

THE SELF-PRESENTATION PROFILE
OF GRANDIOSE NARCISSISM

by

JOHN MILTON ADAMS

WILLIAM HART, COMMITTEE CHAIR
PHILIP GABLE
EDWARD MERRILL
ALEXA TULLETT
DARRIN GRIFFIN

A DISSERTATION

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the Department of Psychology
in the Graduate School of
The University of Alabama

TUSCALOOSA, ALABAMA

2016

Copyright John Milton Adams 2016
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

Although it is generally accepted that grandiose narcissism is related to using self-presentation tactics, many fundamental questions about this issue remain unanswered. For example, among 12 common self-presentation tactics, which are typical of grandiose narcissism? Is grandiose narcissism related to assertive self-presentation, defensive self-presentation, or both? How does the pattern of self-presentation-tactic use differ between grandiose narcissism and two conceptually-overlapping traits – vulnerable narcissism and self-esteem? What are some reasons *why* narcissism might relate to the increased use of self-presentation tactics? In this dissertation, these questions were addressed across two studies. In both studies, grandiose narcissism was related to increased use of assertive but not defensive self-presentation tactics. This self-presentation style differed from vulnerable narcissism (Study 1), which was related to both assertive and defensive tactic use, and also from self-esteem (Study 1 & 2), which was negatively related to using either type of self-presentation tactic. The relation between grandiose narcissism and assertive self-presentation-tactic use was not strongly influenced by temperament-based factors (e.g., BIS/BAS, impulsivity; Study 1). Instead, the relation between grandiose narcissism and increased use of assertive tactics was influenced by unique expectations that assertive self-presentation tactics are effective for making a positive impression on others (Study 2).

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my parents and my advisor: very patient people.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

<i>a</i>	Cronbach's index of internal consistency
<i>F</i>	Fisher's <i>F</i> ratio: A ratio of two variances
<i>M</i>	Mean
<i>SD</i>	Standard deviation
<i>N</i>	Sample size
<i>p</i>	Probability associated with the occurrence under the null hypothesis of a value as extreme as or more extreme than the observed value
<i>r</i>	Pearson product-moment correlation
<i>b</i>	Computed value regression coefficient
<	Less than
=	Equal to

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank my parents, my advisor, my committee members, the undergraduate research assistants in my lab, and my graduate-student peers. Without you, I would not have been able to complete this project. Thank you.

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	ii
DEDICATION.....	iii
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS.....	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER 2 STUDY 1.....	13
CHAPTER 3 STUDY 2.....	26
CHAPTER 4 GENERAL DISCUSSION.....	31
REFERENCES.....	36
APPENDIX A: STUDY MEASURES, IN ORDER OF APPEARANCE.....	43
APPENDIX B: IRB APPROVAL LETTER.....	61

LIST OF TABLES

1.1 Table 1 Descriptions of Self-Presentation Tactics and Sample Items from the SPTS	4
2.1 Table 2 Relations (r) between Variables in Study 1	18
3.1 Table 3 Relations (r) between Variables in Study 2	29

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Grandiose narcissism¹ is related to caring deeply about looking talented, competent, and superior in the eyes of others (Bosson et al., 2008; Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002; Paulhus & John, 1998; Raskin & Novacek, 1991; Rose & Campbell, 2004; Wallace, 2014). Self-presentation tactics are interpersonal behaviors that people use to make themselves look better in the eyes of others (Lee et al., 1999; Roulin, Bangerter, & Levashina, 2014; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984). Given the clear logical connection between these two subjects, one would think that the nature of their inter-relation would be a ripe topic for research. Surprisingly, however, prior research has not attempted to profile grandiose narcissism in terms of self-presentation-tactic use. The current research addressed this issue.

The current research seems particularly worthwhile in light of recent research on grandiose narcissism's relation to unique views toward impression management. While various prior theories of grandiose narcissism usually suggest that narcissistic behavior is primarily driven by emotional factors (e.g., Foster & Trimm, 2008; Kernis, 2001; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Vazire & Funder, 2006), several recent studies suggest that narcissistic interpersonal behavior is actually relatively thoughtful, yet misguided. For example, while most people have negative views toward self-promotion (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1982; Weary et al., 1982), grandiose narcissism is related to being more forgiving of 'flashy' people and their self-

¹ We refer to individuals who score high on dimensional, sub-clinical trait measures of narcissism (typically the Narcissistic Personality Inventory; NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988) as "narcissists" and those scoring low as "non-narcissists." This labeling was chosen because it is conventional and concise. We are not referring to a categorical, clinical distinction.

promoting behaviors (Adams, Hart, & Burton, 2015; Burton et al., under review; Hart & Adams, 2014). Correspondingly, grandiose narcissism is related to viewing self-promotion as a relatively effective way to make a positive impression on others (Hart, Adams, & Burton, 2016). One reason for these unique views toward self-promotion might be that grandiose narcissism is related to being relatively insensitive to following social rules (Adams, Florell, Burton, & Hart, 2014). Indeed, when it comes to identity concerns, grandiose narcissism is related to being more focused on appearing powerful than nice (Campbell et al., 2002), and some data indicate that these unique identity concerns may be a fundamental cause for their tendency toward interpersonal aggression (Hart, Adams, Tortoriello, & Hamilton, unpublished manuscript). This collection of evidence for unique identity concerns associated with grandiose narcissism is new and burgeoning, however, and at this nascent stage it would be best served by direct, descriptive research. As such, the current research aims to provide a missing piece to this new puzzle by constructing a profile of grandiose narcissism in the context of self-presentation tactics.

In particular, the current research aims to profile grandiose narcissism in terms of 12 self-presentation tactics. These 12 tactics appear frequently in prior impression-management research (e.g., Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976; Schlenker, 1980; Jones & Pittman, 1982), and their frequency of use can be measured by the self-presentation tactics scale (SPTS; Lee et al., 1999). For each of these 12 tactics, a description and an example item from the SPTS is provided in Table 1. These tactics are often categorized as either *assertive* (intended to assert a desirable reputation) or *defensive* (intended to dodge or mitigate an undesirable reputation; Tedeschi & Lindskold, 1976; Tedeschi, 1981; Tedeschi & Melburg, 1984), and the current research tested whether grandiose narcissism is related to being more prone to engage in assertive or defensive tactics. This goal seems worthwhile, because different theories of grandiose narcissism lead to different

predictions about how grandiose narcissism should relate to the use of defensive self-presentation-tactics.

Table 1

Descriptions of Self-Presentation Tactics and Sample Items from the SPTS

Category	Tactic	Description	Sample item (SPTS)
Assertive	<i>Enhancement</i>	Advertising or exaggerating the value of one's accomplishments or possessions	"When I succeed at a task, I emphasize to others how important the task was"
	<i>Intimidation</i>	Provoking fear to gain respect or influence	"I do things to make people afraid of me so that they will do what I want"
	<i>Ingratiation</i>	Flattering, helping, or agreeing with others to be liked	"I express the same attitudes as others so they will accept me"
	<i>Entitlement</i>	Proactively taking credit (especially undue credit) for positive outcomes	"I point out the positive things I do which other people fail to notice"
	<i>Blasting</i>	Saying negative things about others to look better by comparison	"I make negative statements about people belonging to rival groups"
	<i>Supplication</i>	Self-presenting as weak to get help or sympathy from others	"I tell others they are stronger or more competent than me in order to get others to do things for me"
Defensive	<i>Exemplification</i>	Trying to serve as a positive example for others to follow	"I act in ways I think others should act"
	<i>Excuse-making</i>	Denying responsibility for negative outcomes.	"I make up excuses for poor performance"
	<i>Justification</i>	Denying the severity or undesirability of negative outcomes caused by the actor	"I offer good reasons for my behavior no matter how bad it may seem to others"
	<i>Disclaimer</i>	Making statements prior to a performance that attempt to lower expectations	"When I believe I will not perform well, I offer excuses beforehand"
	<i>Self-handicapping</i>	Placing identifiable obstacles in the way of success to prevent dispositional attributions for failure	"I do not prepare well enough for exams because I get too involved in social activities"
	<i>Apologies</i>	Admitting guilt with the goal of convincing the audience that the negative outcome does not reflect the actor's true character	"If I harm someone, I apologize and promise not to do it again"

Grandiose Narcissism and Self-Presentation Tactics: Different Theories and Predictions

Based on some theories, one might reasonably predict that grandiose narcissism relates to increased use of both assertive *and* defensive self-presentation tactics. These theories suggest that grandiose narcissism is driven by deep-seated feelings of inadequacy and insecurity (Kernis, 2001; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991; Rhodewalt & Peterson, 2008). According to these theories, narcissists' feelings of inadequacy and insecurity lead to over-compensatory behaviors, such as bragging, intimidation, and entitlement (i.e., *assertive* self-presentation tactics). At the same time, psychological insecurity tends to relate to increased use of *defensive* self-presentation tactics. For example, in one study (Sadler, Hunger, & Miller, 2010), participants completed the SPTS, as well as the multidimensional personality questionnaire. This study found that negative emotionality was among the strongest predictors of both assertive and defensive self-presentation-tactic use. Given this finding, if grandiose narcissism is driven by deep-seated feelings of inadequacy (i.e., a form of negative emotionality), one would expect that grandiose narcissism should relate to increased use of both assertive *and* defensive self-presentation tactics.

