WHO'S THE FAIREST OF THEM ALL?:

THE IMPACT OF NARCISSISM ON SELF- AND OTHER- RATED FAIRNESS

IN THE WORKPLACE

Benjamin Dattner

A dissertation in the Department of Psychology submitted

to the faculty of the Graduate School of Arts and Science

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

New York University

September, 1999

This dissertation examines individual differences in self-perceived and other-assessed fairness. Specifically, it tests whether the personality trait of narcissism can predict higher self-rated fairness, lower other-rated fairness and a larger divergence between self-rated and other rated fairness. Additionally, this study considers the impact of narcissism on the accuracy of one's perceptions of how one is viewed by others as well as the accuracy of others' perceptions of how one views oneself.

Messick, Bloom, Boldizar & Samuelson (1985) published a study in the *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* entitled "Why we are fairer than others" in which they found that people associate more fairness with their own behavior than that of other people. Given that not everyone can be fairer than average, the authors conclude that people have a self-enhancement bias in their perceptions of fairness.

Cates & Messick (1996) describe how the "I am fairer than others" (or the "dual slope phenomenon" in which the "self" and "other" lines in a plot of the frequency of behaviors on the dimensions of fair vs. unfair, frequent vs. infrequent have different slopes and cross one another) has been replicated cross culturally, in the Netherlands by Liebrand, Messick and Wolters (1986), in Hong Kong by Chan (1987) and in Japan by Tanaka (1993). One shortcoming of these studies is that they lack criterion measures against which self-ratings of fairness could be compared and evaluated.

Some theorists have claimed that inflated self-perception, within a reasonable range, is necessary for and diagnostic of healthy mental functioning (Taylor, 1989). Completely accurate

self-perceptions may be a function of "depressive realism," which is the tendency of depressed individuals to see themselves and the world more accurately than non-depressed individuals. The "I am fairer than others" phenomenon may be one realm in which "positive illusions" comprise mental health.

Overly positive self-ratings of fairness can also be considered within larger frameworks such as the actor-observer effect, which involves different patterns of attributions for self versus others (Miller and Ross, 1975) or self-enhancement biases, which cause individuals to rate themselves more highly than others rate them on a wide variety of evaluative dimensions (Taylor and Brown, 1988). Both the actor-observer effect and self-enhancement biases have been explained in terms of self-esteem maintenance.

John and Robins (1994) describe two competing views of self-enhancement- the first is that self-enhancement biases are a universal, general "law" of human nature, and the second is that the presence or absence of self-enhancement biases is a function of individual differences. John and Robins argue for and found evidence supporting the latter position, specifically citing narcissism as an individual difference that influences self-perception and the tendency to make self-serving attributions. Farwell and Wohlwend-Lloyd (1998), commenting on the results of John and Robins, assert that contextual factors interact with narcissism in causing self-enhancement.

In some contexts, there can be benefits of narcissism. Emmons (1984) speculates that there may be a curvilinear relationship between narcissism and adjustment-- too little narcissism may be as maladaptive as too much. For example, attributional training for depressed people might entail teaching them to acquire a more narcissistic attributional style (Emmons, 1987).

Narcissists can be assertive, socially poised and confident (Wink, 1991) and

charming and helpful (Yukl, 1994). Narcissistic people can also appear special,

win other's confidence, (Hogan, Raskin & Fazzini, 1990) and attract envy and admiration

(Jacoby, 1990).

The presence of some narcissistic traits might actually be a prerequisite for the attainment

of a leadership position (Kets de Vries and Miller, 1985) or a predictor of who will rise to the top

of an organization (Hogan, Raskin & Fazzini, 1990) partly because the strength and inflexibility

of a narcissistic leader's worldview can cause followers to identify with and participate in the

leader's self involvement. The narcissistic leader's strong conviction that his or her group or

nation is superior to others might inspire loyalty, group identification and nationalism, which can

itself be considered as analogous to narcissism at a societal level of analysis (Emmons, 1987).

There is also likely to be a "dark side" to the narcissistic leader (Hogan, Raskin & Fazzini, 1990)

and the accompanying distorted view of reality may have disastrous consequences when the

leader begins to use his or her followers to attain narcissistic goals.

While political leaders may benefit from narcissism at certain times and under certain

circumstances, narcissism is likely to be more of a consistent obstacle for business managers,

who comprise the subjects in the present study. Unlike leaders at the top of organizations who

may have the power to establish a vision and set rules, middle level business managers must

operate within the framework of existing organizational rules and their effectiveness is partly

dependent on the discretionary efforts of employees. The goal of this research is to determine

how and to what extent a middle level business manager's narcissism impacts employees'

perceptions of and satisfaction with the interactional manner in which the manager executes an

organization's existing procedural rules.

In their 1994 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* paper "Accuracy and bias in self-perception: individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism", John and Robins tested the relationship between individual differences and self and other rated performance in an assessment center task. The authors found that subjects high on narcissism (As measured by 2 observer-based measures and 2 self-report measures, the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the California Psychological Inventory) overestimated their contributions (self-enhancement bias), those low on narcissism underestimated their contributions (self diminishment bias), and those in the middle of the narcissism scales showed neither bias.

In the introduction to their study, John and Robins (1994) wrote "although the relevance of narcissism for an individual-differences account of self-enhancement bias seems rather obvious, the construct has not yet been examined in studies of self-perception accuracy against observer criteria." (p. 209). While there has been more empirical investigation into narcissism in the last few years, the area remains largely unexplored. As recently as 1998, Farwell and Wohlwend-Lloyd wrote that one important area for future research is "the social consequences of variations in dispositional narcissism." (p. 81), which is exactly what the present study endeavors to explore.

The present study tests the hypothesis that the same narcissistic self-enhancement effect that was found by John and Robins (1994) will be found if the criterion is fairness rather than performance. Since narcissism involves the enhancement of the self and/or the derogation of others, it seems logical that people high on this trait would be likely to rate themselves higher on fairness and to be rated as lower on fairness by others. John and Robins quote the DSM III R definition of narcissism as partly being defined by "interpersonal relations characterized by feelings of entitlement (or "expectation of special favors without reciprocation" in DSM III), exploitativeness, and lack of empathy." (p. 210). This description suggests that narcissists, or people with narcissistic traits, are likely to not know or not care that they may be behaving in a manner that others perceive to be unfair.

In the DSM IV, the description of narcissists also includes "difficulty in recognizing the desires, subjective experiences, and feelings of others," and obliviousness to the "hurt their remarks may inflict". In general, "interpersonal relations are typically impaired due to problems derived from entitlement, the need for admiration, and the relative disregard for the sensitivities of others." (p. 659). These tendencies may even be exacerbated in the workplace, where, compared to a voluntary personal relationship in which the parties are relatively equal and from which the other party can freely choose to exit, a narcissist's position power and an employee's inability to exit the situation may remove such checks and balances.

Because narcissists are likely to ingratiate with their superiors, (one of the criteria in DSM IV is "believes that he or she is 'special' and can only be understood by, or should

associate with, other high status people" (p. 661)), their negative characteristics

may not be as apparent to those above them as to those at their level or below.

Furthermore, narcissists are likely to treat superiors with deference because they can provide the

symbolic and instrumental resources that Kernberg (1975) calls "narcissistic supplies".

Supervisees are likely to suffer the most since there are fewer instrumental incentives for

narcissists to try to win their regard and favor. One important aspect of narcissism is the demands

placed on others for admiration and approval (Kernberg, 1975), and the workplace may provide a

structure in which narcissists are empowered to make such demands on subordinates.

Among subordinates, narcissists are likely to treat people inconsistently because they are

susceptible to "splitting", or projecting everything good on some people and everything bad on

others. In other words, narcissists "divide the world into famous, rich, and great people on the

one hand, and the despicable, worthless 'mediocrity' on the other." (Kernberg, 1975, p. 234).

This may cause the subordinates of narcissistic managers to be put into a clearly differentiated

ingroup or outgroup depending on whether they are viewed positively or negatively.

Freud (1914) wrote a paper entitled "On narcissism: an introduction" in which he credited Paul Nacke with the first usage of the term narcissism in 1899 in the context of clinical description. However, as James Strachey noted in the 1957 publication of Freud's 1914 paper, Freud later learned that Havelock Ellis had used the term "Narcissus-like" in 1898. Freud theorized that narcissism included self-absorption, self love and self-aggrandizement as attempts to gratify infantile needs. While Freud believed that all people pass through a stage of infantile narcissism, he thought the study of pathological narcissists could help illuminate the psychodynamics of narcissism in normal individuals.

According to Freud, a narcissist could love "a) what he himself is (i.e.: himself), b) what he himself was, c) what he himself would like to be" (p. 90) or someone or something that the narcissist experiences as possessing excellence or as ideal. For Freud, these narcissistic tendencies developed partly as a function of how the child is raised by his or her parents. Raskin and Terry (1988) note that Freud's study of narcissism was an important step in the development of his tripartite structural model of the mind, but lament that "his metapsychological theorizing has lead to a matrix of confusion surrounding the meaning and appropriate usage of the construct." (p. 891). Other authors concur that Freud's writings on narcissism are inconsistent and contradictory (Watson and Biderman, 1993).

However, there is widespread agreement that Freud's writings brought attention to narcissism and encouraged others to study it (Rhodewalt and Morf, 1995). Other authors, such as Kohut (1971) and Kernberg (1975) were highly influenced by Freud but have attempted to

provide more accurate, comprehensive and practical psychoanalytic accounts of

narcissism. Wink and Gough (1990) describe how narcissism has not just been

approached from the psychoanalytic perspective, but also from within other frameworks such as

social learning theory as described by Millon (1981). According to Rhodewalt and Morf, (1995;

1998) the concrete definition of narcissism in the American Psychiatric Association's Diagnostic

and Statisical Manual (DSM), has opened up the door to the development of measures and the

empirical testing of hypotheses pertaining to narcissism. (See Appendix A for the DSM IV

definition of narcissism).

Justice and fairness

The dependent variables in the present study relate to justice and fairness. Justice and

fairness judgments are and have historically been an essential component of organizations and

societies. Perceptions of injustice can lead to a wide array of organizational and societal

outcomes ranging from non-compliance with group rules to legal action and violence (Tyler,

Boeckmann, Smith and Huo, 1997), while perceptions of procedural justice can lead to beneficial

outcomes such as organizational citizenship behaviors (Moorman, 1991). In the theoretical and

empirical study of justice, there have been several different approaches to the study of justice and

fairness, several of which were incorporated into the present study.

Distributive justice, or the study of the fairness of an array of outcomes that people

receive from organizations (Tyler et. al., 1997) began with equity theory (Adams, 1965). In

equity theory, people compare the ratio of their inputs into organizations and the outcomes they

receive with ratio of inputs to outcomes of comparison others. If the focal worker

gets less than his or her comparison others, feelings of anger will arise in

proportion to the amount of perceived inequity. If the focal worker gets more than comparison

others, equity theory states that feelings of guilt will result.

