Part of the debate has revolved around issues such as whether NPI measures "pure" narcissism, or if the instrument is confounded with other personality traits, unconnected with narcissism. In this respect the relationship between NPI and psychological health has been discussed (i.e. well-being and lack of sadness and depression, Sedikides et al., 2004), whether or not NPI narcissism is confounded by self-esteem (e.g. Rosenthal & Hooley, 2010), or whether many of the NPI items do not differentiate between what is and what is not narcissistic (i.e. items relating to leadership discussed earlier e.g. Rosenthal et al., 2011), and been put forward as critique against the instrument. The NPI and the clinical description of NPD in the DSM-IV-TR has also been criticized for measuring grandiose aspects of narcissism and disregarding any vulnerable aspects such as "shameful reactivity or humiliation in response to narcissistic injury, alternating states of idealization and devaluation" (Cain et al., 2008, p. 648). Although

this dissertation as a whole, or Study 3 in particular, was not designed with the intention of resolving any of these issues, it might nevertheless have provided some clarification regarding the underlying structure of narcissism. Recent IRT analysis of the NPI suggested that since the total score has been associated with adaptive outcomes not relevant to the clinical manifestations of narcissism, a broader and more specific focus on NPI subscales would benefit the future study of the assessment of narcissism (Ackerman, Donnellan, & Robins, 2012). Developing these subscales further might be more important than trying to “fix the psychometrics” of the NPI scale.

In conclusion, the results of Study 3 demonstrated that it is possible to identify a stable and replicable factor structure based on the common items across samples and response formats. These factors also showed similar correlations with the five-factor model of normal personality. Even though factor analysis is a powerful tool in generating meaning of data, factor analysis does not provide finite answers or solutions. Factor analysis can never discover whether the factors are artifacts or if they represent substantive constructs (Spector, 2012), and is only a tool that guides and gives us information (Clark & Watson, 1995). It is theory that gives meaning to data. To quote Mulaik (1987) “inductive procedures do not automatically give us meanings. It is we that create meanings for things in deciding how they are to be used” (p. 301). In this respect, the results from Study 3, but also for other psychometrics studies, may not necessarily be considered definite. In many steps in both exploratory and even in confirmatory analyses, researchers are making subjective decisions that will have an impact on their final results.

Implications

The main focus of this dissertation was to increase our knowledge of how to avoid hiring one particular type of poor leader. These leaders can have devastating effects on the companies they lead and for those affected by their leadership. It was suggested that narcissists, because of their inherent need for admiration, power and status, are not only attracted to leadership positions, but that they will perform well in such settings where leadership emergence and leadership potential are some of the important criteria. As such, the results from this dissertation have, first and foremost, practical implications regarding selection.

In both Study 1 and Study 2, support for narcissism as positively related to interview ratings, and in particular, leadership potential ratings was found. In addition, both studies also showed that narcissism has a significant indirect effect, through interview ratings, on NCO admission. If narcissism can jeopardize structured selection processes through interview ratings, as these two studies suggest, are interviews a valid selection method for detecting unwanted candidates?

Although some empirical studies suggest a small to moderate link between personality assessment in interviews that are highly structured and designed to assess personality (Van Iddekinge et al., 2005), interviewers are perhaps not able to assess an applicant’s personality with a high degree of certainty (e.g. Roth et al., 2005). In interviews, and correctly as Hogan

(1994) proposes, the focus is rarely, if ever, on maladaptive personality traits. Although there has been little research into the relationship between narcissism and real life selection and since higher interview structure seems to minimize the effect of a candidate's tactics for impression (e.g. Barrick et al., 2009), the results from Study 1 and 2 could also suggest that in low or conventional non-structured interviews, narcissists could influence interview judgments even more than it did in Study 1 and Study 2 where the interviews were relatively structured. This is especially important since organizations do seem to favor unstructured interviews (van der Zee, Bakker, & Bakker, 2002). Although in Study 2 the interview structure was increased from that of Study 1, narcissism had almost the same effect on the interview ratings. Thus, the effect of narcissism on selection interviews also seems to be present when the structure of interviews increases. Additionally, in Study 2, the effect of narcissism was dependent on the types of question asked and the area of focus, where narcissism was only significantly related to leadership potential ratings. Therefore, a high focus on applicant leadership potential should be avoided in interviews conducted for leadership positions since the characteristics of narcissists often resemble our perceptions of a prototypical leader. In this respect, a higher focus on the applicant's past leadership experience, rated by and with opinions from those who have previously worked with or beneath them, are a better source of information.

In Study 1 and 2, it was also discovered that high narcissism could compensate for high extraversion when evaluating leader potential. This effect could have made narcissistic applicants more talkative, and as social skills are among the characteristics being rated in interviews (Huffcutt et al., 2001; Salgado & Moscoso, 2002), high narcissism can compensate for low extraversion and be perceived as leadership potential. This also stresses the need to be aware of those with high narcissistic tendencies.

In both Study 1 and in Study 2, the effect sizes can be considered small, and these studies could therefore be criticized for not providing conclusive results to suggest that narcissism is an issue of practical concern in leader selection. Two examples quoted in Rosenthal (1990) illustrate the fact that small effects may have large consequences. In the first of these, an ethical committee terminated a double blind study of the effects of aspirin on reducing heart attacks on the grounds that it was considered unethical to continue administering a placebo to those in the control group. Here the effect size was .0011 (r^2), but the number of people in the control group who did have a heart attack compared to the experimental group outweighed the traditional method of interpreting effects sizes. The second example was the breakthrough effect of finding that cyclosporine would decrease the probability that the body would reject an organ after a transplant. In this case the effect sizes were .036 for organ rejection and .022 (r^2) for patient survival, but the number of people who could benefit from this outweighed the alternative that the drug did not have an effect. Thus, small effects can have dramatic consequences.

In light of the above examples, narcissism seems to not only jeopardize leader selection, the effects of that on leadership can also be far reaching even if the effect sizes in Study 1 and Study 2 were small compared to the classical interpretation of effect sizes. If only a few with elevated scores are selected, the effects of their leadership can have dramatic consequences for the surrounding employees and coworkers, but also for the organization as a

whole. As well as this, the hypotheses in both Study 1 and Study 2 were based on a well-defined theory and the results are replicated in three samples. As such, the results indicated a small but robust and reoccurring finding in the present setting.