Other research, however, implies that grandiose narcissism does *not* entail psychological insecurity (Wallace, 2011). For example, in studies where participants are asked to rate the likability of various traits and whether they possess the traits themselves (Adams et al., 2015; Hart & Adams), grandiose narcissism is related to consistently claiming that they find traits that denote insecurity (e.g., sensitive, timid) as unlikable and that they do not possess such traits. This finding is particularly persuasive, considering that grandiose narcissism was related to being more likely admit possession of various socially undesirable traits (e.g., rude, aggressive, selfish, arrogant). Other research also points to the idea that grandiose narcissism is not related to being

insecure or sensitive (and, to the contrary, is instead related to being quite *insensitive*). For example, grandiose narcissism is positively related to self-esteem (Brown & Zeigler-Hill, 2004), and it is inversely related to anxiety, depression, neuroticism, shame proneness, and feelings of vulnerability (Aalsma, Lapsley, & Flannery, 2006; Campbell, Foster, & Brunell, 2004; Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Rose, 2002; Watson & Biderman, 1993). Similarly, grandiose narcissism is inversely related to internalizing negative emotions in response to social exclusion (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Finally, while grandiose narcissism is related to having a highly sensitive approach-motivation system, it is related to having a relatively insensitive avoidance-motivation system (Foster & Trimm, 2008). Based on this variety of evidence that grandiose narcissists are *not* particularly insecure or sensitive (and that they are actually somewhat aggressive and *insensitive*), in the current research, it was predicted that grandiose narcissism would relate to increased use of assertive but *not* defensive self-presentation tactics.

In particular, it was predicted that grandiose narcissism would relate to heightened use of assertive tactics that convey identity images that are typically desired by and can be reasonably claimed by grandiose narcissists: authoritative/self-sufficient, dominant, and glibly charming (Buss & Chiodo, 1991; Hart & Adams, 2014). Accordingly, grandiose narcissism should relate to heightened use of: enhancement, entitlement, intimidation, blasting, and ingratiation. Grandiose narcissism should *not* relate to heightened use of exemplification (modeling “positive” behavior) or supplication (appearing needy for sympathy), as these two tactics convey images that are incongruous with grandiose narcissists’ reputation and self-views (Hart & Adams, 2014).

Although we expected grandiose narcissism would be more weakly related to defensive tactics, it seemed possible that grandiose narcissism might relate to certain, specific defensive

tactics. For example, grandiose narcissism might relate to heightened use of justifications (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; Kernis & Sun, 1994), which can involve putting a *positive* spin on negative events. Justifications are unique because, although remedial, they can involve aspects of assertive self-presentation (Schlenker, 1980). Also, it seemed likely that grandiose narcissism might relate to *reduced* use of apologies (Adams, Florell, Burton, & Hart, 2014).

How Self-Presentation-Tactic Use might Differ for Similar Traits

Vulnerable narcissism. An additional goal of the current research was to differentiate the self-presentation profile of grandiose narcissism from the self-presentation profile of two conceptually-overlapping traits: vulnerable narcissism and self-esteem. Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism are similar in that both are related to entitlement, exploitativeness, and grandiose fantasies (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003). They differ, however, in ways that might result in different self-presentation profiles. Most centrally, while the issue of whether grandiose narcissists tend to be insecure is debatable (Wallace, 2011), the evidence for vulnerable narcissists' insecurity has been consistent. Indeed, various studies suggest that vulnerable narcissism is related to being shy, neurotic, introverted, hypersensitive, high in shame-proneness, low in self-esteem, and fearful or anxious in attachment style (Besser & Priel, 2010; Foster, Shenese, & Goff, 2009; Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Miller, Dir, Gentile, Wilson, Pryor, & Campbell, 2010; Miller, Hoffman, Gaughan, Gentile, Maples, & Campbell, 2011; Wink, 1991). These characteristics tend to relate to increased use of both assertive and defensive self-presentation tactics (Sadler et al., 2010). Thus, in the current research, it was expected that vulnerable narcissism would relate to increased use of both assertive *and* defensive self-presentation tactics.

In particular, for assertive tactics, it was expected that vulnerable narcissism would relate to self-presentation tactics that convey self-importance (enhancement, entitlement and blasting) and are designed to both foster acceptance and prevent social rejection (ingratiation). Like grandiose narcissists, vulnerable narcissists should be reluctant to use exemplification, because they probably realize they are not ‘role models.’ Unlike grandiose narcissists, (a) vulnerable narcissists are likely to strategically act weak to gain favors and sympathy (supplication); (b) vulnerable narcissists probably do not rely on intimidation, because they do not come across as powerful people (Miller et al., 2011) and probably cannot convincingly convey that image. For defensive tactics, it was anticipated that vulnerable narcissism would relate to the heightened use of accounting tactics (excuses and justifications) and tactics that reduce expectations (disclaimers and self-handicapping). Vulnerable narcissism is unlikely to relate to heightened use of apologies, because vulnerable narcissists might think that admitting fault is a sign of weakness that could leave them susceptible to rejection (Besser & Priel, 2010).

Self-esteem. Self-esteem is consistently correlated with grandiose narcissism (Brown & Zeigler-Hill, 2004; Campbell et al., 2002), and both traits are related to endorsing unrealistically positive self-views (self-esteem: Alicke & Govorum, 2005; Brown, 1986; Brown & Kobayashi, 2002; Colvin, Block, & Funder, 1995; Sedikides, Gaertner, & Toguchi, 2003; Taylor & Brown, 1988; grandiose narcissism: Gabriel, Critelli, & Ee, 1994; John & Robins, 1994; Rhodewalt & Eddings, 2002; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). Also, similar to grandiose narcissism, some prior research suggests that high self-esteem is related to engaging in various self-presentation tactics. For example, high self-esteem is related to: attributing failure to external factors (i.e., excuses; Fitch 1970; Ickes & Layden, 1978); taking credit for group success (entitlement; Schlenker, Soraci, & McCarthy, 1976); recalling more negative sentences about others after failing a ‘social

sensitivity test' (blasting; Luhtanen & Crocker, 1991); and practicing less, especially when practice time is made public, for an upcoming event that would be evaluated by others (self-handicapping; Tice & Baumeister, 1990). These prior findings make it seem plausible that self-esteem might positively relate to certain self-presentation tactics.

At the same time, however, a great deal of research makes it seem unlikely that self-esteem should relate to increased use of self-presentation tactics. For example, self-esteem is negatively related to neuroticism and negative affect (Judge, Erez, Bono, & Thoresen, 2002; Watson, Suls, & Haig, 2002), while it is positively related to positive affect and optimism (Diener & Diener, 2009; Lyubomirsky, Tkach, & DiMatteo, 2006; Watson et al., 2002). These relations all imply that self-esteem should relate to diminished use of self-presentation tactics (Sadler et al., 2010). Furthermore, self-esteem seems generally related to authenticity (Davis, Hicks, Schlegel, Smith, & Vess, 2014; Goldberg, 1981; Heppner et al., 2008; Paulhus & Martin, 1988; Tracy, Cheng, Robins, & Trzesniewski, 2009), and authenticity seems incompatible with using self-presentation tactics, which aim to deliberately manipulate self-image perceptions. Also, whereas grandiose narcissism is related to inflating self-views related to agency and power, self-esteem is related to inflating self-views related to communal traits (i.e., they like to view themselves as nice; Campbell et al., 2002). Because people tend to avoid self-promotion when they want to seem nice (Greenberg et al., 1982; Weary et al., 1982), high self-esteem individuals' tendency to self-present as high in communal traits might diminish their tendency to engage in manipulative self-presentation tactics. For all of these reasons, we expected that self-esteem would not relate (or maybe even negatively relate) to increased use of self-presentation tactics. Still, as recent reviews on the differentiation of grandiose narcissism and high self-esteem have called for further research (Brummelman, Thomaes, & Sedikides, 2016), it seems worthwhile to

explore the difference between grandiose narcissism and high self-esteem in terms of self-presentation-tactic use.

Exploring Possible Reasons for Grandiose Narcissists' Self-Presentation-Tactic Use

Lastly, the current research also measured individual differences on traits that might covary with both narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use. For example, grandiose narcissism is related to increased impulsivity (Vazire & Funder, 2006) and increased approach-motivation (Foster & Trimm, 2008). Concurrently, it seems possible that these two variables could promote the use of assertive self-presentation tactics. In the current research, measuring these variables enabled an assessment of the influence of grandiose narcissism on assertive self-presentation-tactic use while controlling for possible common causes (i.e., enhanced impulsivity or approach motivation).

Another possibility is that grandiose narcissists' increased use of self-presentation tactics is driven by the fact that they (vs. non-narcissists) have unique expectations about how to effectively make a positive impression on others. For example, some prior research suggests that grandiose narcissists (vs. non-narcissists) view self-promotion as a more effective means of making a good impression (Hart et al., 2016). In this study, participants that scored high on a measure of dispositional narcissism were more likely to agree with statements such as: "*If a person wants to make a good impression on others, the person should set up conversations in which his/her accomplishments come up naturally*"; and, "*If a person wants to make a good impression on others, the person should seek out or set up situations in which s/he can demonstrate his/her talents*" (Hart et al., 2016, p. 70). As such, although it is the norm for self-presentation tactics to be viewed as socially undesirable (Greenberg et al., 1982; Weary et al.,

1982), narcissists might view them as effective, and this might drive their increased use of self-presentation tactics.