Tyler et. al. (1997) cite self-serving biases, such as found by Messick et. al. (1985), whose

paper provided the initial inspiration for this dissertation, as presenting challenges for equity

theory. These perceptual distortions render inaccurate the simple and "objective" formulations of

equity theory. Equity theory has since been modified and amended by some authors, such as

Deutsch (1975). Deustch extended distributive justice beyond equity theory with his discussion

of how, in addition to equity allocation rules, equality and need allocation rules may also

determine judgments of fairness.

Procedural justice concerns the processes by which resources, broadly defined, are

allocated. Thibault and Walker (1975) suggested that procedural justice judgments make a

contribution to fairness perceptions that is independent of the distributive outcome. One

implication of procedural justice is that people will be satisfied with less favorable outcomes if

they believe the process by which those outcomes were allocated was fair. There are various

components to procedural justice, for example whether the procedures are viewed to be

consistent, unbiased (Leventhal, 1980) and impartial (Tyler, 1988), whether people can

participate in the process, provide inputs to influence decisions (Thibault and Walker, 1975), and

whether the rules by which decisions are made are publicized. The fairness of procedures

depends on context, and there are no universally fair procedures (Tyler et. al 1997). Just as

narcissism can have implications at the group, organizational (Brown, 1997) and societal level of

analysis (Lasch, 1978), so too can distributive and procedural justice (Tyler et. al.,

1997).

Retributive justice is another area that has received theoretical and empirical attention. When a perceived injustice occurs, retributive justice is the study of the actions that people take or the punishments that they inflict in the attempt to right the wrong that they believe has been done (Tyler et. al., 1997). Narcissists may be both more likely to inspire thoughts of retributive justice among their employees and to think themselves of retributive justice to punish those who threaten their narcissistic self-conceptions.

In the present study, interactional justice is the primary focus. Interactional justice--in which the interpersonal components of justice judgments are considered independent of distributive or impersonal procedural justice (Tyler and Bies, 1990)-- has also been delineated as an area of inquiry in the literature. Interactional justice is the perceived fairness of the specific ways in which a manager enacts formal or informal organizational procedural rules. While procedural justice is an important factor in the relationship between an employee and an organization, interactional justice is an important component of the relationship between an employee and his or her supervisor (Moorman, 1991).

There is some evidence that in certain contexts, interactional justice is the most important kind of justice. For example, Tyler et al (1997) quote Messick et al (1985), who asked subjects which fair and unfair acts they associated with other people. None of the 80 behaviors had to do with distributive justice. Rather, what came to mind for the subjects was acts which "had to do with interpersonal consideration and politeness." (p. 499) which the previous discussion of narcissism indicates will be major issues for narcissists in the workplace.

Additional evidence for the importance of interactional justice can be found in the work of Moorman (1991), who found that interactional justice was a better predictor of organizational citizenship behaviors than were distributive or procedural justice. Interactional justice relates to the importance of personal factors and relationships in justice judgments, and therefore, it is the most relevant kind of justice in the present study. Because the manager's sensitivity is an important component of interactional justice (Moorman, 1991), it is likely that narcissistic managers will encounter challenges in this realm.

The present study

The present study comprised a correlational field study of 91 business managers in which there were four major hypotheses: A. Self ratings of fairness will be higher than staff ratings of fairness. B. There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and self ratings of fairness. C. There will be a negative correlation between narcissism and staff rated fairness. D. Given hypotheses (B) and (C), there will be greater self-enhancement, as measured by a larger discrepancy between self and staff ratings of fairness, for more narcissistic managers than for less narcissistic managers.

To measure narcissism, the CPI (Wink and Gough, 1990) and the NPI (Raskin and Terry, 1988) were administered. The first version of the NPI was created by Raskin and Hall (1979) based on the criteria in the then-forthcoming DSM III definition of narcissism which was published in 1980. The NPI and the CPI are the same two well-validated (and designed for use in nonclinical populations) self-report measures utilized by John and Robins (1994). In the

present study, these instruments were administered to subjects, along with fairness

questionnaires which contained two types of question-- the first being items in

which the manager was asked "how do you rate yourself" and the second being "how would the

employees that you supervise rate you?". Their employees got a similar questionnaire, also with

two types of question--"how do you rate your manager?" and "how would your manager rate

him/herself?". The comparison of self versus others' ratings was utilized by John and Robins

(1994), and the collection of imputed self and other ratings in the present study is intended to

enable a more detailed picture of the relationship between narcissism and how people view

themselves, how they are viewed by others, and the extent to which they accurately perceive how

they are viewed by others, to emerge. Items on the questionnaires are intended to capture how

fairly the manager distributes rewards, assignments and unpleasant tasks, whether or not the

manager plays favorites, whether or not he/she explains decisions, treats employees with respect,

gives constructive feedback rather than public criticism, etc.

Hypotheses:

1. There will be a main effect for self-enhancement in fairness ratings. Self ratings of fairness will be higher than staff ratings of fairness.

2. There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and self ratings of fairness. More narcissistic managers will rate themselves as more fair.

3. There will be a negative correlation between narcissism and staff rated fairness. More narcissistic managers will be rated as less fair by their staffs.

4. Given hypotheses (2) and (3), there will be greater self-enhancement, as measured by a larger discrepancy between self and staff ratings of fairness, for more narcissistic managers than for less narcissistic managers.

5. There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and staff ratings on "how fair would the manager rate him/herself to be?" items.

6. There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and manager ratings on "how fair would your staff rate you to be?" items.

7. There will be a positive correlation, for both narcissistic and non- narcissistic managers

between staff ratings on "how will the manager rate him or herself" items and

actual self-ratings by the manager.

8. Because narcissists are likely to treat people with differential fairness, there will be greater variance in staff-rated fairness of more narcissistic managers.

9. At the conclusion of the study, narcissistic managers will be less likely to ask for additional feedback about how they were rated by their staff.

Method

Solicitation letters were sent to Executive MBA students at Universities throughout the United States which described the research as being about "the relationship between personality and fairness in the workplace". The incentive offered for participation was a personal and confidential feedback report to be created based on a comparison of a subject's self ratings with the aggregated and anonymous ratings of his or her staff.

Contact information for the researcher was included in the solicitation letter, including an e-mail address. In some Executive MBA programs the director of the program distributed the solicitation letter to students via mailboxes, bulletin boards or e-mail, while in other programs the director sent mailing labels to the researcher who in turn sent personally addressed solicitation letters to all students.

Although the number of staff members varied, in order to be eligible to participate, Executive MBA students had to have at least 3 staff members able to rate them. 108 Executive MBA students volunteered to participate along with 704 of their direct or indirect reports. The Executive MBA students were sent questionnaires which included the Narcissistic Personality Inventory, the narcissism items from the California Psychological Inventory, and a fairness questionnaire. Staff members received a fairness questionnaire in which they were asked to rate their supervisor. All questionnaires were mailed along with instructions, contact information and stamped return envelopes.

Subjects and their staffs were informed that their staffs' responses would be completely anonymous and that no information from either the subject's or the staffs' questionnaires would

ever be shared or published other than in the aggregate. The personal and

confidential feedback reports were created as soon a subject's questionnaire and

those of his or her staff were returned, or after a subject's questionnaire and those of three or

more staff raters were returned and the subject indicated that no additional staff questionnaires

would be forthcoming.

Ninety two of the 108 Executive MBA questionnaires were returned, yielding an 85%

return rate, and 485 of the 704 staff questionnaires were returned, yielding a return rate of 69%.

The overall return rate for EMBA and staff questionnaires was 71%.

Descriptive statistics- subjects

There were 91 subjects that qualified for inclusion in the analyses. One subject did not

qualify because only two of his staff's questionnaires were returned. At the time the data was

collected, subjects were all enrolled in one of 30 participating part-time Executive MBA

Programs at Universities across the United States. These managers were an average of 38 years

old, SD = 6.5 and had been employed in their respective work organizations for an average of 7.5

years, SD = 5.3. They spend an average of 52 hours per week at work, SD = 9.3, and supervise an

average of 7 direct reports, SD= 6.6. At work, they spend an average of 17.9 hours interacting

with their staffs, SD = 11.6, and an average of .93 hours socializing with their staff, SD = 1.3. Of

the 90 subjects reporting, 82 were born in the United States while 8 were not, and 68 were men

and 22 were women.

Descriptive statistics- staff raters

After 16 incomplete questionnaires were discarded, 469 staff questionnaires qualified for

inclusion in the analyses. The instructions assured staff raters of anonymity, but also instructed

them to leave blank any personal information that they preferred not to provide. On some of the

included staff fairness questionnaires, some or all of the demographic information on the last

page was left blank. Of the 365 staff raters who reported organizational tenure, the mean was 7.3

years, SD = 7.4. The 446 reporting spend an average of 45.5 hours at work, SD =

8.1, and have worked for their supervisors, the subjects in the present study, for an

average of 2.4 years, SD = 2.3. The staff raters spend an average of 6.2 hours with their

supervisors each week, SD = 8.9, and an average of .33 hours each week socializing with their

supervisors, SD = .92. Of the 427 reporting, 363 or 77% of the staff raters work at the same

geographic location as their supervisors. The mean difference in organizational level between

staff raters and their supervisors was 1.6, SD = 1.1. Among the 410 staffers who reported their

gender, 233 were men and 177 were women. The mean age of the staff raters was 38, SD = 9.2

and of the 400 reporting, 372 or 79% had been born in the United States. The mean education

level of the staff raters was bachelors degree.

Independent measures:

The mean NPI score in the present study was 16.9, SD = 5.8, with an internal consistency,

as measured by coefficient alpha, of .8. The mean CPI score was 26.6, SD = 5.6, with an internal

consistency of .71. Their correlation with each other was .473, significant at the P <.000 level.

These results are consistent with previously published norms, i.e: Ladd et. al's, (1997) study of

1,018 undergraduates whose NPI mean was 15.5, SD = 6.7, and John & Robins (1994) whose

MBA students averaged 15.6 on the NPI, SD = 5.3, and 26.8 on the CPI, SD = 6.6. The mean of

the narcissism composite which averaged the NPI and the CPI was 21.8, SD = 4.9. The

narcissism composite had a negative correlation of .29, P < .01 with the number of times a

subject had been promoted in his or her career, and a negative correlation of .3, P < .01 with

subjects' age, meaning that younger managers were more narcissistic. The

manager's narcissism composite also had a negative correlation with the number

of raises staffers had gotten in the organization, r = -.15, P < .01 and the length of time staffers

had worked for the organization, r = -.17, P < .01. The final demographic variable with which the

narcissism composite correlated significantly was geographic location, -.16, P < .01 meaning that

more narcissistic managers were more likely to be rated by staff from their same geographic

location.

Dependent measures:

After the items that asked staff to speculate about how the subject would rate him or

herself were removed, a principal components factors analysis indicated that one factor

accounted for 47% of the variance in the staff responses to the items in the first two sections (for

which comparisons with the subjects' questionnaires were possible) providing support that the

questionnaire was measuring the general construct of fairness.