Even if selection personnel do control for dark personalities such as narcissism, the assessment also stresses the ethical aspects of selection. According to the Norwegian Data Protection Authority an employer can ask an applicant for a personality test, but they are not allowed to demand such testing. However, this might imply that the prospect of further advancement in the selection process or obtaining the job is reduced. The employer must also conform to the Norwegian Working Environment Act and cannot discriminate against applicants based on gender, pregnancy, sexual orientation, skin color, ethnicity, national origin, language, religion or belief, political views or membership of a trade union, disability or age. These topics are also covered under the Anti-Discrimination Act and the Gender Equality Act. (Full references and updated laws and regulation can be found at www.lovdata.no and www.datatilsynet.no). The assessment of aberrant personalities should not be affected by race, culture, national origin, language, or gender. It is therefore essential that knowledge of extreme personality among selection staff is high. One particular ethical issue, which may arise is when some of the candidates for a leadership position have dangerous elevations of, for example, narcissism. As such, selection procedures should not only focus on detecting and selecting people with aberrant personalities, they should also build a system for administering feedback based on justice, respect, and equality into their selection process. However, many of these issues are dependent on the current laws governing selection procedures in specific countries. Likewise, there are also limits as to how clinically oriented a job interview or a selection process could or even should be, both in terms of the cost of selection, but also with regards to how applicants perceive discussions of topics relating to their own personality, which may not have anything to do with the job, and whether they believe they are an intrusion.

Limitations and future directions

Although their main weaknesses and limitations are discussed in each of the three studies presented in this dissertation, there are also several overall limitations and future research directions that should be addressed and emphasized when considering the dissertation as a whole.

The first overall limitation of this dissertation concerns the samples in each of the three studies. Participants in all three studies were applicants for the annual NCO admission process in the Norwegian Armed Forces. Although the setting and participants could be considered as one of the strengths of Studies 1 and 2, due to consisting of people seeking leadership training and positions, it is also one of its limitations. All candidates were preselected on several important variables before entering the selection process. Among them were general intelligence, school grades, and physical fitness. In addition, the samples consisted of mainly young men. Thus, because of these sample-specific details, the results may not hold in other different settings, or in other cultures. Future research should therefore

focus on other cultures and in different settings. As such, narcissism could be attributed differently in collectivistic cultures where “me” may perhaps be of less importance for perceptions of leadership qualities than in more individualistic cultures. It is possible that the effects of narcissism could have been seen differently if the sample had consisted of older people who already had leadership experience, as the prevalence of narcissism declines with age (Pulay et al., 2011). If narcissism is really a cause of bad leadership, and these leaders are hired because of insensitive selection processes, more research is needed in other leadership selection settings, especially in civilian settings. An exciting area of future study could be the trajectory of the narcissistic leader from selection to leadership positions. From there, the long term effect of this leadership could be investigated, with a particular focus on the perceptions of subordinates since “followers are more likely to see and know the reality of the leader’s day to day approach to leadership” (Hollander, 1992, p. 51), and they always seem to “know who the bad managers are” (Hogan, 1994, p. 13). Evaluations from coworkers and supervisors are also important sources of information, in addition to objective effects of their leadership, such as performance measures. Another intriguing area of research is the process after people obtain positions of power and authority. Does their narcissism flourish as they obtain leadership experience, or is their narcissism suppressed? In addition, are there any moderators involved in this process, such as mentorships, feedback from others, and additional leadership training? Here, qualitative studies might shed more light into the process.

Secondly, the effect sizes in both Study 1 and Study 2 were small. However, the positive relationship between narcissism and interview ratings was supported by theory and the results were replicated in three samples. Nevertheless, there is a possibility that the selection processes in the current studies actually have done a reasonable job, and that the effects of narcissism could be higher in leadership selection settings where the interviews are less structured. The current selection processes were highly structured, and the selection personnel were trained prior to the conducting the interviews. As discussed earlier, less structured interviews might be more susceptible to narcissistic self-enhancement and impression making, than more structured interviews. Future research should investigate the effect of narcissism in interviews with different degrees of structure. Such studies could be experimental mock interviews where not only the structure of the interviews could be manipulated by researchers, but also tests of different types of interviews (i.e. interviews with situational questions, past behavior questions, background questions, and job knowledge questions).

Thirdly, since the design of the studies was cross-sectional, some biases associated with common method variance could have affected the results. However, only the personality questionnaires were self-reported and all the other variables were either perceptions from other ratings of the applicants or more distant variable sources such as the admission criteria. Nevertheless, Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff (2003) list several potential sources that can bias research results. Of these, two sources of this bias, item characteristic and survey context, are of particular interest to the present discussion. Firstly, item characteristic deals with how the items are presented to respondents. The NPI may contain items that have created an artificial total score for narcissism since the applicants may have responded in a socially desirable way. In addition, the instructions to the respondent varied across Sample One and

Two in Study 1. In Sample One, the participants were told that their responses were not being used in selection, whereas participants in Sample Two were given instructions that explicitly stated that their responses were going to be used in the selection, so as to create as realistic a selection setting as possible. As the results from the two samples were almost identical (narcissism even had a slightly stronger effect on admission in Sample Two), the responses do not seem to have been distorted. In addition, narcissistic individuals do not seem to restrain their responses on the NPI (e.g. Emmons, 1984). In respect to the item characteristic, the rating format or the scale anchors of the personality questionnaires, in particular for the NPI, might bias the results according to Podsakoff et al. (2003). Originally, and used frequently, the NPI asks respondents to endorse either a statement with narcissistic content or one without. In the studies here, only the narcissistic statements were presented to the participants and they were asked to either agree or disagree to the statement. As such, the NPI in the studies had no reverse scored items. Although this way of scoring the NPI has been used in previous research (Judge et al., 2006), no reverse scoring and providing only yes or no alternatives can nevertheless lead to a response set of acquiescence, where some people tend to answer more statements with yes than no (Cooper, 2002). Because of this tendency, we cannot be sure if there has been a distortion of the responses on the NPI, leading to artificially high numbers of high scorers. This influence may also be have affected the use of Likert scales where respondent scoring could also be affected by background culture (e.g. Steiner, 2012). Thus, a problem with all responses is that they may be affected by the culture in which the assessment occurs. As was the case for the generalization issue above, more emphasis on cross-cultural assessment of narcissism is needed.

The second bias, survey context, deals with the context in which the research is conducted and can also affect the results. The present studies were conducted in an arena where the applicants first and foremost are evaluated on their potential for leadership, and the results may have been shaped accordingly. Some of the items in the NPI reflect superiority and leadership, and endorsing such items during leadership selection may not indicate narcissism. As such, there is a possibility that the positive correlation between narcissism and interview ratings, and between narcissism and NCO admission, may be the result of endorsement of these items. In addition, since the authority factor of the NPI seems to be the only replicable and stable NPI factor extracted across all psychometric studies of the NPI, has been questioned for being a part of narcissism (e.g. Rosenthal et al., 2011) and may be interpreted as an outcome of narcissistic processes (Ackerman et al., 2011), further research could isolate this and other factors of the NPI to predict both outcomes related to adaptive and maladaptive functioning.