Overview of Studies, Hypotheses, and Theoretical Implications of Possible Outcomes

In Study 1, participants ($N = 303$) completed measures of grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, and self-esteem; they also completed the self-presentation tactics scale (SPTS; Lee et al., 1999), which measures usage of 12 different tactics, as well as propensity for using assertive and defensive tactics. Study 1 also measured possible temperament-based covariates (e.g., BIS/BAS, verbal impulsivity). Additionally, Study 1 included a measure of social-desirability bias; to the extent that the narcissism and self-esteem variables are not positively associated with social-desirability concerns, we can feel more confident in the veracity of the conclusions drawn from the self-report measures. In Study 2, in addition to completing a measure of grandiose narcissism, self-esteem, and the SPTS, participants ($N = 264$) completed items that assessed their perceptions of the effectiveness of each of the 12 tactics. Additionally, to address theorists' discrepant views regarding grandiose narcissists' insecurity, Study 2 included a measure of fear of negative evaluation.²

In the context of these two studies, different outcomes would imply support for different broad ideas about grandiose narcissism. It was expected that grandiose narcissism would relate to increased use of assertive but not defensive self-presentation tactics. Given that defensive-tactic use is related to low self-esteem and high negative emotionality (Sadler et al., 2010), this outcome would support the broad idea that grandiose narcissists tend to be relatively insensitive and are not particularly insecure. By contrast, if grandiose narcissism *is* related to increased use of defensive tactics, this would support the idea that grandiose narcissistic behavior stems from a deep-seated sense of insecurity and vulnerability. This idea would also be supported if, in Study

² Note: the reason we spread these measures across two studies was to reduce participant fatigue.

2, grandiose narcissism shares a similar pattern of correlations to self-presentation-tactic use as fear of negative evaluation; if it is true that grandiose-narcissistic behavior (e.g., using self-presentation tactics) is driven by insecurity, then a measure of insecurity should relate similarly to self-presentation-tactic use. A positive relation between grandiose narcissism and assertive-tactic use would be consistent with both ideas, whereas a null or negative relation would contradict both ideas, as well as several prior studies that suggest grandiose narcissism is associated with a variety of aggressive, self-promotional behavior (e.g., Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; Lobbetael, Baumeister, Fiebig, & Eckel, 2014; Miller et al., 2013; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Paulhus, 1998; Paulhus, Westlake, Calvez, & Harms, 2013).

CHAPTER 2

STUDY 1

Method

Participants. Participants were 317 University of Alabama undergraduates in the PY101 subject pool. Fourteen of these participants were removed because they did not complete the study, leaving a final sample of $N = 303$ (66 male).³ Mean participant age was 18.79 ($SD = 2.08$). As for race, the sample was predominately composed of white people (81.5% white; 10% black; 9.5% other).

Procedure & measures. Under the guise of an exploratory study regarding the internal validity of a variety of personality questionnaires, participants responded to each of the scales below. The study was administered online via Qualtrics, so participants responded at a time and location of their choice. The order of the scales (and the items on each scale) was randomized within participants. After completing these scales, participants responded on some items assessing demographics and awareness of the true purpose of the study (e.g., “*What do you think was the purpose of this study?*”). Finally, participants were debriefed.

Grandiose narcissism. As an assessment of dispositional grandiose narcissism, participants completed the narcissistic personality inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Each

³ Gender did not moderate any of the main findings in Study 1 or Study 2. This lack of moderation is not too surprising given recent evidence suggesting high amounts of measurement equivalence across the genders for narcissism measures (Grijvala et al., 2015; see also Wright, Lukowitsky, Pincus, & Conroy, 2010). In Study 1, males used assertive tactics significantly more frequently than females ($p = .002$), but this difference was not significant in Study 2 ($p = .24$). The gender difference in defensive-tactic use was not significant in either study ($ps > .4$). In Study 1, men had higher scores on grandiose (NPI) narcissism than women ($p = .012$). In Study 2, gender was unrelated to scores on grandiose narcissism (NPI; $p = .13$) and vulnerable narcissism (HSNS; $p = .34$).

of the 40 items on the NPI asks participants to choose the most accurate self-descriptive statement between two options. Each pair of statements includes one narcissistic statement (e.g., “*I am an extraordinary person*”) and one non-narcissistic statement (“*I am much like everyone else*”). Participants’ narcissism scores are computed by adding up the number of narcissistic statements they choose. A recent meta-analysis suggests that narcissism scores have been rising from generation to generation (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell, and Bushman, 2008), so an undergraduate sample seems appropriate for ensuring a sample that contains participants that are high in narcissism. Further, in Study 1, the NPI ($\alpha = .85$) had a mean of 15.0 and a standard deviation of 6.9, which suggests an ample number of high-narcissism participants.

Self-presentation tactics. Participants rated how frequently (1 = *very infrequently*; 9 = *very frequently*) they engage in each of 63 behaviors that reflect 12 self-presentation tactics (for sample items, please see Table 1). The SPTS can be broken down into multiple subscales. First, it can be broken down into 12 subscales that represent each of the 12 self-presentation tactics in the SPTS (for alphas, see Table 3). The SPTS can be collapsed into two subscales: assertive self-presentation (i.e., ingratiation, intimidation, supplication, entitlement, enhancement, blasting, and exemplification) and defensive self-presentation (excuses, justification, disclaimers, self-handicapping, apologies). An overall SPTS index was computed by averaging responses on all 63 items ($\alpha = .94$, $M = 4.2$, $SD = 1.0$). An assertive index ($\alpha = .92$, $M = 3.9$, $SD = 1.1$) was computed by averaging the 38 items that represent assertive self-presentation tactics, and a defensive index ($\alpha = .88$, $M = 4.7$, $SD = 1.1$) was computed by averaging the 25 items that represent defensive tactics. Attesting to the validity of the measure, prior research reveals that individual difference measures linked to impression motivation correlate positively with the full scale (Lee et al., 1999; Lewis & Neighbors, 2005), and individual differences associated with

defensiveness (assertiveness) tend to relate more closely to the defensive (assertive) index (Lee et al., 1999; see also Sadler et al., 2010).

Additionally, to test whether grandiose narcissism (also, vulnerable narcissism and self-esteem) is more related to assertive or defensive tactics, an *assertive-defensive difference* index ($M = 0.0$; $SD = 0.7$) was created by subtracting the z-score of participants' defensive score from the z-score of their assertive score. Positive values on this index indicated preference for assertive tactics, whereas negative values indicated preference for defensive tactics.

Vulnerable narcissism. Vulnerable narcissism was assessed with the Hypersensitivity Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin & Cheek, 1997). The HSNS asks participants to rate their agreement with each of ten self-referential statements (1 = *very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree*; 5 = *very characteristic or true, strongly agree*). To be sure, there are a few other scales that aim to assess vulnerable narcissism (cf. Pincus et al., 2009; Serkownek, 1975). Although it would be thorough to include each of these scales (e.g., see Foster & Trimm, 2008), the number of items in this study was already fairly high, so we only used the HSNS, as this scale tends to correlate highly with these other measures (Foster & Trimm, 2008). Also, the HSNS was the scale of choice in other recent, well cited studies of vulnerable narcissism (e.g., Boldero, Higgins, & Hulbert, 2015; Foster & Trimm, 2008). The HSNS is computed by averaging responses to each of the ten statements. In Study 1, scores on the HSNS ($\alpha = .73$) had a mean of 2.85 and a standard deviation of 0.63, which suggests an adequate range of responses and an adequate number of high-vulnerable-narcissism participants.

Self-esteem. To assess self-esteem, we used the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965). On this scale, participants rated their agreement (1 = *strongly agree*; 4 = *strongly disagree*) with ten positive and negative self-descriptive statements. After reverse-

scoring positive items, higher scores corresponded to higher self-esteem ($\alpha = .90$, $M = 3.1$, $SD = 0.6$).

Behavioral inhibition system (BIS) & behavioral activation system (BAS). On this 24-item measure (Carver & White, 1994), participants rated the accuracy (1 = *very false for me*; 4 = *very true for me*) of 24 self-descriptive statements. Thirteen of these items reflected BAS (e.g., “*When I want something I usually go all-out to get it*”) and were averaged to create an overall BAS score ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 3.2$, $SD = 0.4$). Seven items reflected BIS (e.g., “*I worry about making mistakes*”) and were averaged (after reverse-coding two items) to create an overall BIS score ($\alpha = .76$, $M = 3.2$, $SD = 0.5$). Four items were filler items.

To be sure, these basic BIS and BAS scales can also be broken down into subscales. The BAS scale (Carver & White, 1994) can be broken down into three sub-scales: four of the items in the BAS scale compose a BAS-drive scale ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 2.8$, $SD = 0.6$); five items compose a BAS-reward scale ($\alpha = .69$, $M = 3.1$, $SD = 0.6$); and four items compose a BAS-fun scale ($\alpha = .75$, $M = 3.6$, $SD = 0.4$). The names of these scales describe the appetitive motives they measure.

The BIS scale (Heym, Ferguson, & Lawrence, 2008) can be broken up into two separate scales: three items compose a sub-scale that measures the Flight-Fight-Freeze System (FFFS; $\alpha = .68$, $M = 2.8$, $SD = 0.8$); and four items compose a sub-scale that measures BIS-anxiety ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 2.8$, $SD = 0.6$). According to a reconceptualization of reward sensitivity theory (Gray & McNaughton, 2000), the FFFS represents the more basic feeling of fear, while the BIS (without FFFS) acts as a negotiator when goal conflicts arise between the FFFS and the BAS (i.e., when both systems are activated, the BIS-anxiety decides whether rewards [BAS] outweigh threats [FFFS] or vice versa).