For the purpose of the analysis, nine conceptual categories of interactional fairness were

created using the items from the fairness questionnaire: consistency— the extent to which a

subject treats staff consistently and does not play favorites; decision making— the extent to

which a subject is unbiased and impartial in making decisions; empathy— the extent to which a

subject can see things from the perspective of his or her staff; equality— the extent to which a

subject treats employees like equals rather than as inferiors; relative fairness— how fair the

subject is relative to other managers within his or her organization; supportiveness— the extent

to which a subject provides substantive, symbolic and emotional support to

employees; transactional fairness— the extent to which a subject is fair and non-

exploitative in resource exchanges with employees; treatment— the extent to which a manager is

respectful and sensitive in interactions with staff; and voice—the extent to which a subject is

open to the advice and feedback of staff. In order to empirically verify the internal consistency of

these categories, reliability measures were computed for each based on the responses of all staff

raters.

The conceptual categories received empirical support-- the alpha coefficients for the

categories were as follows: consistency, .84 (4 questionnaire items); decision making, .85 (3

items); empathy, .85 (3 items); equality, .72 (2 items); relative fairness, .67 (2 items);

supportiveness, .84 (4 items) ; transactional fairness, .53 (2 items); treatment, .83 (3 items); and

voice .56 (2 items).

Hypothesis 1: There will be a main effect for self-enhancement in fairness ratings. The mean self

rating for fairness will be higher than other rated fairness.

There was strong support for this hypothesis. Twenty of the 26 comparisons between

manager rating and mean staff rating were statistically significant in the predicted direction,

meaning that subjects rated themselves more favorably than did their staffs, at the P <.01 level.

Mean staff ratings, rather than unaggregated staff ratings, were used because the mean has been

shown to be a more reliable measure (Church, 1997). After the deletion of one anomalous item in

the managers' questionnaire (which was also excluded from all subsequent analyses), the mean

discrepancy between manager rating and staff rating was -.49, or approximately

one half of one rating on a six point scale, also significant at the P < .000 level.

The mean discrepancies between self rating and staff rating for all fairness categories were statistically significant in the predicted direction, P <.01 and were as follows: consistency, -.28; decision making, -.45; empathy, -.61; equality, -.45; relative fairness, -.34; supportiveness, -.47; transactional fairness, -.68; treatment, -.53; and voice, -.60.

Additional evidence for a general self-enhancement effect was the mean self-rating by subjects in the relative fairness category. For the 91 subjects, the mean self-rating on the six point scale (with 1 as the most favorable rating) on items about how fair one is relative to other managers, was 2.1, SD = .83. A mean rating of 3.5 would have indicated that managers did not believe themselves to be more or less fair than other managers. The mean staff rating of 2.5 on the relative fairness category indicates that the staff raters also believed their managers to be fairer than average, although not to the same extent.

Table 1- Self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating		Staff rating		Discrepancy	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Consistency	2.2	.74	2.6	.97	-.28	.80
Decision making	2.0	.57	2.5	.94	-.45	.79
Empathy	1.9	.52	2.5	.98	-.61	.69
Equality	2.4	1.0	2.8	1.2	-.45	1.2
Relative	2.1	.83	2.5	1.0	-.34	.90
Supportiveness	2.0	.51	2.4	.93	-.47	.67
Transactional	1.9	.50	2.6	.95	-.68	.74
Treatment	1.8	.48	2.3	.93	-.53	.71
Voice	1.8	.54	2.4	.85	-.60	.69
Mean (all items)	2.5	.49	2.0	.43	-.49	.60

Hypothesis 2: There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and self
enhancement. More narcissistic managers will rate themselves as more fair.

There was partial support for hypothesis 1B. While there was no significant correlation between narcissism and managers' overall fairness self-ratings, a narcissism composite calculated using the mean of the CPI and the NPI did correlate, as predicted, with higher self-ratings by managers on one category of questionnaire items. However, there were also correlations between narcissism and other categories of fairness items that were statistically significant in the unexpected direction.

The fairness questionnaire category in which this hypothesis received support was constituted by equality items. The correlation between the narcissism composite and the equality category was .45, significant at the p <.000 level. This relationship derived from both the NPI, r = .38, p < .000 and the CPI, r = .40, p < .000. These correlations indicate that more narcissistic managers rate themselves more highly in an area in which they should theoretically have difficulty-- suppressing their feelings of superiority and treating staff members like equals.

Partial support for this hypothesis was also found in the correlation between the CPI and the consistency category. The correlation between the CPI and subjects' self ratings on the consistency items was .27, significant at the p <.02 level. However, the consistency category did not correlate significantly with either the narcissism composite or the NPI.

Interestingly, the relationship between narcissism and questionnaire items relating to supportiveness was significant in the unexpected direction. Rather than a positive correlation between the narcissism composite and supportiveness items, there was a negative correlation, of -

.25, significant at the p <.05 level. The relationship at the level of the narcissism composite was constituted by the CPI at the P <.05 level, r = -.24, and the NPI at the P <.08 level, r = -.19. Given that the theoretical construct of narcissism includes a lack of supportiveness towards others, this result suggests that narcissists may have some self-awareness about not being affirmatively supportive to their staffs.

There were no statistically significant relationships between the narcissism composite, the NPI or the CPI and subjects' self ratings on the questionnaire categories of decision making, empathy, relative fairness, transactional fairness, treatment, or voice. Analyses demonstrated that there were no statistically significant relationships between these categories and the narcissism composite even after the middle third of subjects, based on their narcissism composites, were excluded from consideration.

The self ratings of subjects in the high and low narcissism groups did not have self-ratings that were distinguishable from one another in any of these categories. Likewise, these categories were not differentiated when the criterion for group membership was being one standard deviation above or below the mean on the narcissism composite, the method utilized by Ladd et. al (1997). However, using the latter method of dividing up the sample may be problematic because only 34 of the 91 subjects (17 in both the high narcissism and low narcissism composite groups) match the criteria for inclusion in analyses on the basis of one standard deviation.

Table 2- Correlations between narcissism composite, NPI and CPI and self ratings

Fairness category	Composite	NPI	CPI
Consistency	.13	-.04	.27*
Decision making	-.02	-.07	.05
Empathy	.12	.10	.12
Equality	.45**	.38**	.40**
Relative	.07	.05	.07
Supportiveness	-.25*	-.19	-.24*
Transactional	.00	.05	-.06
Treatment	.02	-.05	.10
Voice	.10	.10	.06
Mean (all items)	.15	.09	.03

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

Hypothesis 3: There will be a negative correlation between narcissism and staff
rated fairness. More narcissistic managers will be rated as less fair by their staffs.

This hypothesis was not supported. There were no significant relationships in the predicted direction between the narcissism composite and any of the mean staff ratings within the categories of fairness items. There were two unexpected relationships between narcissism and staff ratings: the NPI correlated .24 with staff ratings of equality items and .23 with staff ratings of relative fairness items, both significant at the $P < .05$ level. A comparison of the mean staff ratings within the fairness categories between the top third and bottom third of subjects based on the narcissism composite revealed no statistically significant differences between the groups in the predicted direction.

Table 3- Correlations between narcissism composite, NPI and CPI and mean staff

ratings

Fairness category	Composite	NPI	CPI
Consistency	.04	.14	-.07
Decision making	.00	.12	-.13
Empathy	.14	.19	.04
Equality	.16	.24*	.03
Relative	.15	.23*	.01
Supportiveness	-.03	.02	-.08
Transactional	-.04	.07	-.12
Treatment	.00	.07	-.08
Voice	.16	.16	.12
Mean (all items)	.08	.17	-.03

* P < .05, ** P < .01

Hypothesis 4: There will be a larger discrepancy between self and staff ratings of

fairness for more narcissistic managers than for less narcissistic managers.

This hypothesis was not supported. Because the narcissism composite did not correlate

with either subjects' self ratings or staff ratings, there were also no significant negative

correlations between the narcissism composite and the discrepancies between manager self

ratings and mean staff ratings with any of the fairness questionnaire categories. There was one

statistically significant relationship between the narcissism composite and a questionnaire

category, but in the unexpected direction—narcissism correlated positively with the discrepancy

between manager self rating and mean staff rating on items relating to equality, r = .28, P <.01.

There were no significant relationships between the NPI and the discrepancies for any of

the fairness questionnaire categories. The CPI correlated in the unexpected direction with the

discrepancies deriving from the fairness questionnaire category of equality, r = .32, P <.01,

thereby constituting the significant relationship between the narcissism composite and this

category, as well as with discrepancies deriving from consistency items, r = .26, P < .05.

Table 4- Correlations between narcissism composite, NPI and CPI and
discrepancies between self ratings and mean staff ratings:

Fairness category	Composite	NPI	CPI
Consistency	.07	-.13	.26*
Decision making	-.01	-.13	.12
Empathy	-.03	-.09	.05
Equality	.28**	.16	.32**
Relative	-.04	-.12	.06
Supportiveness	-.16	-.16	-.12
Transactional	.09	.09	.05
Treatment	.02	-.09	.13
Voice	-.05	-.04	-.05
Mean (all items)	.03	-.08	.13

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

One of the reasons why the predicted results may not have been found is that there were generally no correlations between managers' self ratings and the ratings by their staffs. Of the nine categories in the questionnaire, there were only two statistically significant correlations between manager self-ratings and mean staff ratings and both were positive: empathy items-- $r = .24$, $P < .05$, and relative fairness items-- $r = .25$, $P < .05$. These results indicate that there is a partially congruent relationship self and staff ratings on some dimensions of fairness and no relationship between self and staff ratings on other fairness dimensions. In the two cases where there were correlations between self ratings and staff ratings, they were positive and not moderated by narcissism. In regressing self rating onto staff rating and narcissism composite score, the only category for which narcissism explained additional variance was the equality

category, where the proportion of self-rating variance explained by staff rating,

.01, increased to .21 when narcissism was included in the equation.

Table 5- Prediction of self rating by regression of self rating onto staff ratings and narcissism composite score.

	step 1	step 2	
	staff rating r^2	narcissism r^2	change in r^2
Consistency	.01	.02	.01
Decision making	.00	.00	.00
Empathy	.06*	.07*	.01
Equality	.01	.21**	.20**
Relative	.06*	.06	.00
Supportiveness	.02	.08*	.06
Transactional	.01	.01	.00
Treatment	.03	.03	.03
Voice	.03	.04	.01
Mean (all items)	.02	.04	.02

*P < .05, ** P < .01

Hypothesis 5: There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and staff ratings on "how would the manager rate him/herself?" items.

This hypothesis received partial support. Of the 10 questions which asked the staff raters to speculate as to how fair their managers believed themselves to be, the mean staff ratings on two items were associated with the narcissism composite in the hypothesized direction. There was a correlation of .21, P <.05, between the narcissism composite and the extent to which staffers speculated that their supervisors would believe that they treated staff with dignity, and a correlation of .22, p <.05, between the narcissism composite and staffers' speculation about the extent to which supervisors would say that they empathize with employees. When the NPI and the CPI were independently correlated with these two items, the only statistically significant relationship was between the CPI and the staff's guess of the subject's self rating on the dignity item, r = .22, P < .04, although the correlation with the NPI was also positive and close to significant.