Fourthly, selection of only the 31 NPI items in the exploratory factor analysis in Study 3 might have been too arbitrary and not representative of an overall representation of narcissism. Although the rationale for these 31 items was that they were common between the two NPI versions and should therefore have considerable face validity, they may nevertheless not have been representative, or been too few to extract a meaningful factor solution. Instead, the analysis could have been improved had it been based on a combination of the 37 item and the 40 item version. Thus, the factors extracted in Study 3 may have uncovered an imprecise factor solution, even if they were replicated and validated against the five-factor model of

personality. In its present form, the 23 item five factor NPI needs additional items not only from the existing pool, but could also benefit from new items that perhaps more clearly assess other aspects of narcissism. This is important not only for the psychometric properties of the NPI, but also for the validity of the NPI, should it be a valid instrument measuring a narcissistic construct, as is described in the clinical literature. Raskin and Terry (1988) did not see their study as final. They concluded by asking that further studies include a larger pool of items in analysis which “will sample more exhaustively the domain of narcissistic behavior and sentiments” (p. 900). Accounts of expert ratings of prototypical narcissists and their personality descriptions (Samuel & Widiger, 2004) and a newly developed five-factor narcissism inventory (Miller, Gentile, & Campbell, 2013) could be an especially important source in this regard. Using expert ratings of prototypical narcissism is also important since there is disagreement as to whether NPI narcissism can be generalized to clinical populations or is even able to assess subclinical narcissism (Cain et al., 2008). Other models of narcissism, such as the distinction between a vulnerable and grandiose narcissism (e.g. Miller et al., 2011), may also be beneficial for developing the measure, in respect the implementation of these types for the NPD in the DSM-5 (www.dsm5.org).

Finally, it should be acknowledged that Study 3 uses NPI responses and demographic variables from the participants in Study 1 and Study 2. Even so, Study 3 did not use the same total score as the other two studies. Study 3 also had a different theoretical perspective and made unique contributions with different theoretical and practical implications.

Conclusion

Since narcissism could be one of several causes of dangerous leadership, and narcissists may also jeopardize leadership selection by appearing leader-like, there seem to be obvious reasons to avoid narcissistic job candidates. In three samples, replicated support was obtained that those scoring high on narcissism were rewarded with higher interview ratings, and thereby had a higher probability of admission. These results stress the need to be aware that normal selection methods can be insensitive to detecting individual applicants’ aberrant personalities. Through knowledge of such influences, selection personnel should be particularly aware of this effect, especially since high narcissism can also be perceived as extraversion in selection interviews. Taken together, there seems to be increasing empirical evidence to suggest that selection procedures should consider including measures to control for aberrant personalities since most selection processes try only to identify good individual characteristics, not bad ones. Thus, there is reason to suggest that people are only selected as a result of their bright characteristics. Taken as a whole, there is a real danger that normal selection processes does not seem to detect narcissistic candidates, but rather credit them.

References

- Achilles, P. S., & Achilles, E. M. (1917). Estimates of the military value of certain character qualities. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 1*, 305–316.
- Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the narcissistic personality inventory really measure? *Assessment, 18*, 67–87.
- Ackerman, R. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Robins, R. W. (2012). An item response theory analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 94*, 141–155.
- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. (4th ed., text revision). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- 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.
- Back, M. D., Schmulke, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism–popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*, 132–145.
- Barelds, D. P. & Dijkstra, P. (2010). Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Structure of the adapted Dutch version. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 51*, 132–138.
- Barrick, M. R., Mount, M. K., & Judge, T. A. (2001). Personality and performance at the beginning of the new millennium: What do we know and where do we go next? *Personality and Performance, 9*, 9–30.
- Barrick, M. R., Shaffer, J. A., & DeGrassi, S. W. (2009). What you see may not be what you get: Relationships among self-presentation tactics and ratings of interview and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 95*, 1394–1411.
- Barrick, M. R., Dustin, S. L., Giluk, T. L., Stewart, G. L., Shaffer, J. A., & Swider, B. W. (2012). Candidate characteristics driving initial impressions during rapport building: Implications for employment interview validity. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 85*, 330–352.
- Bass, B. M. (2008). *The Bass handbook of leadership: Theory, research, & managerial applications*. With Ruth Bass (4th ed.). New York: Free Press.
- Bono, J. E., & Judge, T. A. (2004). Personality and transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 901–910.
- Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 35*, 951–964.
- 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 and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1663–1676.
- Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychological Review, 28*, 638–656.
- Campbell, K. W., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 340–354.

- Campbell, K. W., Goodie, A. S., & Foster, J. D. (2004). Narcissism, confidence, and risk attitude. *Journal of Behavioral Decision Making*, *17*, 297–311.
- Campion, M. A., Palmer, D. K., & Campion, J. E. (1997). A review of structure in the selection interview. *Personnel Psychology*, *50*, 655–702.
- Chamorro-Premuzic, T., & Furnham, A. (2010). *The psychology of personnel selection*. Edinburgh: Cambridge University Press.
- 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.
- Christiansen, N. D., Wolcott-Burnam, S., Jancovics, J. E., Burns, G. N., & Quirk, S. W. (2005). The good judge revisited: Individual differences in the accuracy of personality judgments. *Human Performance*, *18*, 123–149.
- Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment*, *7*, 309–319.
- Cooper, A. M. (1986). Narcissism. In A. P. Morrison (Ed.), *Essential papers on narcissism*. (pp. 112–143). New York: New York University Press.
- Cooper, C. (2002). *Individual differences*. 2nd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Corbitt, E. M. (2005). Narcissism from the perspective of the five-factor model. In Costa, P. T. Jr., & Widiger T. A. (Eds.). *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality*. (2nd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Corry, N., Merritt, R. D., Mrug, S., & Pamp, B. (2008). The factor structure of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *90*, 593–600.
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). *Revised NEO personality inventory: Professional manual*. Odessa, Fl.: Psychological Assessment Resources.
- Cronbach, L. J., Meehl, P. E. (1955). Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychological Bulletin*, *52*, 281–302.
- Dawis, R V. (1987). Scale construction. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, *34*, 481–489.
- De Fruyt, F., De Clerque, B. J., Miller, J., Rolland, J. P., Jung, S. C., Taris, R., ... Van Hiel, A. (2009). Assessing personality at risk in personnel selection and development. *European Journal of Personality*, *23*, 51–69.
- De Fruyt, F., Wille, B., & Furnham, A. (2013). Assessing aberrant personalities in managerial coaching: Measurement issues and prevalence rates across employment sector. *European Journal of Personality*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1002/per.1911
- de Zavala, A. G., Cichocka, A., Eidelson, R., & Jayawickreme, N. (2009). Collective narcissism and its social consequences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *97*, 1074–1096.
- DeFruyt, F., Wille, B., & Furnham, A. (2013). Assessing aberrant personality in managerial coaching: Measurement issues and prevalence across employment sectors. *European of Personality*, Advance online publication. doi: 10.1002/per.1911