Verbal impulsivity. Verbal impulsivity was assessed with the Brief Loquaciousness and Interpersonal Responsiveness Test (BLIRT; Swann & Rentfrow, 2001). Each item on this scale is a self-descriptive statement (e.g., “*If I have something to say, I don’t hesitate to say it*”) to which participants respond on a five-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). After reverse-coding appropriate items (e.g., “*Sometimes I just don’t know what to say to people*”), the items were summed such that higher scores reflect higher verbal impulsivity ($\alpha = .78$, $M = 22.0$, $SD = 5.4$).

Social desirability. To assess socially desirable responding, participants responded on the 33-item Marlow-Crowne Scale (MCS; Crowne & Marlow, 1960). On this scale, participants responded either “true” or “false” to descriptions of 33 common but undesirable traits, attitudes, and behaviors (e.g., “*I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off*”). Social-desirability scores were computed by adding up the number of “false” responses to negative items and “true” responses to positive items ($\alpha = .77$, $M = 26.9$, $SD = 5.2$).

Results & Discussion of Study 1

The self-presentation-tactics profile of grandiose narcissism. The first column of Table 2 shows the self-presentation-tactics profile for grandiose narcissism. As predicted, grandiose narcissism was related to increased use of each of the assertive tactics, except for exemplification and supplication. By contrast, grandiose narcissism was only related to increased use of one defensive tactic (justifications), and it was unrelated to the defensive sub-scale. In line with this pattern of results, grandiose narcissism was positively related to the assertive-defensive difference index ($r = .45$, $p < .001$), which suggests grandiose narcissism is related to a preference for using assertive (vs. defensive) self-presentation tactics.

Table 2. Relations (r) between variables in Study 1

Scale or subscale	Mean (SD)	NPI	HSNS	Self-Esteem	BIS	BAS	Verbal Impulsivity	Social Desirability
SPTS	4.23 (1.02)	.22_a	.33_a	-.19_b	.06	.18	.08	-.30
<i>Assertive</i>	3.95 (1.08)	.34_a	.26_a	-.12_b	-.06	.23	.15	-.29
<i>enhancement</i>	3.51 (1.55)	.32_a	.22_a	-.08 _b	-.07	.21	.19	-.21
<i>intimidation</i>	2.37 (1.54)	.42_a	.07 _b	-.12_c	-.25	.16	.31	-.21
<i>entitlement</i>	3.54 (1.43)	.27_a	.24_a	-.08 _b	-.08	.19	.14	-.26
<i>ingratiation</i>	4.66 (1.48)	.28_a	.22_a	-.09 _b	.05	.27	.08	-.24
<i>blasting</i>	3.31 (1.54)	.25_a	.22_a	-.15_b	-.11	.08	.16	-.44
<i>exemplification</i>	6.21 (1.61)	.10 _a	.06 _a	.18_a	.06	.10	-.04	.19
<i>supplication</i>	3.62 (1.39)	.05 _a	.30_b	-.28_c	.06	.13	-.06	-.31
<i>Defensive</i>	4.66 (1.12)	.01 _a	.36_b	-.28_c	.22	.06	-.05	-.25
<i>disclaimer</i>	4.23 (1.70)	.02 _a	.30_b	-.26_c	.12	.04	.00	-.27
<i>apologies</i>	7.17 (1.45)	-.21_a	.01 _b	.06 _b	.26	-.05	-.18	.22
<i>excuse-making</i>	3.78 (1.60)	.08 _a	.32_b	-.20_c	.09	.08	.01	-.38
<i>justification</i>	4.26 (1.72)	.17_a	.28_a	-.10 _b	.08	.11	.05	-.21
<i>self-handicapping</i>	3.89 (1.52)	-.08 _a	.33_b	-.45_c	.23	.00	-.08	-.19
<i>Assertive-Defensive Difference</i>	0.0 (0.7)	.45_a	-.13_b	.21_c	-.37	.24	.27	-.06
HSNS	2.85 (0.63)	-.14_a	-	-.34_b	.35	-.10	-.25	-.28
Self-Esteem	3.05 (0.57)	.36_a	-.34_b	-	-.26	.15	.33	.24
BIS	3.20 (0.51)	-.29_a	.35_b	-.26_a	-	-.08	-.42	-.08
BAS	3.20 (0.39)	.39_a	-.10 _b	.15_c	-.08	-	.29	-.14
Verbal Impulsivity	22.0 (5.4)	.49_a	-.25_b	.33_c	-.42	.29	-	-.04
Social Desirability	26.9 (5.2)	-.06 _a	-.28_b	.24_c	-.08	-.14	-.04	-

Note1: bold coefficients represent correlations that are significant at $p < .05$; bold-italic coefficients represent $p < .01$.

Note2: In the columns for NPI, HSNS, and Self-Esteem, significant differences ($p < .05$) between coefficients in the same row are represented by unshared subscripts (a, b, c)

Comparing grandiose narcissism to vulnerable narcissism and self-esteem. The first three columns of Table 2 show differences between self-presentation-tactic profiles for grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, and self-esteem. For each tactic (i.e., each row), coefficients in the same row that have different subscripts (a, b, c) differ at $p < .05$ (per procedures suggested by Steiger, 1980). This notation scheme enables direct comparisons between the self-presentation tactics preferred by grandiose narcissism versus each of the other two traits.

Grandiose narcissism versus vulnerable narcissism. As predicted, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were both related to increased use of assertive self-presentation tactics (see Table 2). In particular, both were related to increased use of enhancement, justification, entitlement, ingratiation, and blasting. Another similarity between the two forms of narcissism is that neither was significantly related to increased use of exemplification ($ps > .07$), which is unsurprising, given the relation between narcissism and tendencies toward antisocial behavior and acknowledgement of apathy toward a communal identity (Adams et al., 2014; Krizan & Johar, 2015; Hart & Adams, 2014; Carlson, 2013; Wink, 1991). In the context of assertive self-presentation tactics, differences between the two types of narcissism arose for intimidation and supplication. As predicted, grandiose narcissism was related to increased use of intimidation but not supplication, which is consistent with the idea that grandiose narcissism relates to a desired self-identity of agency and ‘toughness’ (Hart & Adams, 2014; Hart et al., unpublished). By contrast, vulnerable narcissism was related to increased use of supplication but not intimidation, which is consistent with vulnerable narcissism relating to self-views of self-doubt and powerlessness (Miller et al., 2011; Wink, 1991).

While both forms of narcissism were related to generally increased use of assertive tactics, the two forms of narcissism differed in the use of defensive tactics (Table 2). As

predicted, vulnerable narcissism was related to increased use of defensive tactics, but grandiose narcissism was not. Likewise, relations to the assertive-defensive difference score suggested that grandiose narcissism was related to preferring to use assertive tactics ($r = .45, p < .001$), whereas vulnerable narcissism was related to preferring to use defensive tactics ($r = -.13, p < .001$). Indeed, grandiose narcissism was unrelated or negatively related to four of the defensive tactics, while it was only positively related to justification ($r = .17, p < .01$). By contrast, vulnerable narcissism was related to increased use of each of the defensive tactics, with the exception of apologies, which makes sense since vulnerable narcissism – like grandiose narcissism – is related to arrogance (Wink, 1991).

Grandiose narcissism versus self-esteem. While grandiose narcissism was positively related to assertive tactics and unrelated to defensive tactics, self-esteem was negatively related to both categories of self-presentation tactics (see Table 2). Indeed, while each form of narcissism was positively related to the omnibus SPTS ($r_s > .21, p_s < .001$; in other words, generally, narcissism relates to increased use of self-presentation tactics), self-esteem was negatively related to the omnibus SPTS ($r = -.19, p < .001$), which suggests that people with high self-esteem generally tend to avoid using self-presentation tactics.

Looking deeper, the pattern of relations between self-esteem and specific self-presentation tactics (Table 2) is generally in line with ad-hoc speculation that self-esteem might be negatively related to self-presentation-tactic use because high-self-esteem individuals tend to value communal ideals such as authenticity and being nice (Campbell et al., 2002; Davis et al., 2014; Goldberg, 1981; Heppner et al., 2008; Paulhus & Martin, 1988; Tracy et al., 2009). Indeed, the statistically significant negative relations between self-esteem and specific tactics were among tactics that seem particularly a-communal, manipulative, or socially undesirable,

(i.e., intimidation, blasting, supplication, disclaimer, excuse-making, self-handicapping), whereas self-esteem was unrelated or positively related to the two tactics that seem potentially communal (i.e., exemplification implies setting a good example; apologies implies humility). This trend is consistent with the positive relation between self-esteem and social desirability ($r = .24, p < .001$) and the negative relation between the SPTS and social desirability ($r = .30, p < .001$). To statistically test this idea, we ran an exploratory analysis with self-esteem predicting the omnibus SPTS via social desirability using PROCESS bootstrapping procedures (Model 4; Hayes, 2013). Based on 50000 bootstrapped samples, this analysis revealed a significant indirect effect of self-esteem on the omnibus SPTS via social desirability ($b = -.11$; $SE = .037$; 95% CI: $-.201, -.053$). Thus, it seems plausible that high-self-esteem individuals' general avoidance of using self-presentation tactics may be partially driven by social-desirability concerns. Although this idea is somewhat speculative and the current research was not designed to test it, it is generally supported by data from Study 1, and it may be worthy of further testing in future research.