Hypothesis 6: There will be a positive correlation between narcissism and

manager ratings on "how fair would your staff rate you to be?" items.

This hypothesis was not supported. There were no statistically significant relationships between the narcissism composite and the questionnaire items in which the managers were asked to speculate about how their staffs would rate them. There were also no discernible patterns of results when the NPI and the CPI were individually correlated with these items. The CPI correlated with one item- "my staff believes I treat them with respect" in the predicted direction, r = .25, p <.05. The NPI correlated with another item, "How fairly would your staff say that you make decisions?", but not in the predicted direction, r = -.23, P <.05.

Of the 8 items in which the subject was asked to speculate about how he or she would be rated by his or her staff, there were two items for which the subject's guesses and staff ratings correlated significantly. The first was a correlation of .37, p <.000 between self-rating by subjects and mean staff rating on an empathy item, and the second was a correlation of .23, p <.03 on a consistency item.

Hypothesis 7: There will be a positive correlation, for both narcissistic and non-narcissistic managers between staff ratings on "how will the manager rate him or herself" items and actual self-ratings by the manager.

There was partial support for this hypothesis. Out of the 8 items in which there are comparisons possible between subject's self rating and how the staff speculates the subject will rate him or herself, the mean staff guess for one item-- the extent to which the subject believed that he or she empathized with employees—correlated with the subject's self rating in the hypothesized direction, $r = .24$, $P < .023$. There were no significant relationships for the other 7 items.

Hypothesis 8: Because narcissists are likely to treat people with differential fairness, there will be greater variance in staff-rated fairness of more narcissistic managers.

This hypothesis was not supported. Coefficient alphas were calculated for each subject based on the average correlation among the ratings of his or her staff on 51 fairness items on the questionnaire. For the 85 subjects for whose staffs it was possible to calculate intra-class correlation coefficients, the alphas averaged .7, $SD = .17$, indicating a relatively high degree of consensus among staffers. However, there were no associations between coefficient alpha and either of the narcissism measures or the narcissism composite.

Hypothesis 9: At the conclusion of the study, narcissistic managers will be less
likely to ask for additional feedback about how they were rated by their staff.

This hypothesis did not receive support, as fewer than five subjects asked for additional
feedback after they were given their feedback reports. Several subjects commented that they had
found the feedback reports to be helpful and a few asked for interpretation of their results.

NPI Subfactors

Because the narcissism composite and the NPI and the CPI did not yield a pattern of results in support of the hypotheses, additional analyses were conducted on the basis of subfactors of the NPI. In the present study, Raskin & Terry's (1988) seven NPI subfactors, authority, self sufficiency, superiority, exhibitionism, exploitativeness, vanity and entitlement were used to capture the various subcomponents of the NPI. These factors were created by Raskin and Terry on the basis of a factor analysis, but the authors also believe that they reflect the conceptual and diagnostic categories of the instrument.

The authority subscale is based on NPI items 1, 10, 11, 12, 32, 33 and 36 and had an internal consistency in the present study of .64 as measured by coefficient alpha. The authority subscale correlated in the predicted direction with the self-rated equality category of the fairness questionnaire, r = .33, P <. 002 meaning that subjects who got higher scores on the authority subscale also rated themselves as treating their staffs as equals. There were no statistically significant correlations the authority subscale and staff ratings or discrepancies between self and staff ratings.

Table 6- Correlations between authority subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	.08	.18	-.08
Decision making	-.05	.10	-.10
Empathy	.12	.14	-.04
Equality	.33**	.20	.15
Relative	.01	.20	-.13
Supportiveness	-.17	-.05	-.10
Transactional	-.03	-.07	-.01
Treatment	-.01	.07	-.07
Voice	.05	.14	-.07
Mean (all items)	.09	.13	-.05

*P < .05, ** P < .01

Self sufficiency subscale

The self-sufficiency subscale is based on NPI items 17, 21, 22, 31, 34 and 39 and had an internal consistency of .46. The self-sufficiency subscale did not correlate at a significant level with any of the fairness categories for self-ratings, staff ratings or discrepancies between self ratings and staff ratings.

Table 7- Correlations between self sufficiency subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	-.07	.08	-.12
Decision making	-.06	.12	-.13
Empathy	-.01	.06	-.06
Equality	.19	.15	.06
Relative	-.07	.13	-.16
Supportiveness	-.07	.11	-.01
Transactional	.00	.17	-.01
Treatment	-.03	.05	-.07
Voice	.17	.05	.10
Mean (all items)	.02	.13	-.09

$* P < .05, ** P < .01$

The superiority subscale is based on NPI items 4, 9, 26, 37, and 40 and had an internal

consistency of .57. The superiority subscale correlated in the predicted direction with one fairness

category of subject self ratings: equality, $r = .24$, $P < .05$. The superiority subscale did not

correlate with any of the staff ratings or discrepancies on the fairness categories.

Table 8- Correlations between superiority subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	-.04	.03	-.03
Decision making	.00	.03	-.02
Empathy	.03	.05	-.02
Equality	.24*	.09	.14
Relative	.03	.00	.03
Supportiveness	-.10	.00	-.08
Transactional	.08	.03	.10
Treatment	-.13	-.03	-.06
Voice	.04	.01	.02
Mean (all items)	.05	.03	.01

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

Exhibitionism subscale

The exhibitionism subscale is based on NPI items 2, 3, 7, 20, 28, 30 and 38 and had a coefficient alpha of .68. The exhibitionism subscale correlated in the predicted direction with the self rated equality category, $r = .30$, $P < .01$ and self-rated empathy, $r = .25$, $P < .05$. There were unexpected positive correlations between the exhibitionism subscale and the fairness questionnaire categories of staff-rated relative fairness, $r = .22$, $P < .05$ and voice, $r = .22$, $P < .05$. The exhibitionism subscale did not correlate with discrepancies on any of the fairness categories.

Table 9- Correlations between exhibitionism subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	.04	.07	-.02
Decision making	-.03	.02	-.04
Empathy	.25*	.19	.03
Equality	.30**	.17	.14
Relative	.10	.22*	-.06
Supportiveness	.03	.11	-.07
Transactional	.17	.06	.07
Treatment	.17	.07	.07
Voice	.04	.22*	-.14
Mean (all items)	.19	.15	.00

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

Exploitativeness subscale

The exploitativeness subscale is based on NPI items 6, 13, 16, 23, and 35 and had an

internal consistency of .37. It did not correlate with subject self-ratings but did correlate with

higher staff ratings on voice, r = .22, P <.05, an unexpected result. Exploitativeness also

correlated in the expected direction with discrepancy between self ratings and staff ratings on the

relative fairness category, r = -.22, P < .033.

Table 10- Correlations between exploitativeness subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and
discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	-.10	-.03	-.05
Decision making	-.09	.00	-.06
Empathy	-.12	-.01	-.08
Equality	.17	.08	.09
Relative	-.20	.06	-.22*
Supportiveness	-.13	.00	-.10
Transactional	.00	-.05	.09
Treatment	-.18	-.05	-.08
Voice	.14	.22*	-.06
Mean (all items)	-.07	.03	-.09

* P < .05, ** P < .01

Vanity subscale

The vanity subscale is based on NPI items 15, 19 and 29 and had a coefficient alpha of

.59. This subscale did not correlate with self-ratings, but did correlate in the expected direction

with the discrepancy between self and staff ratings in the treatment category, $r = -.23$, $P < .05$.

There was also a pattern of unexpected correlations between vanity and staff ratings-- vanity

correlated with better staff ratings in the fairness categories of consistency, $r = .22$, $P < .05$;

decision making $r = .26$, $P < .05$; empathy $r = .26$, $P < .05$; relative fairness $r = .29$ $P < .01$; and

treatment $r = .25$, $P < .05$, as well as with the overall staff rating, $r = .24$, $P < .05$.

Table 11- Correlations between vanity subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and
discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	.01	.22*	-.17
Decision making	-.02	.26*	-.20
Empathy	.05	.26*	-.18
Equality	.07	.18	-.06
Relative	.14	.29**	-.08
Supportiveness	.00	.13	-.10
Transactional	.05	.09	.05
Treatment	-.01	.25*	-.23*
Voice	.06	.08	-.02
Mean (all items)	.07	.24*	-.16

* $P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

Entitlement subscale

The entitlement subscale is based on NPI items 5, 14, 18, 24, 25 and 27 and had an internal consistency of .4. It correlated in the predicted direction with self ratings on the equality category, $r = .22$, $P < .05$. There was an unexpected correlation between the entitlement subscale and self ratings on the supportiveness category, $r = -.24$, $P < .05$. There were no significant correlations between the entitlement subscale and either staff ratings or the discrepancies between self and staff ratings for any of the fairness questionnaire categories.

Table 12- Correlations between entitlement subscale, self ratings, mean staff ratings and discrepancies.

	Self rating	Staff rating	Discrepancy
Consistency	.07	.06	-.08
Decision making	-.03	.03	-.04
Empathy	.07	.13	-.06
Equality	.22*	.13	.10
Relative	.15	.11	.06
Supportiveness	-.24*	-.11	-.09
Transactional	.00	.02	.06
Treatment	-.01	-.02	.00
Voice	.00	.00	.00
Mean (all items)	.05	.06	.01

*$P < .05$, ** $P < .01$

The results of the present study indicate that the relationship between narcissism and self and other rated fairness is not as straightforward as anticipated by the hypotheses. There was no discernible pattern of prediction by narcissism of self-rated fairness, other ratings of fairness, or the discrepancy between the two kinds of rating. Despite the lack of statistical support for the hypotheses as originally conceptualized, the present results can be considered along with theoretical accounts of narcissism to suggest alternative hypotheses and directions for future research.

The first hypothesis in the present study was the one that received the strongest support. Managers consistently rated themselves as more fair than they were rated by their staffs. However, this seemingly straightforward result is open to interpretation. Does it mean that managers are self-enhancing or does it reflect what John & Robins (1994) refer to as "observer harshness"- the tendency for other raters to be overly critical?

The other hypotheses in the present study received mixed support or no support. Narcissism correlated to some extent with certain of the subjects' self ratings, but both in the expected and in the unexpected directions. For example, while there was a strong correlation between the narcissism composite and subjects' self ratings on the equality category in the hypothesized direction, r = .45, meaning that more narcissistic managers were more likely to believe that they treated their staffs like equals. However, there was also a statistically significant relationship between the narcissism composite and self-ratings of supportiveness items in the unexpected direction, r = -.25, meaning that more narcissistic managers rated themselves as

being less supportive towards their staffs. For both the equality and the

supportiveness categories of fairness items, as well as all of the other fairness

categories, the narcissism composite had no significant correlations in the hypothesized direction

with staff ratings. There was also no support for the hypothesis that narcissism would predict

larger discrepancies between self and staff ratings of fairness, which derived partly from the

general absence of any correlation between self and staff ratings.