- del Rosario, P. M., & White, R. M. (2005). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Test-retest stability and internal consistency. *Personality and Individual Differences, 39*, 1075–1081.
- Deluga, R. J. (1997). Relationship among American presidential charismatic leadership, narcissism, and rated performance. *The Leadership Quarterly, 8*, 49–65.
- Dipboye, R. L., Macan, T., & Shahani-Denning, C. (2012). The selection interview from the interviewer and applicant perspectives: Can't have one without the other. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 323–352). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Dvir, T., Eden, D., Avolio, B. J., & Shamir, B. (2002). Impact of transformational leadership on follower development and performance: A field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal, 45*, 735–744.
- Egan, V., & McCorkindale, C. (2007). Narcissism, vanity, personality and mating effort. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 2105–2115.
- Einarsen, S., Schanke, M. S., & Skogstad, A. (2007). Destructive leadership behaviour: A definition and conceptual model. *Leadership Quarterly, 18*, 207–216.
- Ellis, H. (1898). Auto-eroticism: A psychological study. *Alienist and Neurologist, 19*, 260–299.
- Ellis, H. (1927). The conception of narcissism. *The Psychoanalytic Review, 14*, 129–153.
- Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*, 291–300.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 11–17.
- Ensari, N., Riggio, R. E., Christian, J., & Carlsaw, G. (2011). Who emerges as a leader? Meta-analyses of individual differences as predictors of leadership emergence. *Leadership Quarterly, 51*, 532–536.
- Floyd, F. J., & Widaman, K. F. (1995). Factor analysis in the development and refinement of clinical assessment instruments. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 286–299.
- Foster, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2007). Are there such things as “narcissists” in social psychology? A taxometric analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Personality and Individual Differences, 43*, 1321–1332.
- Freud, S. (1957). On narcissism: An introduction. In J. Strachey (Ed. and Trans.), *The standard edition of the complete psychological works of Sigmund Freud* (Vol. 14, pp. 73–102). London, England: Hogarth Press. (Original work published 1914).
- Furnham, A. (2008). *Personality and intelligence at work: Exploring and expanding individual differences at work*. London: Routledge.
- Furnham, A. (2010). *The elephant in the boardroom. The causes of leadership derailment*. London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Gentile, B., Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). A test of two brief measures of grandiose narcissism: The Narcissistic Personality Inventory–13 and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory–16. *Psychological Assessment*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/a0033192

- Gerstner, C. R., & Day, D. V. (1997). Meta-analytic review of leader-member exchange theory: Correlates and construct issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82*, 827–844.
- Glad, B. (2002). Why tyrants go too far: Malignant narcissism and absolute power. *Political Psychology, 23*, 1–37.
- Guildford, J. P. (1946). New standards for test evaluation. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 6*, 427–438.
- Gunderson, J. G., Ronningstam, E., & Bodkin, A. (1990). The diagnostic interview for narcissistic patients. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 47*, 676–680.
- Harder, D. W. (1979). The assessment of ambitious-narcissistic character style with three projective tests: The early memories, TAT, and Rorschach. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 43*, 23–32.
- Haynes, S. N., Richard, D. C. S., & Kubany, E. S. (1995). Content validity in psychological assessment: A functional approach to concepts and methods. *Psychological Assessment, 7*, 238–247.
- Hogan, R. (1994). Trouble at the top: Causes and consequences of managerial incompetence. *Consulting Psychology Journal, 46*, 9–15.
- Hogan, R. (2007). *Personality and the fate of organizations*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hogan, R., Raskin, R., & Fazzini, D. (1990). The dark side of charisma. In K. E. Clark & M. B. Clark (Eds.), *Measures of Leadership* (pp. 343–354). West Orange, NJ: Leadership Library of America.
- Hogan, R., & Hogan, J. (2001). Assessing leadership: A view from the dark side. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 9*, 40–51.
- Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2005). What we know about leadership. *Review of General Psychology, 9*, 169–180.
- Hogan, J., Hogan, R., & Kaiser, R. B. (2011). Management derailment. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), *APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 3, pp. 555–575). Washington DC: American Psychological Association.
- Hollander, E. P. (1992). Leadership, followership, self, and others. *The Leadership Quarterly, 3*, 43–54.
- Horton, R. S., & Bleau, G., & Drwecki, B. (2006). Parenting narcissus: What are the link between parenting and narcissism? *Journal of Personality, 74*, 345–376.
- Hough, L. M., & Oswald, F. L. (2000). Personnel selection: Looking toward the future – remembering the past. *Annual Review of Psychology, 51*, 631–664.
- Huffcutt, A. I., Conway, J. M., Roth, P. L., & Stone, N. J. (2001). Identification and meta-analytic assessment of psychological constructs measured in employment interviews. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 86*, 897–913.
- 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.
- Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test of their predictive validity. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 755–768.

- Judge, T. A., Piccolo, R. F., & Ilies, R. (2004). The forgotten ones? The validity of consideration and initiating structure in leadership research. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 89*, 36–51.
- 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.
- 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.
- Kaiser, R. B., Hogan, R., & Craig, S. B. (2008). Leadership and the fate of organizations. *American Psychologist, 63*, 96–110.
- Kansi, J. (2003). The narcissistic personality inventory: Applicability in a Swedish population sample. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 44*, 441–448.
- Kellett, J. B., Humphrey, R. H., & Sleeth, R. G. (2002). Empathy and complex task performance: Two routes to leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*, 523–544.
- 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.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1979). Regression in organizational leadership. *Psychiatry, 42*, 24–39.
- Kets de Vries, M. F. R., & Miller, D. (1997). Narcissism and leadership: An object relations perspective. In R. P. Vecchio (Ed.), *Leadership: Understanding the dynamics of power and influence in organizations* (pp. 194–214). Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Kernberg, O. F. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Kimhi, S. (2001). Benjamin Netanyahu: A psychological profile using behavior analysis. In O. Feldman & L. O. Valenty (Eds.), *Profiling political leaders: Cross-cultural studies of personality and behavior* (pp. 149–164). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self: A systematic approach to the psychoanalytic treatment of narcissistic personality disorders*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Krajewski, H. T., Goffin, R. D., McCarthy, J. M., Rothstein, M. G., & Johnston, N. (2006). Comparing the validity of structured interviews for managerial-level employees: Should we look to the past or focus on the future? *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79*, 411–432.
- Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 857–872.
- Kubinger, K. D. (2003). On artificial results due to using factor analysis for dichotomous variables. *Psychological Science, 45*, 106–110.
- Levashina, J., & Campion, M. A. (2007). Measuring faking in the employment interview: Development and validation of an interview faking behavior scale. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 1638–1656.