Controlling for possible confounds. To account for possible confounds of the relation between grandiose narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use, Study 1 included measures of BIS, BAS, verbal impulsivity, and social desirability. The role of each of these variables within the relation between grandiose narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use was tested with the PROCESS bootstrapping macro for SPSS (Model 4; Hayes, 2013).⁴

BIS and BAS. Because of the non-significant relation between BIS and assertive-tactic use (see Table 2), and because of the non-significant relation between grandiose narcissism and defensive-tactic use, BIS probably did not confound the relation between grandiose narcissism and tactic use (Sobel, 1982). BAS, however, was related to both grandiose narcissism ($r = .39, p$

⁴ Note that mediation, suppression, and confounding are identical on statistical grounds. They each reflect changes in an IV-DV relationship upon adding a third variable to the model. Hence, mediation tests are appropriate for testing each of these ideas (MacKinnon, Krull, & Lockwood, 2000).

< .001) and assertive-tactic use ($r = .23, p < .001$), so it was tested as a confound of the relation between these two variables.⁵ Based on 50000 bootstrapped samples, this analysis revealed a significant indirect effect of grandiose narcissism on assertive-tactic use via BAS ($b = .007$; SE = .004; 95% CI: .001, .015). To be sure, this effect is small, and the analysis was exploratory. Still, it may be worthwhile in future research to more precisely test the role of BAS in the context of grandiose narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use.

Exploratory analyses were also conducted with the subscales of the BIS (FFFS, BIS-anxiety) and BAS (BAS-drive, BAS-reward, BAS-fun). The FFFS subscale was negatively correlated with both the NPI ($r = -.32, p < .001$) and assertive-tactic use ($r = -.17, p = .003$), so we tested to see if it confounded the relation between these two variables (using PROCESS Model 4; 5000 bootstrapped samples; Hayes, 2013), but the 95% confidence interval for the effect contained zero (-.002, .011), so the “fearlessness” that accompanies grandiose narcissism and assertive-tactic use does not seem to significantly influence the relation between these two variables.

The BIS-anxiety subscale was correlated with both vulnerable narcissism ($r = .36, p < .001$) and defensive-tactic use ($r = .25, p < .001$), so it was tested as a confound for the relation between these two variables. Indeed, based on 5000 bootstrapped (PROCESS Model 4; Hayes, 2013), the indirect effect of HSNS on defensive-tactic use via BIS-anxiety was significant ($b = .087$; SE = .040; 95% CI: .018, .178). This significant effect implies that BIS-anxiety influences the relation between vulnerable narcissism and defensive-tactic use.

Given that BAS served as a statistical confound for the relation between grandiose narcissism and assertive-tactic use, it is worth noting some differences in how the three BAS subscales related to grandiose narcissism and assertive-tactic use. Per Steiger’s t-tests (all $ps <$

⁵ As noted earlier, statistically, this analysis is identical to a mediation analysis.

.05), BAS-drive was more strongly related to NPI ($r = .41, p < .001$) than was BAS-fun ($r = .29, p < .001$), and BAS-fun was more strongly related to NPI than was BAS-reward ($r = .14, p = .013$). BAS-drive was also more strongly related to assertive-tactic use ($r = .28, p < .001$) than was BAS-fun ($r = .17, p = .002$), and BAS-fun was more strongly related to assertive-tactic use than was BAS-reward ($r = .039, p = .50$). So, generally, BAS-drive seems to be the strongest confound for the relation between grandiose narcissism and assertive-tactic use, while BAS-reward seems non-influential.

Finally, BAS-reward had some correlations with certain tactics that were quite discrepant from the other two BAS subscales. For example, while BAS-drive and BAS-fun were both positively correlated with intimidation ($r_s > .20, p_s < .001$), BAS-reward was negatively correlated with intimidation ($r = -.17, p = .004$). BAS-reward was significantly correlated with exemplification ($r = .26, p < .001$), while the other two BAS subscales were not ($r_s < .05, p_s > .45$). BAS-reward was positively related to apologies ($r = .23, p < .001$), while BAS-drive ($r = -.16, p = .007$) and BAS-fun ($r = -.11, p = .06$) were negatively related. Lastly, the assertive-defensive difference index was positively related to BAS-drive ($r = .32, p < .001$) and BAS-fun ($r = .18, p < .001$), but it was unrelated to BAS-reward ($r = -.01, p = .84$). To be sure, these analyses were exploratory and tangential to the purpose of the present research. Still, in future research, it may be worthwhile to more closely examine these differences in the BIS/BAS subscales as they relate to narcissism and self-presentation-tactics use.

Verbal impulsivity. Similar to BAS, verbal impulsivity was significantly related to both grandiose narcissism ($r = .49, p < .001$) and assertive-tactic use ($r = .15, p < .01$), so it was tested as a confound of the relation between these two variables. Based on 50000 bootstrapped samples, the 95% confidence interval for this indirect effect included zero (95% CI: $-.012, .009$), which

implies that the effect was not significant. To be sure, this does not rule out the possibility that verbal impulsivity plays a role in grandiose narcissists' use of self-presentation tactics. However, data from Study 1 imply that its role is limited.

Social Desirability. Perhaps our findings reflect social-desirability biases. For example, grandiose narcissism might relate to underreporting defensive behavior to appear desirable. But, grandiose narcissism was unrelated to social-desirability bias ($r = -.06, p = .28$). Thus, data from Study 1 suggest that it is unlikely that social desirability influenced the relation between grandiose narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use.

Other post-hoc exploratory analyses. Multiple members of the committee for this dissertation suggested that it might be interesting to explore the interaction effect of grandiose narcissism and each of the two similar personality variables (vulnerable narcissism; self-esteem) on self-presentation-tactic use.

*NPI*HSNS on self-presentation-tactic use.* To test the interaction of the two types of narcissism on self-presentation-tactics use, we ran two multiple-regression analyses: one with assertive self-presentation-tactic use as the dependent variable and another with defensive tactic use as the dependent variable; each with NPI (z-scored) and HSNS (z-scored) in block 1 and the NPI*HSNS interaction term in block 2. In each analysis, the NPI*HSNS interaction was not significant in block 2 ($ps > .35$). Thus, there does not seem to be an interactive effect of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism on self-presentation-tactic use.

*NPI*self-esteem on self-presentation-tactic use.* To test this interaction, we ran two multiple-regression analyses that paralleled the analyses from the prior subsection, except HSNS (z-scored) and the NPI*HSNS interaction term were replaced by self-esteem (z-scored) and an

NPI*self-esteem interaction term, respectively. In each of these analyses, the NPI*self-esteem interaction term in block two was not significant ($ps > .19$).

CHAPTER 3

STUDY 2

Study 1 provides a basic profile of grandiose narcissism in terms of self-presentation-tactic use. Additionally, it provides comparisons between the profile for grandiose narcissism and two similar traits, and it provides exploratory tests of possible confounding variables in the relation between grandiose narcissism and self-presentation-tactic use. The purpose of Study 2 was to expand on Study 1 by adding a factor that might provide a partial explanation for why grandiose narcissism relates to increased use of assertive self-presentation tactics. Prior research suggests that grandiose narcissism is related to viewing self-promotion as a more effective means of making a good impression (Hart et al., 2016). Thus, in Study 2, we explored whether grandiose narcissism relates to unique expectations about the effectiveness of self-presentation tactics, which might contribute to their increased use of self-presentation tactics. Specifically, in Study 2, in addition to completing a measure of grandiose narcissism, self-esteem, and the SPTS, participants ($N = 264$) completed items that assessed their perceptions of the effectiveness of each of the 12 tactics. As a secondary purpose of Study 2, to address theorists' discrepant views regarding grandiose narcissists' insecurity, Study 2 included a measure of fear of negative evaluation.

Method

Participants. Two-hundred and seventy-eight undergraduate-psychology students participated in exchange for course credit. Fourteen participants were removed because they did not complete the entire study, leaving a final sample of $N = 264$ (91 male). Mean participant age

was 18.78 ($SD = 1.06$). Ethnicity was predominately white (83.7% white; 6.8% black; 9.5% other).

Procedure & measures. The procedure was virtually identical to the procedure from Study 1, but some of the measures were different. In an online setting, prior to completing demographic measures and being debriefed, participants completed the following measures.

Grandiose narcissism; self-esteem. As in Study 1, grandiose narcissism was assessed with the NPI ($\alpha = .83$, $M = 17.4$, $SD = 6.9$). Self-esteem was assessed with the Rosenberg self-esteem scale ($\alpha = .90$, $M = 3.5$, $SD = 0.8$).

Effectiveness of self-presentation tactics. Twelve items were constructed to measure participants' perceived effectiveness of each of the 12 self-presentation tactics. Specifically, for each tactic (e.g., supplication), participants rated the effectiveness (1 = *not at all effective*; 9 = *extremely effective*) of the tactic as a means of making a good impression on others (e.g., "*When you are trying to make a good impression... How effective is it when a person tries to show others he/she is weak and dependent to get something from them?*"). From these 12 items, we constructed three scales: the 12 self-effectiveness items were averaged into a *SPT-effectiveness* index ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 4.5$, $SD = 1.3$); the seven assertive items were averaged into an *assertive-effectiveness* index ($\alpha = .84$, $M = 4.1$, $SD = 1.6$); the five defensive effectiveness items were averaged into a *defensive-effectiveness* index ($\alpha = .55$, $M = 5.0$, $SD = 1.3$).