There are several potential theoretical and methodological explanations for the mixed

results which will be described below:

Sampling:

The sampling procedure used in the present study may explain why many of the

hypotheses were not supported. Letters soliciting participation in the study were distributed to

approximately 4,000 Executive MBA students across the United States. Of these, 110

volunteered for the study and 91 were included in the analyses. Therefore, the subjects in the

study represent roughly one fortieth of the total population of potential participants. It is not

possible to determine which ways, if any, the volunteers differ from those who did not

participate. While the consistency of the narcissism measures with previously published norms

indicates that there was not restriction of range in the independent variables, it is not possible to

determine whether there may have been restriction of range in the dependent measures of fairness

ratings or in the range of one or more unmeasured confounding variables. It is also possible that

although volunteers for the study scored similarly to published norms and the NPI and the CPI,

there may have been ways in which they are less narcissistic, since narcissists are generally unwilling to seek out or accept feedback from their subordinates (Yukl, 1994). This may be because feedback seeking under some circumstances can call one's self-confidence into question.

Ashford (1989) found that people who rate themselves more favorably are less likely to seek out evaluative information about themselves. There may have been a corollary to that finding in the present study in that volunteers, being more interested in and open to learning about how fair they are perceived to be by their staffs than were non-participants, were less likely to have inflated self-conceptions. Some evidence for this was the tendency for staffers to rate their managers as being relatively more fair than average. It may also be the case that volunteering for the present study indicates a motivation to change, on the basis of the feedback that the staff provides, self perceptions, behavior, or both. Since the opportunity to give feedback to managers may have given staffers a feeling that they are respected by their managers (Lind & Tyler, 1988), their appreciation may have influenced their overall ratings of their supervisors.

Although other researchers, such as Ashford & Tsui (1991) have used Executive MBAs as subjects and John & Robins (1994) whose study provided the foundation for the present study, used traditional MBA students as subjects, Executive MBA students as a population might also not be representative of the entire population of business managers. For example, as with other types of training programs, Executive MBA's tuition payments are often reimbursed by their respective work organization which likely means that they are performing at an acceptable level or better (Church, 1997).

Executive MBA students have very busy schedules in which they must balance the

competing demands of their full-time jobs and school. Sometimes they are forced

to miss work because of school and sometimes they are forced to miss school

because of work. These constraints on their schedules may lead to increased dependence on their

staffs which in turn might give them incentives to pay more careful attention, relative to the

population of non-Executive MBA business managers, to how fair they are perceived to be.

Dependence on staff may have also attenuated the influence of narcissism, which is likely to be

curtailed when managers must share power with others and/or when they occupy lower-level

organizational positions (Kets de Vries & Miller, 1985).

In the present study, there is also the issue of the sampling of staff raters, which was at the

sole discretion of the subjects. Although analyses determined that the proportion of a subject's

total staff that he or she asked to participate in the study, as well as the proportion of staffers who

completed the questionnaires, did not vary as a function of narcissism, it is still not possible to

determine whether more narcissistic managers used a different sampling procedure than did less

narcissistic managers. Ideally, future research would include a sample of managers for whom the

ratings of all direct reports was available. Even if this were the case, there would still be the

danger that narcissistic managers hire their staffs using different criteria than non-narcissistic

managers. For example, Ashford (1989) cites the example of Henry Ford who surrounded

himself with "yes-men" and Yukl (1994) describes the tendency of narcissistic leaders to

surround themselves with loyal and uncritical staff.

Contextual effects of different workplaces

In the current study, in addition to the risk of systematic error distorting the relationship

between narcissism and fairness, there is also the possibility that random error obscured the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variables. The 91 participants were from 91 different work environments in a wide variety of jobs in a wide variety of industries located in various locations across the United States. Some contextual factors may have increased the impact of narcissism on self and other rated fairness while others may have lessened that impact. In general, situational factors may moderate the extent to which narcissism leads to self enhancing biases and may determine whether self-enhancement is a general phenomenon or is specific to narcissists (Farwell and Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998).

Ashford (1989) states that some work environments may be sufficiently stress-free to enable unrealistic self-enhancement to persist, while other, more demanding work environments may prohibit ego defensiveness. While it is not possible to assess the stress levels at the work organizations in the present study, the fact that the narcissism composite correlated negatively with the number of times subjects had been promoted in their careers may constitute evidence that the organizations where the subjects are working or have worked may be less hospitable to narcissists. Additionally, the narcissism composite had a negative correlation with staff tenure, r = -.17, indicating that the managers' narcissism may cause higher turnover among their staffs.

In the present study there was evidence that contextual variables played a part in the results. For example, the length of time that a staff rater had reported to a supervisor was predictive of ratings across multiple fairness categories, with greater tenure under a supervisor predicting higher staff ratings in the following categories: consistency (r = .2); empathy (r = .16); equality (r = .2); transactional fairness (r = .16); and treatment (r = .27). The number of hours that a supervisor spends with employees was also predictive of staff fairness ratings, but in a negative

direction. Hours spent with staff correlated negatively with staff ratings in the following categories: consistency (-.13); empathy (-.12); relative fairness (-.17); supportiveness (-.17); transactional fairness (-.15); treatment (-.10); and voice (-.12). Tenure under a supervisor and hours spent with staff did not correlate significantly with the NPI, the CPI or the narcissism composite. As mentioned previously, other variables, such as subjects' ages and number of times they had been promoted in their careers did correlate with the independent variables.

Although there were no contextual variables that correlated significantly with both the independent variables and the dependent variables, it is still possible that extraneous variables may have mediated the relationship between narcissism and fairness. Future research might include business managers from a single organization who occupy the same position as one another, in order to control for the situational variables that are likely to impact the manifestations of narcissism in general and their impact on fairness in particular. Additionally, a study of managers within a single organization would enable an examination of managers' interactional fairness without the potential confounds of varying organizational policies and procedures which may have contributed to the ambiguity of the results in the present study.

Even within a single organization, managers should be matched in terms of demographic variables such as age, educational level, and organizational tenure in order to limit the additional variance that such individual differences might cause. Ideally, their staffs would be also matched on these dimensions. The study of a single organization could also reap the benefits of in-depth case studies and qualitative research which might be useful methodologies for the study of the narcissism on the workplace (Brown, 1997).

<u>Contextual effects of the study itself</u>

There is the possibility that the self-reports and staff ratings were both influenced by the methods employed in the present study. Staff raters might have been concerned that their ratings would not be fully anonymous, and the amount of demographic information that was left blank on the questionnaires supports this interpretation. Even if the staff raters had been convinced that their ratings were anonymous, low ratings might anger their supervisors. For a manager with only 3 staff raters, each staffer might have felt that his or her ratings would be an important determinant of the final staff rating. It might have even been the case that staffers of more narcissistic managers were more likely to give inflated ratings because they feared reprisals.

It might also have been the case, for example, that subjects rated themselves more modestly than they ordinarily would have because they knew that their self-ratings were going to be compared and contrasted with the ratings by their staffs. In fact, their incentive for participation, as described in the solicitation letter, was "a personal and confidential report which will compare and contrast how you rate yourself with how you are rated by your staff". This may have lead to attempts on the part of subjects to rate themselves as they guessed their staffs would rate them rather than how they believed themselves to be. If that were the case, it would have been an example of what Weary-Bradley (1978) calls "counterdefensive attribution" which means that people rate themselves more modestly when their attributions are public and subject to challenge by the ratings of others.

Weary-Bradley wrote "An individual may not want to accept undue credit for good

outcomes and deny credit for bad outcomes if he is explicitly told that his

performance is the major object of study and if his too-positive self presentation

could be invalidated." (p.66). Weary et. al (1982) conducted a study in which there was support

for this assertion and concluded: "attribution is as much a *social* as it is an individual

psychological phenomenon." (p. 158). Miller (1978) differentiated between a person's *perception*

of causality and a person's *description* of causality.

Given that modesty may be a better self-presentation strategy than self-aggrandizement

(Baumeister, 1982), there is likely to be a difference between public and private attributions,

particularly for narcissists. Morf (1994) found that more narcissistic individuals were self-

aggrandizing when writing self-descriptive sentences but that they were not more self-

aggrandizing than less narcissistic individuals when they were asked to pick and choose among

their self-descriptive sentences for use in a conversation with an interaction partner.

Given that rating oneself more positively than one is rated by others can be a source of

embarrassment and threats to public esteem according to Weary-Bradley, there is the possibility

that narcissists would be even more vigilant than other subjects in attempting to avoid the

humiliation of verifiably inflated self-ratings. Subjects distributed the questionnaires to their

staffs and may have seen that they would be rated on the exact same items that they were

answering. A knowledge of the staff questionnaire may have lead to an even greater concern with

the potential invalidation of their self-ratings. Narcissists may also be willing to publicly take

blame for negative outcomes in order to gain the esteem of others, especially since they are

highly dependent on acclaim (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995). In other words, when it comes to

narcissists, self esteem and public esteem may both be powerful factors with opposing influences

on attributions (Hartouni, 1992).

It might also be the case that the relationships between narcissism, attributions, and self-ratings of fairness are more complex than they are conceptualized to be in the present study. Previous research has also yielded equivocal results about the relationship between narcissism and attribution. For example, Hartouni (1992) and Rhodewalt and Morf (1995, 1998) found that the NPI was related to self-attributions for positive outcomes but not the denial of responsibility for negative outcomes. An interesting question is whether the self-assessment of fairness is framed in a positive or a negative way. Some people may frame the questions as being about the extent to which they succeed at being fair while others may frame them as being about the extent to which they fail to be fair.

Levels of Analysis:

One potential reason why the results were not as expected is that the independent variables were not specified at the most useful level of analysis. It might be the case, for example, that narcissism is too broad a construct to enable specific predictions to be made. Raskin and Terry (1988) wrote "an instrument that purports to measure the construct of narcissism should reflect the multidimensionality inherent in the construct itself" (p. 892). Therefore, the use of a composite based on the CPI and the NPI, or even these two tests themselves, might be too general for the present purposes. In order to examine the alternative hypothesis that subcomponents of narcissism might succeed in predicting self and other rated fairness where the general factor for narcissism had failed, the seven subfactors were correlated

with all the subject and staff rating composites. As was the case with the general

factor of narcissism, none of these subfactors yielded a pattern of results in

support of the hypotheses. Therefore, utilizing a lower level of analysis of the NPI data did not

help illuminate the relationship between narcissism and fairness.

At a higher level of analysis, several authors have developed categorization systems for

narcissists. Fiscalini (1993) claimed that there is great heterogeneity among narcissists and listed

subtypes of narcissist such as the arrogant narcissist, the manipulative narcissist, and the

ambition-ridden narcissist. Wink (1996) differentiated between overt (exhibitionistic) narcissism

and covert (closet) narcissism, and it is likely that overt narcissists would be more likely to

alienate their staffs than would covert narcissists.