- Lieberson, S., & O'Connor, J. F. (1972). Leadership and organizational performance: A study of large corporations. *American Sociological Review*, *37*, 117–130.
- Likert, R. (1932). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology*, *22*, 3–55.
- Lodato, M. A., Highhouse, S., & Brooks, M. E. (2010). Predicting professional preferences for intuition-based hiring. *Journal of Management Psychology*, *26*, 352–365.
- Lubit, R. (2002). The long-term organizational impact of destructively narcissistic managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*, 127–138.
- Macan, T. (2009). The employment interview: A review of current studies and directions for future research. *Human Resource Management Review*, *19*, 203–218.
- Maccoby, M. (2000, January–February). Narcissistic leaders: the incredible pros, the inevitable cons. *Harvard Business Review*, *78*, 69–77.
- Maccoby, M. (2003). *Narcissistic leaders, who succeeds and who fails*. New York: Broadway Books.
- McDaniel, M. A., Whetzel, D. L., Schmidt, F. L., & Maurer, S. D. (1994). The validity of employment interviews: A comprehensive review and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *79*, 599–616.
- Messick, S. (1995). Validity of psychological assessment. Validation of inferences from persons' responses and performance as scientific inquiry into score meaning. *American Psychologist*, *50*, 741–749.
- Meyers, L. S., Gamst, G., & Guarino, A. J. (2006). *Applied multivariate research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, *76*, 449–476.
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Addressing the criticism 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: Wiley.
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., Rolland, J. P., De Fruyt, F., Reynolds, S. K., Pham-Scottet, A., ... Bagby, R. M. (2008). Scoring the DSM-IV personality disorders using the five-factor model: Development and validation of normative scores for north American, French, and Dutch-Flemish samples. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *22*, 433–450.
- Miller, J. D., Gaughan, E. T., Pryor, L. R., Kamen, C., & Campbell, W. K. (2009). Is research using the narcissistic personality inventory relevant for understanding narcissistic personality disorder? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 482–488.
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, *79*, 1013–1042.
- Miller, J. D., Gentile, B., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). A test of the construct validity of the five-factor narcissism inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *95*, 377–387.
- Moscoseo, S., & Salgado, J. F. (2004). “Darks side” personality styles as predictors of task, contextual, and job performance. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *12*, 356–362.

- Mulaik, S. A. (1987). A brief history of the philosophical foundations of exploratory factor analysis. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 22, 267–305.
- Muthén, B. O. (1989). Dichotomous factor analysis of symptom data. *Sociological Methods & Research*, 18, 19–65.
- Nevicka, B., De Hoogh, A. H. B., Van Vianen, A. E. M., Beersma, B., & McIlwain, D. (2011a). All I need is a stage to shine: Narcissists' leader emergence and performance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 22, 910–925.
- Nevicka, B., Ten Velden, F. S., De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Van Vianen, A. E. M. (2011b). Reality at odds with perceptions: Narcissistic leaders and group performance. *Psychological Science*, 22, 1259–1264.
- Northouse, Peter G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. (3rd ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory*. (3rd ed.). New York: McGraw Hill.
- Oltmanns, T. F., Friedman, J. N. W., Fiedler, E. R., & Turkheimer, E. (2004). Perceptions of people with personality disorders based on thin slices of behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38, 216–229.
- Osborne, S. M., Feild, H. S., & Veres, J. G. (1998). Introversion-extraversion. Self-monitoring, and applicant performance in a situational interview: A field study. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 13, 143–156.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1998). Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74, 1197–1208.
- Paulhus, D. L. (2001). Normal narcissism: Two minimalist accounts. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 228–230.
- Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of Personality*, 66, 1025–1060.
- Paulhus, D. L., Harms, P. D., Bruce, N. M., & Lysy, D. C. (2003). The over-claiming technique: Measuring self-enhancement independent of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 890–904.
- 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.
- Paunonen, S. V., Lönnquist, J., Verkasalo, M., Leikas, S., & Nissinen, V. (2006). Narcissism and the emergent leadership in military cadets. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17, 475–486.
- Pantern, A. T., Swygert, K. A., Dahlstrom, W. G., & Tanaka, J. S. (1997). Factor analytic approaches to personality item-level data. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68, 561–589.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Schmelkin, L. P. (1991). *Measurement, design, and analysis*. New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory, *Psychological Assessment, 21*, 365–379.
- 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.
- Post, J. M. (1986). Narcissism and the charismatic leader-follower relationship. *Political Psychology, 7*, 675–688.
- Post, J. M. (1993). Current concepts of the narcissistic personality: Implications for political psychology. *Political Psychology, 14*, 99–121.
- Posthuma, R. A., Morgeson, F. P., & Campion, M. A. (2002). Beyond employment interview validity: A comprehensive narrative review of recent research and trends over time. *Personnel Psychology, 55*, 1–81.
- Publius Ovidius Naso. *Methamorphoses*. (Ed. Sir Samuel Garth). Retrieved from <http://classics.mit.edu/Ovid/metam.3.third.html>.
- Pulay, A. J., Goldstein, R. B., & Grant, B. F. (2011). Sociodemographic correlates of DSM-IV narcissistic personality disorder. Results from the wave 2 national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions (NESARC). In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 167–180). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 590.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The narcissistic personality inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 159–162.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890–902.
- Raskin, R., & Novacek, J. (1989). An MMPI description of the narcissistic personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 53*, 66–80.
- Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 911–918.
- Rathvon, N., & Holmstrom, R. W. (1996). An MMPI-2 portrait of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*, 1–19.
- Reynolds, S. K., & Clark, L. A. (2001). Predicting dimension of personality disorder from domains and facets of the Five-Factor model. *Journal of Personality, 69*, 199–222.
- Robins, R. W., & Paulhus, D. L. (2001). The character of self-enhancers. In B. W. Roberts & R. Hogan (Eds.), *Personality psychology in the workplace* (pp. 193–219). Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Robins, R. W., Tracy, J. L., & Shaver, P. R. (2001). Shamed into self-love: Dynamics, roots, and functions of narcissism. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 230–236.