Brief fear of negative evaluation scale (FNE). For this measure (Leary, 1983), participants rated the accuracy (1 = *not at all characteristic of me*; 9 = *extremely characteristic of me*) of 12 self-descriptive statements (e.g., "*I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make.*"). The 12 items were averaged onto a single index of FNE ($\alpha = .93$, $M = 5.6$, $SD = 1.5$).

Results and Discussion of Study 2

The self-presentation-tactics profile of grandiose narcissism. The self-presentation profile for grandiose narcissism in Study 2 (Table 3) was highly similar to the profile attained in Study 1 (Table 2), with a few minor exceptions. Unlike Study 1, Study 2 produced significant correlations between grandiose narcissism and each of supplication ($r = .13, p = .03$) and excuses ($r = .13, p = .03$). To be sure, each of these correlations was small, especially in the context of a large sample and dozens of correlation analyses. Given their inconsistency with Study 1, it seems likely that these significant correlations were the result of Type-1 error; indeed, they would not have reached significance if we had used a Bonferroni correction (Holm, 1979). It is also worthwhile to note the consistency in the differences between the self-presentation profile for grandiose narcissism and self-esteem between Study 1 (Table 2) and Study 2 (Table 3).

Table 3. Relations (r) between variables in Study 2

Scale or subscale	Mean (SD)	NPI	FNE	Self-Esteem
SPTS	4.66 (0.96)	.23_a	.26_a	-.34_b
<i>Assertive</i>	4.30 (1.13)	.30_a	.16_a	-.30_b
<i>enhancement</i>	4.08 (1.64)	.26_a	.10 _a	-.23_b
<i>intimidation</i>	3.21 (1.87)	.32_a	-.15_b	-.27_b
<i>entitlement</i>	3.85 (1.49)	.23_a	.09 _a	-.30_b
<i>ingratiation</i>	5.11 (1.33)	.21_a	.30_a	-.16_b
<i>blasting</i>	3.75 (1.69)	.31_a	.08 _b	-.30_c
<i>exemplification</i>	5.64 (1.45)	.04 _a	.25_b	.13_{ab}
<i>supplication</i>	3.94 (1.49)	.13_a	.14_a	-.42_b
<i>Defensive</i>	5.20 (1.03)	.04 _a	.36_b	-.29_c
<i>disclaimer</i>	4.99 (1.48)	.09 _a	.29_b	-.26_c
<i>apologies</i>	6.95 (1.44)	-.26_a	.25_b	.22_b
<i>excuse-making</i>	4.50 (1.49)	.13_a	.24_a	-.32_b
<i>justification</i>	5.03 (1.52)	.17_a	.24_a	-.19_b
<i>self-handicapping</i>	4.51 (1.44)	.01 _a	.24_b	-.46_c
<i>Assertive-Defensive Difference</i>	0.0 (0.7)	.26_a	-.21_b	-.01 _c
SPTS effectiveness	4.5 (1.30)	.23_a	-.03 _b	-.20_b
<i>Assertive effectiveness</i>	4.1 (1.62)	.28_a	-.10 _b	-.21_b
<i>Defensive effectiveness</i>	5.0 (1.31)	.06 _{ab}	.10 _a	-.12_b
Fear of Neg. Eval. (FNE)	5.6 (1.50)	-.21_a	-	-.29_a
Self Esteem	3.5 (0.83)	.17_a	-.29_b	-

Note1: bold coefficients represent correlations that are significant at $p < .05$; bold-italic coefficients represent $p < .01$.

Note2: In the columns for NPI, FNE, and Self-Esteem, significant differences ($p < .05$) between coefficients in the same row are represented by unshared subscripts (a, b, c)

Mediation by perceived effectiveness. As anticipated, grandiose narcissism related positively to the assertive-effectiveness index. Grandiose narcissism seems to relate to anticipating that assertive tactics will be more effective at achieving a positive impression. Furthermore, as might be anticipated, the assertiveness-effectiveness index related positively to the assertive index, $r = .59, p < .001$. In light of these relations, we tested the indirect effect of

grandiose narcissism on the assertive index through assertive-effectiveness. Based on 50000 bootstrapped samples, this analysis revealed a significant indirect effect of grandiose narcissism on assertive-tactic use via assertive-effectiveness ($b = .026$; $SE = .009$; 95% CI: .015, .038). Still, although this indirect effect was significant, this is a correlational analysis, so we cannot be completely confident that perceived effectiveness beliefs cause grandiose narcissists to engage in more assertive self-presentation. At the same time, the indirect effect is generally consistent with this idea, and further research should do more to test this issue.

Fear of negative evaluation (FNE). According to some prominent theories of grandiose narcissism, insecurity (i.e., fear of negative evaluation) is a key component. This may be true, but the present data found that FNE was *inversely* related to grandiose narcissism ($r = -.21, p < .01$). Likewise, grandiose narcissism and FNE had quite disparate relations to self-presentation-tactic use (see Table 3). Whereas grandiose narcissism was related to assertive but not defensive tactic use (as in Study 1), FNE was related to increased use of both types of tactics. Furthermore, FNE was negatively related to the assertive-defensive difference index ($r = -.21, p < .01$), which implies that high-FNE individuals generally preferred defensive (vs. assertive) tactics; by contrast, in both Study 1 and Study 2, grandiose narcissists preferred assertive (vs. defensive) tactics.

CHAPTER 4

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present findings offer several new insights regarding relations between self-presentation-tactic use and grandiose narcissism. While prior research has shown that narcissism is related to using self-presentation tactics, the present research is the first to address which specific self-presentation tactics are used more often (and which are not). As hypothesized, in both studies, grandiose narcissism was related to increased use of assertive (but not defensive) self-presentation tactics, especially those that are consistent with a self-image of agency and toughness (i.e., enhancement, intimidation, entitlement, ingratiation, and blasting). Additionally, Study 1 showed that the pattern of self-presentation-tactic use that is associated with grandiose narcissism is quite different from that of vulnerable narcissism and high self-esteem (Table 2), and recent reviews have called for novel phenomenological comparisons between these traits (Besser & Priel, 2010; Brummelman et al., 2016). Finally, both studies made initial progress toward identifying factors that might underlie grandiose narcissists' (vs. non-narcissists) enhanced tendency to use assertive self-presentation tactics. Seemingly, temperament-based explanations (Study 1) are not as useful as the simple explanation that grandiose narcissism is related to viewing assertive self-presentation tactics as particularly effective for making a good impression on others.

While each of these findings represents novel progress in the specific area of understanding the self-presentation-tactic use that relates to grandiose narcissism, the present findings also provide insight regarding some broad theoretical debates about grandiose

narcissism. For example, several prominent theories of grandiose narcissism assert that narcissistic behavior is driven by deep-seated feelings of inadequacy and insecurity (Kernis, 2001; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991; Rhodewalt & Peterson, 2008). This may be the case, but this idea is inconsistent with the present findings in a few ways. First, if grandiose narcissists are driven by insecurity, then they should be prone to enhanced use of defensive self-presentation tactics – if a person were insecure about being exposed as inadequate, then the person would probably be motivated to mitigate the impact of negative self-relevant events (as is the goal of defensive self-presentation tactics). In the current research, however, grandiose narcissism was unrelated to the use of defensive self-presentation tactics. Second, grandiose narcissism was *inversely* related to fear of negative evaluation (FNE), which seems like a face-valid proxy for feelings of insecurity. Third, in terms of self-presentation tactics, people high in grandiose narcissism were quite different from people high in FNE (see Table 3). This discrepancy is arguably noteworthy for the following reason: One could argue that the inverse relation between grandiose narcissism and FNE is due to the tendency for grandiose narcissists to not admit to their insecurities on the self-report FNE scale; but, if grandiose narcissistic behavior is truly driven by insecurity (i.e., FNE), then the patterns of self-presentation-tactic use among grandiose narcissists and individuals high in FNE should still be similar, because the SPTS is not a context that requires participants to admit to insecurity. If insecurity (FNE) is the cause of narcissists' enhanced self-presentation-tactic use, then the FNE should have a similar pattern of relations with the SPTS as the NPI, even if the two scales are inversely related because narcissists are not comfortable admitting their insecurities on the FNE.⁶

⁶ Also, regarding the idea that grandiose narcissists are lying because they do not want to admit to high FNE, note that grandiose narcissism (NPI) was unrelated to social-desirability bias, which suggests that grandiose narcissists do not particularly care to hide their socially undesirable characteristics (see also: Adams et al., 2015; Carlson, 2013;

Furthermore, as in prior research (Foster & Trimm, 2008), grandiose narcissism was unrelated to BIS, which is associated with insecurity and fearfulness (Field, 2008), and it was positively related to BAS, which is associated with fearless dominance (Ross, Benning, Patrick, Thompson, & Thurston, 2008).

Indeed, the current findings are more consistent with recent ideas that grandiose narcissism is less driven by insecurity and more driven by unique views about the way to make a good impression on others (Adams et al., 2015; Hart et al., 2016; Wallace, 2011). As in prior research (Hart et al., 2016), the results of Study 2 suggest that grandiose narcissists' enhanced use of assertive self-presentation tactics may be driven by the fact that (more so than non-narcissists) they think these tactics are quite useful for making a good impression on others. This view of grandiose narcissism emphasizes the role of narcissists' desire to maintain an agentic and 'tough' self-identity (Adams et al., 2015; Hart & Adams, 2014; Hart et al., unpublished), and grandiose narcissists in the present research were particularly drawn toward self-presentation tactics that are consistent with agency and toughness (i.e., enhancement, intimidation, entitlement, ingratiation, and blasting).