Kets de Vries & Miller (1985) differentiated between three different kinds of narcissistic

leaders: reactive, self-deceptive and constructive. According to these authors, these different

kinds of narcissists display different levels of the DSM diagnostic criteria. They claimed that the

reactive narcissist does not listen to advisors or subordinates, while the self-deceptive narcissist

will try to make a show of appearing interested in or sympathetic to the opinions of subordinates.

The typology of narcissists developed by Kets de Vries & Miller (1985) has implications

for the mapping of narcissism to fairness because, for example, the authors claimed that the

reactive narcissist is much more concerned with being transformational than being transactional,

while the self-deceptive leader is likely to be more transactional. While it might be the case that

there are different kinds of narcissists for whom the hypotheses could receive support, the

absence of an shared categorization system for narcissists in the literature (Raskin and Novacek,

1991) or in this study precludes the possibility of segmenting the subjects in a more fine-grained

way than their scores on the two global narcissism measures.

Alternatively, narcissism may not have had the predicted effects in the present study because of issues at a higher level of analysis. For example, the influence of narcissism may be moderated by other individual differences which were not measured here. More accurate predictions may have been possible if narcissism could have been included in higher-order taxonomies. In other words, rather than examining narcissism alone, the inclusion of other traits like subjective well-being, defensiveness, and self-esteem (Emmons, 1987) or hostility, grandiosity, and dominance (Raskin, Novacek and Hogan, 1991) would enable a consideration of narcissism within larger personality configurations.

Just as some aspects of narcissism are adaptive and some are not (Emmons, 1984,1987), so too might some narcissists be well adjusted and others may not depending on other aspects of their personalities. An example of a theorist who locates narcissism in a higher-order system is Rothstein (1984), who claimed that the trait of narcissism cannot be considered either healthy or pathological without examining it in the larger context of an individual's entire personality structure. Rothstein believed that narcissism could be successfully integrated by a healthy personality but could also be integrated in a pathological manner by an unhealthy personality.

These level of analysis issues mean that to accurately predict the relationship between narcissism and self and other rated fairness, it may either be necessary to develop a typology of different kinds of narcissists, incorporate narcissism into larger constellations of traits, or both. Finer grain analyses at both the higher and the lower levels of analysis could help future research determine which other individual differences can independently or collectively moderate the impact of narcissism on self perceptions and perceptions by others.

The results in the present study are also limited by the validity of the NPI and the CPI. The NPI has been improved over time and its author, Raskin, views it as a work in progress (Raskin and Terry, 1988). Both the NPI and the CPI are self report measures and are therefore subject to the general weaknesses of self report measures in addition to their own specific weaknesses in their current states of development. Furthermore, as Rhodewalt & Morf (1995) pointed out, self report measures pose unique challenges for narcissists whose responses may be subject to distortion or whose surface self-conceptions or "ideal" selves may radically diverge from their deeper views of their "real" selves. These authors therefore advocate a multi-method approach to the assessment of narcissism. The present study does not include expert ratings of narcissism as additional independent variables as did John and Robins (1994).

Additional considerations

The present results supported the claim made by Messick et. al. (1985) about people demonstrating a bias in rating themselves as being more fair than other people. However, the present study differed from Messick et. al.'s study in several important respects and therefore the results need to be interpreted differently. Messick et. al. asked subjects to think of as many fair and unfair behaviors as they could, and depending on their perceptions of the frequency of that behavior as displayed by themselves versus other people, to preface the sentence with "I" or "they". In the present study, the participants were asked to make evaluative rather than frequentistic ratings with the subject of the sentence specified. In other words, Messick et. al.'s

study was more about recall and frequency and the present study was more about

recognition and evaluation.

Another difference is that the present study did not ask participants to evaluate specific instances of fairness or unfairness but to make ratings in more general way. However, the present study was more specific in the sense that the "other" was specified while Messick let the subjects pick their own comparison group. It may have been the case that when subjects wrote "they" they meant peers in the Messick study, while in the present case "they" was pre-specified as supervisors or staff. Self-enhancement in the Messick study meant that subjects believed themselves to be more fair than other people, while self-enhancement in the present study meant that subjects believed themselves to be more fair than their staffs believed them to be.

The present study was intended to extend the findings of John & Robins (1994), that narcissists self-enhance in the job performance domain, to the fairness domain. Their results were not replicated, and there are two potential explanations. The first is that there is some fundamental difference between the processes by which people self-assess fairness and performance and that therefore, narcissism impacts self-assessments in these two realms differentially. It may be the case that fairness is not a central issue for narcissists. While a narcissist may be more likely to believe that he or she is more intelligent, attractive or competent than others, it is not necessarily the case that narcissists will believe themselves to be more fair. Since fairness is intrinsically social and relational, it might be difficult for narcissists to individually "own" their fairness in the same sense that they might "own" artistic ability, physical attractiveness or job performance. Although fairness is likely to be socially valued, it might be the case that narcissists would fear that being fair is a sign of weakness or dependence on others.

Self-serving biases have been called "ego-defensive, ego-protective and ego-biased" (Miller & Ross, 1978). However, it may be that fairness is not ego-involving for people in general or for narcissists in particular. In the language of Freud's tripartite structure of the mind, fairness may be more super-ego involving than ego involving.

The second reason why the present results may have failed to support those of John & Robins is because of different methodologies. John & Robins used MBA students in an assessment center environment while the present study used Executive MBA students in a naturalistic environment. The present study used a six point rating scale while John & Robins used a ranking format, which has lower resolution and practical utility than a rating format (Kam, 1995), to circumvent the problem of observer harshness. However, the two studies have in common that they utilized the discrepancy between self and other ratings as the criterion for self-enhancement.

The empirical study of the nature and implications of self-other rating congruence is relatively new, has to date inspired only a few studies, and is characterized by a diversity of approaches and analyses (Church, 1997). The present study endeavored to take two steps simultaneously—to determine the relationship between self and other ratings of fairness and then to examine the impact of narcissism on that relationship. Because there was little or no correlation between self and other ratings of fairness, irrespective of narcissism, it was not possible to make any definitive statements about how narcissism contributes to the difference between self and other ratings of fairness. However, the fact that there was no correlation between self ratings and staff ratings of fairness in the present study is itself an interesting finding, especially since there was high congruence among the ratings of the staff of each

manager. This may reflect the different perspectives of actors and observers which

results in different attributions for the same behavior. However, it is not clear that

a straightforward attributional approach is appropriate for the study of fairness because

judgments of morality may be complex (Van Lange, 1991) while judgments about causality may

be more straightforward.

Since staff can display attributional biases just as their superiors do (Martinko & Gardner,

1987), the present study is also limited by the absence of criteria other than subjective staff

ratings. Future research could include fairness ratings by peers and superiors within the

organization, and customers and suppliers from outside of the organization. The inclusion of a

diverse set of "others" to rate a focal manager would enable a better perspective to emerge about

the ways in which narcissism might predict the level of congruence between self and various

others' ratings.

In general, correlating self-ratings with others' ratings begs the question of which is a

better reflection of reality (Ashford, 1989). Ashford's point is well taken when it comes to

subjective self versus other ratings of performance "reality". When it comes to fairness,

subjectivity and objectivity cannot be disentangled. In the present study, the staffs' perceptions of

managerial fairness were not just reflective of a manager's fairness—they constituted the fairness

criterion. In future research, a set of performance criteria could also be included which could help

illuminate the relationship between self and other fairness ratings and efficacy in a job.

Organizations differ in the extent to which they provide opportunities for narcissists to

thrive (Symington, 1993). Perhaps the contemporary workplace, with its constant demands for

responding to competitive challenges and accurately assessing one's own strengths and

weaknesses (Ashford, 1989) will be increasingly inhospitable to narcissists.

However, Ashford also claimed that accurate self-assessments are not always beneficial. She gave the example of an entrepreneur who must discount negative feedback about their new organizations and persist in their beliefs, seemingly irrational at the time, that they will prevail. It might also be the case that inflated self-perceptions are beneficial because people will to some extent form opinions of one another on the basis of how they each view themselves. In other words, there may be a positively self-fulfilling component of inflated self-views.

It is unclear however, whether narcissists will fare worse in the contemporary world of work or will successfully adapt to changing organizational realities. There is no clear consensus about the extent to which narcissism may be affected by changing circumstances. While Lasch (1978) believed that a society's level of narcissism can be affected by culture and history, other theorists conceive of narcissism as a more fixed individual difference.

In general, many authors have claimed, as does Kernberg (1975), that "narcissistic as a descriptive term has been both abused and overused." (p. 16), Rhodewalt and Morf (1998) claim that the prevalence of vague and contradictory definitions of narcissism in the past is an important reason why the construct of narcissism has only recently begun to appear in empirical investigations. While there is a general consensus in the literature that there is a quantitative continuum between normal and pathological narcissism (Wink, 1996), there is a noticeable absence of any specific description of the boundary between normal and pathological narcissism or discussion about the difference between people who have some narcissistic personality traits and people who have narcissistic personality disorder. Watson and Biderman (1993) claimed that situational factors can determine whether a person will exhibit normal or pathological narcissism.

Other theorists have speculated that healthy and unhealthy narcissism can coexist

in the same individual (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995).

There are paradoxes in the construct of narcissism (Emmons, 1984). Narcissists are

highly self-involved yet also keenly aware of how they are viewed by others—in other words

they are simultaneously independent of yet dependent on other people (Morf, 1994). They also

oscillate between feeling superior and special and feeling worthless and inferior (Wink, 1996). It

is possible that the equivocal results in the present study derive from these essential paradoxes in

the construct itself—narcissists may have tendencies to be less fair while at the same time caring

about how fair they are viewed to be.

These paradoxes also lead to seemingly paradoxical results in other empirical studies of

the social implications of narcissism. For example, Morf (1994) found that in some situations,

subjects who displayed self-aggrandizement were more liked by others than were less self

aggrandizing subjects. In the present study, subjects who rated highly on the NPI subfactor of

vanity were rated more favorably by their staffs on the fairness categories of consistency,

decision making, empathy, relative fairness, and treatment.

Perhaps staff members respond more positively to narcissistic managers because they are

"basking in the reflected glory" (Cialdini et. al., 1976) of their self-involved bosses. Smith &

Tyler (1997) differentiated between the benefits to self esteem of pride, or the prestige associated

in one's group membership versus respect, or how well one is treated within one's group. It may

be the case that narcissistic managers may inspire pride in the group even though they may not

treat members with respect. Brown (1997) believed that the right level of narcissism can benefit

groups and organizations by enabling them to project an image of importance, legitimacy and

status, thereby enhancing the self esteem of their members. The narcissism of the

staff was not measured in the present study, but it seems that the extent to which a

manager's narcissism can complement the narcissism of his or her staff will have implications

for how fair the staff believes the manager to be.

Conclusion

The main contribution of the present study was to take a first step into the uncharted

territory of self versus other ratings of fairness and their relationships with narcissism. The

empirical results in the present study are ambiguous with respect to the hypotheses and reflect the

complexity of the construct of narcissism and the challenges of correlational field studies. Future

research should include larger samples, control for situational variables, and multiple methods.