- Rosenthal, R. (1990). How are we doing in soft psychology? *American Psychologist*, *45*, 775–777.
- Rosenthal, S. A. (2006). Narcissism and leadership: A review and a research agenda. *Center for Public Leadership Working Paper Series, 06–04*, Harvard University: Center for Public Leadership. Retrieved from <http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/55948>
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Pittinsky, T. L. (2006). Narcissistic leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *17*, 617–633.
- Rosenthal, S. A., & Hooley, J. M. (2010). Narcissism assessment in social-personality research: Does the association between narcissism and psychological health result from a confound with self-esteem? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*, 453–465.
- Rosenthal, S. A., Montoya, M. R., Ridings, L. E., Rieck, S. M., & Hooley, J. M. (2011). Further evidence of the narcissistic personality inventory's validity problems: A meta-analytic investigation—Response to Miller, Maples, and Campbell. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*, 408–416.
- Roth, P. L., Van Iddekinge, C. H., Huffcutt, A. I., Eidson, C. E. Jr., & Schmit, M. J. (2005). Personality saturation in structured interviews. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, *13*, 261–273.
- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Yerly, E. (2011). The uniqueness effect in selection interviews. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, *10*, 43–47.
- Ryan, A. M., McFarland, L., Baron, H., & Page, R. (1999). An international look at selection practices: Nation and culture as explanations for variability in practice. *Personnel Psychology*, *52*, 359–391.
- Rynes, S. L., Giluk, T. L., & Brown, K. G. (2007). The very separate worlds of academic and practitioner periodicals in human resource management: Implications for evidence-based management. *Academy of Management Journal*, *50*, 987–1008.
- Salgado, J. F., & Moscoso, S. (2002). Comprehensive meta-analysis of the construct validity of the employment interview. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *11*, 299–324.
- Salgado, J. F., Anderson, N., Moscoso, S., Bertua, C., De Fruyt, F., & Rolland, J. P. (2003). A meta-analytic study of general mental ability validity for different occupations in the European Union. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *88*, 1068–1081.
- Samuel, D. B., & Widiger, T. A. (2004). Clinicians' personality descriptions of prototypic personality disorders. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *18*, 286–308.
- Saulsman, L. M., & Page, A. C. (2004). The five-factor model and personality disorder empirical literature: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *23*, 1055–1085.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. E. (1998). The validity and utility of selection methods in personnel psychology: Practical and theoretical implications of 85 years of research findings. *Psychological Bulletin*, *124*, 262–274.
- Schmidt, F. L., & Hunter, J. (2004). General mental ability in the world of work: Occupational attainment and job performance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 162–173.

- Sedikides, C., Rudich, E. A., Gregg, A. P., Kumashiro, M., & Rusbult, C. (2004). Are normal narcissists psychologically healthy? Self-esteem matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *87*, 400–416.
- Sheng, M. M. (2001). Mao Zedong's narcissistic personality disorder and China's road to disaster. In O. Feldman & L. O. Valenty (Eds.), *Profiling political leaders: Cross-cultural studies of personality and behavior*. (pp. 111–127). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Skogstad, A., & Einarsen, S. (2009). Destruktivt lederskap – Handler det om de få ondskapsfulle tyrannene eller om destruktive handlinger alle ledere sporadisk viser? [Destructive leadership – Is it about a few vicious tyrants or destructive acts all leaders occasionally shows?] In P. Ø. Saksvik & K. Nytrø (Eds.), *Klinisk organisasjonspsykologi (Clinical organizational psychology)*. (pp. 218–247). Cappelen Akademisk Forlag.
- Spector, P. E. (2012). Self-reports for employee selection. In E. Scmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 443–461). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Sperry, L. (2003). *Handbook of diagnosis and treatment of DSM-IV-TR personality disorders* (2nd ed.). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Steger, M. F. (2006). An illustration of issues in factor extraction and identification of dimensionality in psychological assessment data. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *86*, 263–272.
- Steiner, D. D. (2012). Personnel selection across the globe. In N. Schmitt (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of personnel assessment and selection* (pp. 740–767). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stöber, J., Dette, D. E., & Musch, J. (2002) Comparing continuous and dichotomous scoring of the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *78*, 370–389.
- Svindseth, M. F., Sørebo, Ø., Nøttestad, J. A., Roaldset, J. O., Wallin, J., & Dahl, A. A. (2009). Psychometric examination and normative data for the narcissistic personality inventory 29 item version. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *50*, 151–159.
- Thomas, A. B. (1988). Does leadership make a difference to organizational performance? *Administrative Science Quarterly*, *33*, 388–400.
- Thornton, G. C., Hollenbeck, G. P., & Johnson, S. K. (2010). Selecting leaders: Executives and high potentials. In J. L. Farr & Tippins, N. T. (Eds.), *Handbook of employee selection*. (pp. 823–843). NY: Routledge.
- Torgersen, S., Kringlen, E., & Cramer, V. (2001). The prevalence of personality disorders in a community sample. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, *58*, 590–596.
- van der Zee, K. I., Bakker, A. B., & Bakker, P. (2002). Why are structured interviews so rarely used in personnel selection? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *87*, 176–184.
- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., Edison, C. E. Jr., & Attenweiler, W. J. (2004). What do structured selection interviews really measure? The construct validity of behavior description interviews. *Human Performance*, *17*, 71–93.

- Van Iddekinge, C. H., Raymark, P. H., & Roth, P. L. (2005). Assessing personality with a structured employment interview: Construct-related validity and susceptibility to response inflation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*, 536–552.
- Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 154–165.
- Vazire, S., Nauman, 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.
- Wallace, H. M. (2011). Narcissistic self-enhancement. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 309–318). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 818–834.
- 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.
- Widiger, T. A., & Trull, T. J. (2007). Plate tectonics in the classification of personality disorder. *American Psychologist, 62*, 71–83.
- Wiesner, W. H., & Cronshaw, S. F. (1988). A meta-analytic investigation of the impact of interview format and the degree of structure on the validity of the employment interview. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 61*, 275–290.
- Wink, P., & Gough, G. H. (1990). New narcissism scales for the California Psychological Inventory and MMPI. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 54*, 446–461.
- Yukl, G. (2005). *Leadership in organizations* (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Series of Dissertations

The Dissertations may be ordered from our website www.bi.no
(Research – Research Publications – Series of Dissertations)

2014

- 4/2014 *Christian Enger Gimsø*
Narcissus and Leadership Potential - The measurement and implications of narcissism in leadership selection processes
- 3/2014 *Mehrad Moeini-Jazani*
When Power Has Its Pants Down: Social Power Increases Sensitivity to Internal Desires
- 2/2014 *Yuriy Zhovtobryukh*
The role of technology, ownership and origin in M&A performance
- 1/2014 *Siv Staubo*
Regulation and Corporate Board Composition