Related to this issue, the present findings might also be useful for understanding differences between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. While these two forms of narcissism are similar in terms of some characteristics (e.g., arrogance, entitlement; Wink, 1991), the process of differentiating them is ongoing (Besser & Priel, 2010). While the present findings are inconsistent with the idea that grandiose narcissism is driven by insecurity, they are quite consistent with the idea that vulnerable narcissism is driven by insecurity. For example, grandiose narcissism was unrelated to tactics that imply weakness, such as supplication,

Hart & Adams, 2014). Moreover, this apathy toward hiding socially undesirable characteristics is probably even more pronounced in the context of an anonymous, online study.

disclaimers, and self-handicapping. Vulnerable narcissism, however, was positively related to each of these tactics. Also, comparing the second column of Table 2 with the second column of Table 3, vulnerable narcissism seems similar to FNE, in terms of self-presentation-tactic use. Future research might explore the root of this difference in insecurity between grandiose and vulnerable narcissists. For example, it seems like each form of narcissism desires different self-identity goals (e.g., assertive and tough for grandiose narcissists), and identifying these differences might unlock insight regarding a variety of discrepant behaviors between the two forms of narcissism.

The present research is not without shortcomings. For example, the present research relied on student samples, so it is unclear whether the present effects might replicate with more representative samples. Future research might recruit participants from the general population to help bolster the current findings. Also, the present findings relied on self-reports of self-presentation tactics and are therefore subject to the shortcomings of this method (e.g., memory failures and distortions). Finally, although the correlational findings of the present research provide promising initial insights toward understanding the self-presentation-tactic profile of grandiose narcissism, future research should test these ideas in the context of a true experimental design.

Even still, the present research offers novel advances in understanding the self-presentation profile associated with grandiose narcissism. Consistent with prior theorizing, this profile differs from the self-presentation profile associated with vulnerable narcissism and self-esteem. More broadly, the present research emphasizes the importance of thinking about narcissism as an interpersonal trait that is driven by its own set of unique interpersonal impression-management goals. Although it is interesting to speculate about the underlying,

unconscious emotions that drive narcissistic behavior, it is also important to further our understanding of narcissism in terms of self-image goals. These goals can be explicitly measured, and if are predictive of self-presentation-tactic use, they might also be predictive of a variety of fundamental narcissistic behaviors.

REFERENCES

- Aalsma, M. C., Lapsley, D. K., & Flannery, D. J. (2006). Personal fables, narcissism, and adolescent adjustment. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 481-491.
- Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the narcissistic personality inventory really measure? *Assessment, 18*, 67-87.
- Adams, J. M., Florell, D., Alex Burton, K., & Hart, W. (2014). Why do narcissists disregard social-etiquette norms? A test of two explanations for why narcissism relates to offensive-language use. *Personality and Individual Differences, 58*, 26-30.
- Adams, J. M., Hart, W., & Burton, K. A. (2015). I only like the idea of you: Narcissists tolerate others' narcissistic traits but not their corresponding behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 82*, 232-236.
- Alicke, M.D. and O. Govorum (2005). The better-than-average effect In M. D. Alicke, D. A. Dunning, & J. I. Krueger (Eds.), *The Self in Social Judgment* (pp. 85-108). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Arble, E. P. (2008). Evaluating the psychometric properties of the hypersensitive narcissism scale: Implications for the distinction of covert and overt narcissism. *Master of Science Thesis*, Eastern Michigan University, Ypsilanti, MI.
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2001). Narcissism as addiction to esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 206-210.
- Berridge, K. C. (1996). Food reward: brain substrates of wanting and liking. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews, 20*, 1-25.
- Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2010). Grandiose narcissism versus vulnerable narcissism in threatening situations: Emotional reactions to achievement failure and interpersonal rejection. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 29*, 874.
- Bizumic, B., & Duckitt, J. (2008). "My group is not worthy of me": Narcissism and ethnocentrism. *Political Psychology, 29*, 437-453.
- Brown, J. D. (1986). Evaluations of self and others: Self-enhancement biases in social judgments. *Social Cognition, 4*, 353-376.
- Brown, J. D., & Kobayashi, C. (2002). Self-enhancement in Japan and America. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5*, 145-168.

- Brown, R. P., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2004). Narcissism and the non-equivalence of self-esteem measures: A matter of dominance? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *38*, 585-592.
- Brown, R. P., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2004). Narcissism and the non-equivalence of self-esteem measures: A matter of dominance? *Journal of Research in Personality*, *38*, 585-592.
- Buss, D. M., & Chiodo, L. M. (1991). Narcissistic acts in everyday life. *Journal of Personality*, *59*, 179-215.
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, J. D. (2007). The narcissistic self: Background, an extended agency model, and ongoing controversies. In C. Sedikides & S. Spencer (Eds.), *Frontiers in social psychology: The self* (pp. 115–138). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, J. D., & Brunell, A. B. (2004). Running from shame or reveling in pride? Narcissism and the regulation of self-conscious emotions. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*, 150-153.
- Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*(3), 329-347.
- Carlson, E. N. (2013). Honestly arrogant or simply misunderstood? Narcissists' awareness of their narcissism. *Self and Identity*, *12*(3), 259-277.
- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 319-333.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York: Academic Press.
- Colvin, C. R., Block, J., & Funder, D. C. (1995). Overly positive self-evaluations and personality: negative implications for mental health. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *68*, 1152-1162.
- Cramer, P. (1995). Identity, narcissism, and defense mechanisms in late adolescence. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *29*, 341-361.
- Crowne, D., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, *24*, 349-354.
- Davis, W. E., Hicks, J. A., Schlegel, R. J., Smith, C. M., & Vess, M. (2015). Authenticity and self-esteem across temporal horizons. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *10*, 116-126.
- Dickinson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *17*, 188.

- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (2009). Cross-cultural correlates of life satisfaction and self-esteem. In *Culture and well-being* (pp. 71-91). Springer Netherlands.
- Emmons, R. A. (1981). Relationship between narcissism and sensation seeking. *Psychological Reports, 48*, 247-250.
- Field, A. P. (2006). The behavioral inhibition system and the verbal information pathway to children's fears. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 115*, 742-752.
- Fitch, G. (1970). Effects of self-esteem, perceived performance, and choice on causal attributions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 16*, 311-315.
- Fossati, A., Borroni, S., Eisenberg, N., & Maffei, C. (2010). Relations of proactive and reactive dimensions of aggression to overt and covert narcissism in nonclinical adolescents. *Aggressive Behavior, 36*, 21-27.
- Foster, J. D., & Trimm, R. F. (2008). On being eager and uninhibited: Narcissism and approach-avoidance motivation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1004-1017.
- Foster, J. D., Shenese, J. W., & Goff, J. S. (2009). Why do narcissists take more risks? Testing the roles of perceived risks and benefits of risky behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 885-889.
- Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic Illusions in Self-Evaluations of Intelligence and Attractiveness. *Journal of Personality, 62*, 143-155.
- Goldberg, L. R. (1981). Unconfounding situational attributions from uncertain, neutral, and ambiguous ones: A psychometric analysis of descriptions of oneself and various types of others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 41*, 517-552.
- Gray, J. A., & McNaughton, N. (2000). *The neuropsychology of anxiety: An inquiry into the functions of the septo-hippocampal system* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1982). The self-serving attributional bias: Beyond self-presentation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*, 56-67.
- Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2015). Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 141*, 261-310.
- Hart, W., & Adams, J. M. (2014). Are narcissists more accepting of others' narcissistic traits?. *Personality and Individual Differences, 64*, 163-167.
- Hart, W., Adams, J. M., & Burton, K. A. (2016). Narcissistic for the people: Narcissists and non-narcissists disagree about how to make a good impression. *Personality and Individual Differences, 91*, 69-73.

- Hart, W., Adams, J. M., & Tortoriello, G., and Hamilton, J. (unpublished manuscript). *You mess with the Bull, you get the horns! Narcissists' provoked aggression as defense of honor.*
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *An introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 588-599.
- Heppner, W. L., Kernis, M. H., Nezlek, J. B., Foster, J., Lakey, C. E., & Goldman, B. M. (2008). Within-person relationships among daily self-esteem, need satisfaction, and authenticity. *Psychological Science, 19*, 1140-1145.
- Heym, N., Ferguson, E., & Lawrence, C. (2008). An evaluation of the relationship between Gray's revised RST and Eysenck's PEN: Distinguishing BIS and FFFS in Carver and White's BIS/BAS scales. *Personality and Individual Differences, 45*, 709-715.
- Holm, S. (1979). A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics, 65-70.*
- Ickes, W., & Layden, M. A. (1978). Attributional styles. *New Directions in Attribution Research, 2*, 119-152.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*, 206-219.
- Judge, T. A., Erez, A., Bono, J. E., & Thoresen, C. J. (2002). Are measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, locus of control, and generalized self-efficacy indicators of a common core construct? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 693-710.
- Kernis, M. H. (2001). Following the trail from narcissism to fragile self-esteem. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 223-225.
- Leary, M. R. (1983). A brief version of the Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 9*, 371-375.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin, 107*, 34.
- Lee, S., Quigley, B. M., Nesler, M. S., Corbett, A. B., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Development of a self-presentation tactics scale. *Personality and Individual Differences, 26*, 701-722.
- Lewis, M. A., & Neighbors, C. (2005). Self-determination and the use of self-presentation strategies. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 145*, 469-490.
- Lobbestael, J., Baumeister, R. F., Fiebig, T., & Eckel, L. A. (2014). The role of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in self-reported and laboratory aggression and testosterone reactivity. *Personality and Individual Differences, 69*, 22-27.