As the empirical study of narcissism progresses, conceptualizations and measurement tools for

narcissism will evolve and improve, enabling further exploration of the relationship between

narcissism and self and other ratings of fairness in the workplace.

Appendix A - DSM IV Narcissism 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. Lack 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.

Dear NYU Executive MBA candidate,

I'm a fourth year doctoral student in Industrial and Organizational Psychology at NYU. My dissertation research is about the relationship between an executive's personality and how fair the executive is perceived to be by his or her staff. Dean Berman has generously granted me permission to solicit voluntary participation by Executive MBA students in this research project.

The benefit to you of participating in this study will be a confidential, personalized feedback report. This report will compare and contrast how fair you judge yourself to be with how fair you are perceived to be by your staff, and will give you a new perspective on how your subordinates perceive and interpret your decisions and actions.

Fairness has been demonstrated to be a critical driver of employee loyalty, commitment, and "discretionary effort." Judgments of unfairness by employees can lead to a wide array of counterproductive organizational behavior and can slow an executive's advancement.

As part of my dissertation research, I will distribute two questionnaires, one for executives and the other for the employees who report to them. The first is for you to fill out, and contains a personality test and a fairness questionnaire which asks you to rate yourself. It takes approximately 15 minutes to complete.

The second questionnaire is for 3 to 6 of your subordinates to fill out, anonymously, and also takes roughly 15 minutes to finish. It consists only of a fairness questionnaire which substantially overlaps with your questionnaire. This will enable a comparison of how you rate yourself with how you are rated by your staff. I will provide self-addressed, stamped envelopes so that you and your subordinates can mail the questionnaires directly to me.

Your responses will remain completely confidential. Your staffs' responses will remain anonymous and will be shared, in aggregated form, only with you. In order to insure the complete confidentiality of the results, no data from either of the questionnaires will ever be presented or published except in the aggregate. If you are interested, I will also send you a copy of the final overall results and discussion.

Please contact me if you are interested in participating.

Sincerely,

Benjamin Dattner
130 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
212-501-8945
benj@psych.nyu.edu

Appendix C- Explanation letter to staff raters

Dear Sir/Madam,

_____ has volunteered to participate in a research project that I am conducting about fairness in the workplace. This project involves the comparison of how executives rate themselves with how they are rated by their staffs.

Attached please find an anonymous questionnaire that asks you to rate _____ on a variety of dimensions, as well as to provide some information about your general perceptions of your workplace and job.

Your ratings will be combined with those of your co-workers, and the aggregated ratings will provide useful feedback to _____ in the form of a confidential feedback report.

Your individual responses to the questionnaire will remain anonymous and confidential, and none of the information in the questionnaire will ever be shared other than in the aggregate.

Attached please find the questionnaire, as well as a self-addressed envelope to facilitate its return to me.

Please feel free to contact me if you have any questions.

Thank you for your participation.

Sincerely,

    Benjamin Dattner

130 West 57th Street
New York, NY 10019
(212) 501-8945

ben.dattner@nyu.edu

- Some of these questions ask you to rate yourself. *Others ask how you think your staff would rate you.*

	Not at all					Very/ A lot
1. How well do you know your employees?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. How much do the decisions made by you influence your staff?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3A. How consistent are your decisions across people and situations?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3B. *How consistent does your staff believe your decisions to be?*	1	2	3	4	5	6
4A. How fairly do you make decisions?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4B. *How fairly would your staff say that you make decisions?*	1	2	3	4	5	6
5A. How fairly do you treat your staff in general?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5B. *How fairly would your staff believe you are in general?*	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Relative to other managers, how much <u>more</u> important is it to you that your employees feel fairly treated?	1	2	3	4	5	6

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1A. My staff is able to influence the decisions I make	1	2	3	4	5	6
1B. *My staff believes that they are able to influence my decisions..........................*	1	2	3	4	5	6
2A. My decisions are equally fair to everyone	1	2	3	4	5	6
2B. *My staff believes that I am equally fair to everyone ....*	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. There are some employees that I favor more than others	1	2	3	4	5	6
4A. I treat my staff with respect	1	2	3	4	5	6
4B. *My staff believes that I treat them with respect..*	1	2	3	4	5	6
5A. I empathize with employees...	1	2	3	4	5	6
5B. *My staff would say that I empathize with employees ....*	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I treat employees the way I would want to be treated..	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I <u>do not</u> play favorites...	1	2	3	4	5	6
8A. I am fair in giving credit or assigning blame	1	2	3	4	5	6
8B. *My staff believes that I am fair when it comes to credit/blame.........................*	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I do my best to look out for employees	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. I treat employees like equals 1 2 3 4 5 6

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I repay employees who make extra efforts	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Other managers are more fair than I am	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I inspire loyalty among employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I give constructive criticism	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I feel superior to employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I take an interest in helping employees grow in their careers	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. I can see things from my employees' point of view	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. I ask employees for advice and feedback	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. I am always available if employees need to talk to me	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. My employees are satisfied with the way I treat them	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I divide my staff into people I do and do not like working with	1	2	3	4	5	6

Do you agree or disagree with these statements about your job and the organization in which you work?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. The organization really cares about my well-being	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. It would be easy for me to move to another job that I like as much as the one I have now	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I have good opportunities for promotion where I work	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I feel proud to be working where I am	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I am treated with respect by my work organization	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Sometimes I get so frustrated here that I want my organization to fail	1	2	3	4	5	6

7. When someone praises the accomplishments of my work organization, it feels like a personal compliment to me 1   2   3   4   5   6

8. I am familiar with the formal rules and policies of my work organization 1   2   3   4   5   6

9. At times I get very angry at the way I am treated by the organization.................. 1   2   3   4   5   6

10. The rules and procedures for decision-making in my organization are fair........ 1   2   3   4   5   6

Think of your **job in general**. All in all, to what extent do you agree or disagree that your job is:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. Worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Worse than most	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Better than most	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Undesirable	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6

What do you do in your work setting, **that is <u>not</u> part of your job description**. How often do you:

	Very often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Almost never	Never
1. Voluntarily do things that help your organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Volunteer to help to orient new employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Make innovative suggestions to help improve your work setting	1	2	3	4	5	6

How long have you been at the organization for which you currently work? _____ years _____ months

What industry is your organization a part of? _____

What is your job title? _____

How many times have you been promoted in your career? _____ In your organization? _____ How many pay raises have you gotten in your organization? ____

About how many hours a week do you spend at work? _____

How many people report to you directly? _____ Indirectly? _____

How many hours a week do you spend personally interacting with your staff at work? _____ outside of work/socially? _____

What is your gender?   [ ] male   [ ] female

In what year were you born? _____ Were you born in the US? _____ If not, how long have you lived here? _____

What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed?

   [ ] some high school   [ ] some college, technical school   [ ] grad./professional. school degree
   [ ] high school graduate   [ ] bachelor's degree   [ ] some grad/professional school

What category most appropriately describes your racial/ethnic background? _____

Staff Questionnaire   Supervisor's
name:_____

- Thank you for taking a few minutes to complete this questionnaire. Everything you write is **confidential and anonymous**.

- If you feel that any of the questions ask you for personal information that you would prefer not to provide, please leave the question blank.

- Some of the questions ask you to rate your manager. *Others ask how you think your manager would rate him/herself.*

	Not at all					Very/ A lot
	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. How well do you know your supervisor?	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. How much do the decisions made by your work supervisor influence your work situation?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3A. Are your supervisor's decisions consistent across people and situations?	1	2	3	4	5	6
3B. How consistent does your supervisor believe him/herself to be?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4A. How fairly does your work supervisor make decisions?	1	2	3	4	5	6
4B. How fairly does your supervisor believe he/she makes decisions?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5A. How fairly does your supervisor treat employees in general?	1	2	3	4	5	6
5B. How fairly does your supervisor think he/she treats employees?	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. How much <u>more</u> important is fairness to your supervisor as compared to other managers?	1	2	3	4	5	6

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. I am able to influence the decisions made by my supervisor	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. I am given an opportunity to express my views before my supervisor makes decisions	1	2	3	4	5	6

3.   My supervisor's decisions are made based upon facts, not personal biases and

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
opinions.	1	2	3	4	5	6
4A. My supervisor's decisions are equally fair to everyone	1	2	3	4	5	6
4B. My supervisor believes he/she is equally fair to everyone	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. My supervisor usually gives me an honest explanation for the decisions he/she makes...	1	2	3	4	5	6

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
6. I am one of my supervisor's favorite employees...	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. My supervisor takes account of my needs when making decisions....................	1	2	3	4	5	6
8A. My supervisor treats his/her employees with dignity	1	2	3	4	5	6
8B. My supervisor believes that he/she treats employees with dignity	1	2	3	4	5	6
9A. My supervisor empathizes with employees..	1	2	3	4	5	6
9B. My supervisor would say that he/she empathizes with employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. My supervisor treats people the way he/she would want to be treated.............	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. My supervisor <u>does not</u> play favorites	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. My supervisor <u>never</u> takes his/her bad moods out on employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
13A. My supervisor is fair in giving credit or assigning blame	1	2	3	4	5	6
13B. My supervisor believes that he/she is fair when it comes to credit/blame.....	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. My supervisor does his/her best to look out for the employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
15A. My supervisor cares about the well being of employees...............................	1	2	3	4	5	6
15B. My supervisor would say that he/she cares about employees' well being	1	2	3	4	5	6
16A. My supervisor treats employees like equals..	1	2	3	4	5	6
16B. My supervisor believes he/she treats employees like equals	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. My supervisor treats me better than he/she treats other employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. My supervisor repays employees who make extra efforts.................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. My supervisor exploits employees..	1	2	3	4	5	6

20.	My supervisor is talented at managing people	1	2	3	4	5	6
21.	Other managers are more fair than my supervisor is..	1	2	3	4	5	6
22A.	My supervisor is well liked by employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
22B.	*My supervisor believes that he/she is well liked by employees*	1	2	3	4	5	6
23.	My supervisor inspires loyalty among employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
24.	My supervisor gives constructive criticism...	1	2	3	4	5	6
25.	My supervisor <u>never</u> embarrasses employees in public	1	2	3	4	5	6
26.	My supervisor feels superior to employees..	1	2	3	4	5	6
27.	My supervisor takes an interest in helping employees grow in their careers ...	1	2	3	4	5	6

How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?