2013

- 9/2013 *Bjørn Tallak Bakken*
Intuition and analysis in decision making: On the relationships between cognitive style, cognitive processing, decision behaviour, and task performance in a simulated crisis management context
- 8/2013 *Karl Joachim Breunig*
Realizing Reticulation: A Comparative Study of Capability Dynamics in two International Professional Service Firms over 10 years
- 7/2013 *Junhua Zhong*
Three Essays on Empirical Asset Pricing
- 6/2013 *Ren Lu*
Cluster Networks and Cluster Innovations: An Empirical Study of Norwegian Centres of Expertise
- 5/2013 *Therese Dille*
Inter-institutional projects in time: a conceptual framework and empirical investigation
- 4/2013 *Thai Binh Phan*
Network Service Innovations: Users' Benefits from Improving Network Structure
- 3/2013 *Terje Gaustad*
Creating the Image: A Transaction Cost Analysis of Joint Value Creation in the Motion Picture Industry
- 2/2013 *Anna Swärd*
Trust processes in fixed-duration alliances: A multi-level, multi-dimensional, and temporal view on trust
- 1/2013 *Sut I Wong Humborstad*
Congruence in empowerment expectations: On subordinates' responses to disconfirmed experiences and to leaders' unawareness of their empowerment expectations

2012

- 9/2012 *Robert Buch*
Interdependent Social Exchange Relationships: Exploring the socially embedded nature of social exchange relationships in organizations
- 8/2012 *Ali Faraji-Rad*
When the message feels right: Investigating how source similarity enhances message persuasiveness
- 7/2012 *Marit Anti*
Commercial friendship from a customer perspective: Exploring social norm of altruism in consumer relationships and self-interest-seeking behavior
- 6/2012 *Birgit Helene Jevnaker*
Vestiges of Design-Creation: An inquiry into the advent of designer and enterprise relations
- 5/2012 *Erik Aadland*
Status decoupling and signaling boundaries: Rival market category emergence in the Norwegian advertising field, 2000-2010
- 4/2012 *Ulaş Burkay*
The Rise of Mediating Firms: The Adoption of Digital Mediating Technologies and the Consequent Re-organization of Industries
- 3/2012 *Tale Skjølsvik*
Beyond the 'trusted advisor': The impact of client-professional relationships on the client's selection of professional service firms
- 2/2012 *Karoline Hofslett Kopperud*
Well-Being at Work: On concepts, measurement, and leadership influence
- 1/2012 *Christina G. L. Nerstad*
In Pursuit of Success at Work: An Empirical Examination of the Perceived Motivational Climate, Its Outcomes and Antecedents

2011

- 12/2011 *Kjell Jørgensen*
Three Articles on Market Microstructure at the Oslo Stock Exchange (OSE)
- 11/2011 *Siri Valseth*
Essays on the information content in bond market order flow
- 10/2011 *Elisabet Sørfjorddal Hauge*
How do metal musicians become entrepreneurial? A phenomenological investigation on opportunity recognition
- 9/2011 *Sturla Lyngnes Fjesme*
Initial Public Offering Allocations
- 8/2011 *Gard Paulsen*
Betwixt and between: Software in telecommunications and the programming language Chill, 1974-1999
- 7/2011 *Morten G. Josefsen*
Three essays on corporate control

- 6/2011 *Christopher Wales*
Demands, designs and decisions about evaluation: On the evaluation of postgraduate programmes for school leadership development in Norway and England
- 5/2011 *Limei Che*
Investors' performance and trading behavior on the Norwegian stock market
- 4/2011 *Caroline D Ditlev-Simonsen*
Five Perspectives on Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR): Aan empirical analysis
- 3/2011 *Atle Raa*
Fra instrumentell rasjonalitet til tvetydighet: En analyse av utviklingen av Statskonsults tilnærming til standarden Mål- og resultatstyring (MRS) 1987-2004
- 2/2011 *Anne Louise Koefoed*
Hydrogen in the making - how an energy company organises under uncertainty
- 1/2011 *Lars Erling Olsen*
Broad vs. Narrow Brand Strategies: The Effects of Association Accessibility on Brand Performance

2010

- 8/2010 *Anne Berit Swanberg*
Learning with Style: The relationships among approaches to learning, personality, group climate and academic performance
- 7/2010 *Asle Fagerstrøm*
Implications of motivating operations for understanding the point-of-online-purchase: Using functional analysis to predict and control consumer purchasing behavior
- 6/2010 *Carl J. Hatteland*
Ports as Actors in Industrial Networks
- 5/2010 *Radu-Mihai Dimitriu*
Extending where? How consumers' perception of the extension category affects brand extension evaluation
- 4/2010 *Svanhild E. Haugnes*
Consumers in Industrial Networks: a study of the Norwegian-Portuguese bacalhau network
- 3/2010 *Stine Ludvigsen*
State Ownership and Corporate Governance: Empirical Evidence from Norway and Sweden
- 2/2010 *Anders Dysvik*
An inside story – is self-determination the key? Intrinsic motivation as mediator and moderator between work and individual motivational sources and employee outcomes. Four essays
- 1/2010 *Etty Ragnhild Nilsen*
Opportunities for learning and knowledge creation in practice

2009

- 8/2009 *Erna Senkina Engebretsen*
Transportation Mode Selection in Supply Chain Planning

- 7/2009 *Stein Bjørnstad*
Shipshaped: Kongsberg industry and innovations in deepwater technology, 1975-2007
- 6/2009 *Thomas Hoholm*
The Contrary Forces of Innovation: An Ethnography of Innovation Processes *in the Food Industry*.
- 5/2009 *Christian Heyerdahl-Larsen*
Asset Pricing with Multiple Assets and Goods
- 4/2009 *Leif-Magnus Jensen*
The Role of Intermediaries in Evolving Distribution Contexts: A Study of Car Distribution
- 3/2009 *Andreas Brække*
A Bumper!? An Empirical Investigation of the Relationship between the Economy and the Environment
- 2/2009 *Monica Skjold Johansen*
Mellom profesjon og reform: Om fremveksten og implementeringen av enhetlig ledelse i norsk sykehusvesen
- 1/2009 *Mona Kristin Solvoll*
Televised sport: Exploring the structuration of producing change and stability in a public service institution