Strongly agree / *Agree* / *Slightly agree* / *Slightly disagree* / *Disagree* / *Strongly disagree*

28.	My coworkers are satisfied with the way they are treated by my supervisor ...	1	2	3	4	5	6
29.	My supervisor can see things from employees' point of view	1	2	3	4	5	6
30.	My supervisor has a friendly personality	1	2	3	4	5	6
31.	My supervisor asks employees for advice and feedback.................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
32.	My supervisor likes some employees more than others....................................	1	2	3	4	5	6
33.	I am satisfied with the way I am treated by my supervisor	1	2	3	4	5	6
34.	My co-workers take advantage of my supervisor's generosity	1	2	3	4	5	6
35.	My supervisor does a good job of managing overall	1	2	3	4	5	6
36.	Sometimes I get very angry at my supervisor	1	2	3	4	5	6
37.	My supervisor divides employees into two groups: those he/she does or those he/she does not like working with	1	2	3	4	5	6

Do you agree or disagree with these statements about your job and the organization in which you work:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1. My future opportunities for pay increases are <u>not</u> very favorable.........................	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. It would be easy for me to move to another job that I like as much as the one I have now...	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. I have good opportunities for promotion where I work	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. I feel proud to be working where I am...	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. I find that my values and the values where I work are very similar	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. I agree with what my organization stands for	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Sometimes I get so frustrated here that I want my organization to fail	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. My work is important to the way I think of myself as a person	1	2	3	4	5	6
9. When someone praises the accomplishments of my work organization, it feels like a personal compliment to me	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. When I talk about where I work I usually say "we" rather than "they"...............	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. I am familiar with the formal rules and policies of my work organization.........	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. The rules and procedures for decision-making in my organization are fair	1	2	3	4	5	6

Do you agree or disagree with these statements about your job and the organization in which you work:

	Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
13. The organization follows through on the decisions and promises it makes	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. I am treated with respect by my work organization	1	2	3	4	5	6
15. My needs are taken into account by my work organization when decisions are being made...	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Sometime I get very angry at the way I am treated by the organization..............	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. The organization really cares about my well being..	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. The organization disregards my best interests when it makes decisions.............	1	2	3	4	5	6
19. Help is available from my organization when I have a problem.........................	1	2	3	4	5	6

Think of your **job in general**. All in all, to what extent do you agree or disagree that your job is:

		Strongly agree	Agree	Slightly agree	Slightly disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
1.	Worthwhile	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Worse than most	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	Better than most	1	2	3	4	5	6
4.	Undesirable	1	2	3	4	5	6
5.	Enjoyable	1	2	3	4	5	6

What do you do in your work setting, **that is <u>not</u> part of your job description**. How often do you:

		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Seldom	Almost never	Never
1.	Voluntarily do things that help your organization.	1	2	3	4	5	6
2.	Volunteer to help to orient new employees	1	2	3	4	5	6
3.	Make innovative suggestions to help improve your work setting	1	2	3	4	5	6

How long have you been at the organization for which you currently work? _____ years _____ months

About how many hours a week do you spend at work? _____

How many times have you been promoted within your organization? _____

How many times have you gotten raises in your organization? _____

How long have you known your supervisor? _____ years _____ months

For how long have you reported to him/her? _____ years _____ months

How many hours a week do you spend personally interacting with your supervisor at work? _____ outside of work/socially? _____

Do you and your supervisor work at the same geographic location? _____

How many organizational levels above your job is your supervisor's job? _____

Is the supervisor you rated in this questionnaire the only person who you report to? _____
If not, how many other supervisors do you report to? _____

What is your gender?   [ ] male   [ ] female

In what year were you born? _____

Were you born in the United States? _____ If not, how long have you lived here? _____

What is the highest grade or year of school that you have completed?
    [ ] up to 8th grade   [ ] some college, technical school   [ ] grad./professional. school degree
    [ ] some high school   [ ] bachelor's degree
    [ ] high school graduate   [ ] some grad/professional school

What category most appropriately describes your racial/ethnic background? _____

References

Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp, 267 - 299). New York: Academic Press.

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

American Psychiatric Association. (1987). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders.* (3rd ed., revised). Washington, DC: Author.

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

Ashford, S.J. (1989). Self-assessments in organizations: a literature review and integrative model. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, *11*, 133 - 174.

Ashford, S.J. & Tsui, A.S. (1991). Self-regulation for managerial effectiveness: the role of active feedback seeking. *Academy of Management Journal*, *34 (2)*, 251 - 280.

Baumeister, R.F. (1982). A self-presentational view of social phenomena. *Psychological Bulletin*, 91 (1), 3 - 26.

Brown, A.D. (1997). Narcissism, identity and legitimacy. *Academy of Management Review*, *22 (3),* 643 - 686.

Cates, K.L. & Messick, D.M. (1996). Frequentistic adverbs as measures of egocentric

biases. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 26 (1),* Jan-Feb 1996, 155 - 161.

Chan Kwan Shing, D. (1987). *Are Chinese also fairer or more compassionate than others?* Unpublished psychology thesis, Chinese University of Hong Kong.

Church, A.H. (1997). Managerial self awareness in high-performing individuals in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 82 (2),* 281 - 292.

Church, A.H. & Bracken, D.W. (1997). Advancing the state of the art of 360-degree feedback. *Group & Organization Management, 22 (2),* 149 - 161.

Cialdini, R.B., Borden, R.J., Thorne, A., Walker, M.R., Freeman, S., & Sloan, L.R. (1976). Basking in reflected glory: three (football) field studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *34 (3)*, 366- 375.

Deustch, M. (1975). Equity, equality and need: What determines which value will be used as the basis for distributive justice? *Journal of Social Issues, 31 (3),* 137 - 149.

Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *48 (3)*, 291 - 305.

Emmons, R.A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52 (1),* 11 - 17.

Farwell, L. & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations, favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of*

Personality, *66 (1),* 65 - 83.

Fiscalini, J. (1993). Interpersonal relations and the problem of narcissism. In J. Fiscalini
& A.L. Grey (Eds.) *Narcissism and the interpersonal self*. New York: Columbia
University Press.

Freud. (1957). On Narcissism. In J. Strachey (Ed.). The standard edition of the complete
works of Sigmund Freud. (Vol. 144, pp. 69 – 102). London: Hogarth Press. (Original
work published 1914).

Gough, H.G. (1987). *The California Psychological Inventory administrator's guide*. Palo
Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Hartouni, Z.S. (1992). Effects of narcissistic personality organization on causal
attributions. *Psychological Reports*, *71*, 1339 - 1346.

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.

John, O. P. & Robins, R.W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual
differences in self- enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and
Social Psychology*, *66 (1),* 206 - 219.

Kam. S.M. (1995). *Self ratings of performance as reflections of narcissism, impression
management, and social comparison.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of
California, Berkeley.

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

Jason Aronson.

Kets de Vries, M.F.R. & Miller, D. (1985). Narcissism and leadership: An object relations perspective. *Human Relations*, *38 (6),* 583 - 601.

Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of self*. New York: International Universities Press.

Ladd, E.R., Welsh, M.C., Vitulli, W.F., Labbe, E.E. & Law, J.G. (1997). Narcissism and causal attribution. *Psychological Reports*, *80*, 171 - 178.

Lasch, C. (1978). *The culture of narcissism: American life in an age of diminishing expectations*. New York: Norton.

Leventhal, G.S. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K.J. Gergen, M.S. Greenberg & R.H. Willis (Eds.), *Social Exchange: Advances in Theory and Research.* New York: Plenum.

Liebrand, W.B.G., Messick, D.M. & Wolters, F.J.M. (1986). Why we are fairer than others: A cross-cultural replication and extension. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 22, 590 - 604.

Lind, E.A. & Tyler, T.R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.

Martinko, M.J. & Gardner, W.L. (1987). The leader/member attribution process. *Academy of Management Review*, *12 (2),* 235 - 249.

Messick, D.M., Bloom, S., Boldizar, J.P. & Samuelson, C.D. (1985). Why we are fairer than others. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *21*, 480 - 500.

Miller, D.T. & Ross, M. (1975). Self-serving biases in the attribution of causality: Fact or fiction? *Psychological Bulletin*, *82 (2),* 213 - 225.

Miller, D.T. (1978). What constitutes a self-serving attributional bias? A reply to Bradley. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36 (11),* 1221 - 1223.

Millon, T. (1981). *Disorders of personality: DSM-III: Axis II*. New York: Wiley.

Moorman, R.H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology, 76 (6)*, 845 - 855.

Morf, C.C. (1994). *Interpersonal consequences of narcissists' continual effort to maintain and bolster self-esteem*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah.

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

Raskin, R. & Novacek, J. (1991). Narcissism and the use of fantasy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *47 (4)*, 490 - 499.

Raskin, R., Novacek, J. & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self esteem management,

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, *60 (6),* 911 - 918.

Raskin, R. & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54 (5),* 890 - 902.

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

Rhodewalt, F. & Morf, C.C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74 (3),* 672 - 685.

Rothstein, A. (1984). *The narcissistic pursuit of perfection*. (2nd revised edition). New York: International Universities Press.

Sedikides, C., Campbell, W.K., Reeder, G.D., & Elliot, A.J. (1998). The self-serving bias in relational context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,*74 (2),* 378 - 386.

Smith, H.J. & Tyler, T.R. (1997). Choosing the right pond: The impact of group membership on self- esteem and group-oriented behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 33*, 146 - 170.

Symington, N. (1993). *Narcissism: a new theory*. London: Karnac Books.

Tanaka, K. (1993). Egocentric bias in perceived fairness: Is it observed in Japan? 81 *Social*

   Justice Research, 6, 273 - 285.

Taylor, S.E. (1989). *Positive illusions: Creative self-deceptions and the healthy mind*.

   New York: Basic Books.

Taylor, S.E. & Brown, J. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological

   perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, *103*, 193 – 210.

Thibault, J. and Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice: A psychological analysis*.

   Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tyler, T.R. (1988). What is procedural justice?: Criteria used by citizens to assess the

   fairness of legal procedures. *Law & Society Review, 22 (1),* 103 - 135.

Tyler, T.R. & Bies, (1990). Beyond formal procedures: The interpersonal context of

   procedural justice. In J.S. Carroll (Ed.), *Applied social psychology in business settings*

   (pp, 77 - 98). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Tyler, T.R. & Lind, E.A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. *Advances in*

   Experimental Social Psychology, 25, 115 - 191.

Tyler, T., Boeckmann, R.J., Smith, H. & Huo, Y. (1997). *Social justice in a diverse*

   society. Boulder, CO: Westview.

Van Lange, P.A.M. (1991). Being better but not smarter than others: the Muhammad Ali

    effect at work in interpersonal situations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 17 (6), 689 - 693.*

Watson, P.J. & Biderman, M.D. (1993). Narcissistic personality inventory factors,

    splitting and self- consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *61 (1)*, 41 - 57.

Weary Bradley, G. (1978). Self-serving biases in the attribution process: A re-

    examination of the fact or fiction question. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *36 (1)*, 56 - 71.

Weary, G., Harvey, J.H., Schwieger, P. Olson, C.T., Perloff, R. & Pritchard, S. (1982).

    Self- presentation and the moderation self-serving attributional biases. *Social Cognition*, 1 (2), 140 - 159.

Wink, P. & Gough, H.G. (1990). New Narcissism scales for the California psychological

    inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *54 (3-4),* 446 - 462.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61 (4),* 590 - 597.

Wink, P. (1996). Narcissism. In C.G. Costello (Ed.) *Personality characteristics of the personality disordered.* New York: Wiley.

Yukl, G.A. (1994). *Leadership in Organizations* (3rd Edition). Englewood Cliifs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.