2008

- 7/2008 *Helene Loe Colman*
Organizational Identity and Value Creation in Post-Acquisition Integration: The Spiralling Interaction of the Target's Contributive and the Acquirer's Absorptive Capacities
- 6/2008 *Fahad Awaleh*
Interacting Strategically within Dyadic Business Relationships: A case study from the Norwegian Electronics Industry
- 5/2008 *Dijana Tiplić*
Managing Organizational Change during Institutional Upheaval: Bosnia-Herzegovina's Higher Education in Transition
- 4/2008 *Jan Merok Paulsen*
Managing Adaptive Learning from the Middle
- 3/2008 *Pingying Zhang Wenstøp*
Effective Board Task Performance. Searching for Understanding into Board Failure and Success
- 2/2008 *Gunhild J. Ecklund*
Creating a new role for an old central bank: The Bank of Norway 1945-1954
- 1/2008 *Øystein Strøm*
Three essays on corporate boards

2007

- 6/2007 *Martha Kold Bakkevig*
The Capability to Commercialize Network Products in Telecommunication

- 5/2007 *Siw Marita Fosstenløy*
Enhancing Intangible Resources in Professional Service Firms. A Comparative Study of How Competence Development Takes Place in Four Firms
- 4/2007 *Gro Alteren*
Does Cultural Sensitivity Matter to the Maintaining of Business Relationships in the Export Markets? An empirical investigation in the Norwegian seafood industry
Lars C. Monkerud
- 3/2007 Organizing Local Democracy: The Norwegian Experience
- 2/2007 *Siv Marina Flø Karlsen*
The Born Global – Redefined. On the Determinants of SMEs Pace of Internationalization
- 1/2007 *Per Engelsest*
The Role of the Package as an Information Resource in the Supply Chain. A case study of distributing fresh foods to retailers in Norway
- 2006**
- 10/2006 *Anne Live Vaagaasar*
From Tool to Actor - How a project came to orchestrate its own life and that of others
- 9/2006
Kjell Brynjulf Hjertø
The Relationship Between Intragroup Conflict, Group Size and Work Effectiveness
- 8/2006 *Taran Thune*
Formation of research collaborations between universities and firms: Towards an integrated framework of tie formation motives, processes and experiences
- 7/2006 *Lena E. Bygballe*
Learning Across Firm Boundaries. The Role of Organisational Routines
- 6/2006 *Hans Solli-Sæther*
Transplants' role stress and work performance in IT outsourcing relationships
- 5/2006 *Bjørn Hansen*
Facility based competition in telecommunications – Three essays on two-way access and one essay on three-way access
- 4/2006 *Knut Boge*
Votes Count but the Number of Seats Decides: A comparative historical case study of 20th century Danish, Swedish and Norwegian road policy
- 3/2006 *Birgitte Grøgaard*
Strategy, structure and the environment. Essays on international strategies and subsidiary roles
- 2/2006 *Sverre A. Christensen*
Switching Relations - The rise and fall of the Norwegian telecom industry
- 1/2006 *Nina Veflen Olsen*
Incremental Product Development. Four essays on activities, resources, and actors

2005

- 6/2005 *Jon Erland Bonde Lervik*
Managing Matters: Transferring Organizational Practices within Multinational Companies
- 5/2005 *Tore Mysen*
Balancing Controls When Governing Agents in Established Relationships: The Influence of Performance Ambiguity
- 4/2005 *Anne Flagstad*
How Reforms Influence Organisational Practices: The Cases of Public Roads and Electricity Supply Organisations in Norway
- 3/2005 *Erlend Kvaal*
Topics in accounting for impairment of fixed asset
- 2/2005 *Amir Sasson*
On Mediation and Affiliation. A Study of Information Mediated Network Effects in The Banking Industry
- 1/2005 *Elin Kubberød*
Not just a Matter of Taste – Disgust in the Food Domain

2004

- 10/2004 *Sverre Tomassen*
The Effects of Transaction Costs on the Performance of Foreign Direct Investments - An empirical investigation.
- 9/2004 *Catherine Børve Monsen:*
Regulation, Ownership and Company Strategies. The Case of European Incumbent Telecommunications Operators
- 8/2004 *Johannes A. Skjeltnor*
Trading in Equity Markets: A study of Individual, Institutional and Corporate Trading Decision.
- 7/2004 *Frank Elter*
Strategizing in Complex Contexts
- 6/2004 *Qinglei Dai*
Essays on International Banking and Tax-Motivated Trading
- 5/2004 *Arne Morten Ulvnes*
Communication Strategies and the Costs of Adapting to Opportunism in an Interfirm Marketing System
- 4/2004 *Gisle Henden*
Intuition and its Role in Strategic Thinking
- 3/2004 *Haakon O. Aa. Solheim*
Essays on volatility in the foreign exchange market
- 2/2004 *Xiaoling Yao*
From Village Election to National Democratisation. An Economic-Political Microcosm Approach to Chinese Transformation

- 1/2004 *Ragnhild Silkoset*
Collective Market Orientation in Co-producing Networks
- 2003**
- 2/2003 *Egil Marstein*
The influence of stakeholder groups on organizational decision-making in public hospitals
- 1/2003 *Joyce Hartog McHenry*
Management of Knowledge in Practice. Learning to visualise competence.
- 2002**
- 6/2002 *Gay Bjercke*
Business Landscapes and Mindscapes in People's Republic of China. A Study of a Sino-Scandinavian Joint Venture
- 5/2002 *Thorvald Hærem*
Task Complexity and Expertise as Determinants of Task Perceptions and Performance: Why Technology-Structure Research has been unreliable and inconclusive
- 4/2002 *Norman T. Sheehan*
Reputation as a Driver in Knowledge-Intensive Service Firms: An exploratory study of the relationship between reputation and value creation in petroleum exploration units
- 3/2002 *Line Lervik Olsen*
Modeling Equity, Satisfaction and Loyalty in Business-to-Consumer Markets
- 2/2002 *Fred H. Strønen*
Strategy Formation from a Loosely Coupled System Perspective. The Case of Fjordland
- 1/2002 *Terje I. Våland*
Emergence of conflicts in complex projects. The role of informal versus formal governance mechanisms in understanding interorganizational conflicts in the oil industry
- 2001**
- 6/2001 *Kenneth H. Wathne*
Relationship Governance in a Vertical Network Context
- Ming Li*
- 5/2001 Value-Focused Data Envelopment Analysis
- 4/2001 *Lin Jiang*
An Integrated Methodology for Environmental Policy Analysis
- 3/2001 *Geir Høidal Bjørnnes*
Four Essays on the Market Microstructure of Financial Markets
- 2/2001 *Dagfinn Rime*
Trading in Foreign Exchange Markets. Four Essays on the Microstructure of Foreign Exchange
- 1/2001 *Ragnhild Kvålshaugen*
The Antecedents of Management Competence. The Role of Educational Background and Type of Work Experience

2000

1/2000

Per Ingvar Olsen

Transforming Economies. The Case of the Norwegian Electricity Market Reform