- Luchner, A. F., Houston, J. M., Walker, C., & Houston, M. A. (2011). Exploring the relationship between two forms of narcissism and competitiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences, 51*, 779-782.
- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1991). Self-esteem and intergroup comparisons: Toward a theory of collective self-esteem. In J. Suls & T. A. Wills (Eds.), *Social comparison: Contemporary theory and research*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Lyubomirsky, S., Tkach, C., & DiMatteo, M. R. (2006). What are the differences between happiness and self-esteem. *Social Indicators Research, 78*, 363-404.
- MacKinnon, D. P., Krull, J. L., & Lockwood, C. M. (2000). Equivalence of the mediation, confounding and suppression effect. *Prevention Science, 1*, 173-181.
- Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality, 78*, 1529-1564.
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Keith Campbell, W. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality, 79*, 1013-1042.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 668-676.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177-196.
- Paulhus, D. L., & John, O. P. (1998). Egoistic and moralistic biases in self-perception: The interplay of self-deceptive styles with basic traits and motives. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 1025-1060.
- Paulhus, D., Westlake, B., Calvez, S., & Harms, P. (2013). Self-presentation style in job interviews: The role of personality and culture. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, 2042-2059.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Martin, C. L. (1988). Functional flexibility: A new conception of interpersonal flexibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55*, 88-101.
- Pincus, A. L., & Roche, M. J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatment* (pp. 31-40). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Raskin, R., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternative form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*, 159-162.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*, 890-902.
- Raskin, R., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*, 911-918.

- Rhodewalt, F., & Eddings, S. K. (2002). Narcissus reflects: Memory distortion in response to ego-relevant feedback among high-and low-narcissistic men. *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*, 97-116.
- Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*, 672-685.
- Rhodewalt, F., & Peterson, B. (2008). The self and social behavior: The fragile self and interpersonal self-regulation. In F. Rhodewalt (Ed.), *Personality and social behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Rhodewalt, F., & Peterson, B. (2009). The self and intergroup attitudes: Connecting “fragile” personal and collective self-concepts. In J. P. Forgas, J. E. Cooper & W. D. Crano (Eds.), *The psychology of attitudes and attitude change* (pp. 263-282). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Rose, P. (2002). The happy and unhappy faces of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences, 33*, 379-391.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Ross, S. R., Benning, S. D., Patrick, C. J., Thompson, A., & Thurston, A. (2009). Factors of the psychopathic personality inventory: criterion-related validity and relationship to the BIS/BAS and five-factor models of personality. *Assessment, 16*, 71-87.
- Roulin, N., Bangerter, A., & Levashina, J. (2014). Interviewers' perceptions of impression management in employment interviews. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 29*, 141-163.
- Sadler, M. E., Hunger, J. M., & Miller, C. J. (2010). Personality and impression management: Mapping the multidimensional personality questionnaire onto 12 self-presentation tactics. *Personality and Individual Differences, 48*, 623-628.
- Schlenker, B. R. (2003). Self-presentation. In M. R. Leary and J.P. Tangney (Eds.), *Handbook of self and identity* (pp. 492-518). New York: Guilford.
- Schlenker, B. R., Soraci, S., & McCarthy, B. (1976). Self-esteem and group performance as determinants of egocentric perceptions in cooperative groups. *Human Relations, 29*, 1163-1176.
- Sedikides, C., Gaertner, L., & Toguchi, Y. (2003). Pancultural self-enhancement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*, 60-79.
- Sobel, M. E. (1982). Asymptotic confidence intervals for indirect effects in structural equation models. In S. Leinhardt (Ed.), *Sociological methodology 1982* (pp. 290-312). Washington, DC: American Sociological Association.

- Steiger, J. H. (1980). Tests for comparing elements of a correlation matrix. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87, 245.
- Taylor, S. E., & Brown, J. D. (1988). Illusion and well-being: A social psychological perspective on mental health. *Psychological Bulletin*, 103, 193-210.
- Tedeschi, J. T., & Melburg, V. (1984). Impression management and influence in the organization. *Research in the Sociology of Organization*, 3, 31-58.
- Tice, D. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (1990). Self-Esteem, Self-Handicapping, and Self-Presentation: The Strategy of Inadequate Practice. *Journal of Personality*, 58, 443-464.
- Tracy, J. L., Cheng, J. T., Robins, R. W., & Trzesniewski, K. H. (2009). Authentic and hubristic pride: The affective core of self-esteem and narcissism. *Self and Identity*, 8(2-3), 196-213.
- Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 154-165.
- Wallace, H. M. (2011). Narcissistic self-enhancement. In W. K. Campbell & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp. 309-318). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Waller, N. G., Tellegen, A., McDonald, R. P., & Lykken, D. T. (1996). Exploring nonlinear models in personality assessment: Development and preliminary validation of a negative emotionality scale. *Journal of Personality*, 64, 545-576.
- Watson, D., Suls, J., & Haig, J. (2002). Global self-esteem in relation to structural models of personality and affectivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83, 185-197.
- Weary, G., Harvey, J. H., Schwieger, P., Olson, C. T., Perloff, R., & Pritchard, S. (1982). Self-presentation and the moderation of self-serving attributional biases. *Social Cognition*, 1, 140-159.
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 590-597.
- Wright, A. G. C., Lukowitsky, M. R., Pincus, A. L., & Conroy, D. E. (2010). The higher order factor structure and gender invariance of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Assessment*, 17, 467-483.

7. A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B. I like to be the center of attention. 7. _____
8. A. I will be a success.
B. I am not too concerned about success. 8. _____
9. A. I am no better or worse than most people.
B. I think I am a special person. 9. _____
10. A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B. I see myself as a good leader. 10. _____
11. A. I am assertive.
B. I wish I were more assertive. 11. _____
12. A. I like to have authority over other people.
B. I don't mind following orders. 12. _____
13. A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
B. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people. 13. _____
14. A. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
B. I usually get the respect that I deserve. 14. _____
15. A. I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B. I like to show off my body. 15. _____
16. A. I can read people like a book.
B. People are sometimes hard to understand. 16. _____
17. A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
B. I like to take responsibility for making decisions. 17. _____
18. A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world. 18. _____
19. A. My body is nothing special.
B. I like to look at my body. 19. _____
20. A. I try not to be a show off.
B. I will usually show off if I get the chance. 20. _____
21. A. I always know what I am doing.
B. Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing. 21. _____
22. A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.

- B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done. 22. _____
23. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.
B. Everybody likes to hear my stories. 23. _____
24. A. I expect a great deal from other people.
B. I like to do things for other people. 24. _____
25. A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
B. I take my satisfactions as they come. 25. _____
26. A. Compliments embarrass me.
B. I like to be complimented. 26. _____
27. A. I have a strong will to power.
B. Power for its own sake doesn't interest me. 27. _____
28. A. I don't care about new fads and fashions.
B. I like to start new fads and fashions. 28. _____
29. A. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
B. I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror. 29. _____
30. A. I really like to be the center of attention.
B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention. 30. _____
31. A. I can live my life in any way I want to.
B. People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want. 31. _____
32. A. Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me.
B. People always seem to recognize my authority. 32. _____
33. A. I would prefer to be a leader.
B. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not. 33. _____
34. A. I am going to be a great person.
B. I hope I am going to be successful. 34. _____
35. A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.
B. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to. 35. _____
36. A. I am a born leader.
B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop. 36. _____
37. A. I wish somebody would someday write my biography.
B. I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason. 37. _____

38. A. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
B. I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public. 38. _____
39. A. I am more capable than other people.
B. There is a lot that I can learn from other people. 39. _____
40. A. I am much like everybody else.
B. I am an extraordinary person. 40. _____

SCORING KEY:

Assign one point for each response that matches the key:

- 1, 2 and 3: A
4, 5: B
6: A
7: B
8: A
9, 10: B
11, 12, 13, 14: A
15: B
16: A
17, 18, 19, 20: B
21: A
22, 23: B
24, 25: A
26: B
27: A
28: B
29, 30, 31: A
32: B
33, 34: A
35: B
36, 37, 38, 39: A
40: B

Self-Presentation Tactic Scale

On the following pages you will be asked a number of questions dealing with your perceptions of yourself. Please read the instructions carefully and try to respond to all the items as openly and honestly as possible. There are no right or wrong answers. In responding to the items, please circle the number on the scale which most closely represents your behavior.

1 = *Very infrequently*, 9 = *Very frequently*

Excuse

1. When I am blamed for something, I make excuses.
2. I make up excuses for poor performance.
3. When things go wrong, I explain why I am not responsible.
4. To avoid being blamed, I let others know that I did not intend any harm.
5. I try to convince others that I am not responsible for negative events.

Justification

6. I offer socially acceptable reasons to justify behavior that others might not like.
7. After a negative action, I try to make others understand that if they had been in my position they would have done the same thing.
8. I offer good reasons for my behavior no matter how bad it may seem to others.
9. When others view my behavior as negative, I offer explanations so that they will understand that my behavior was justified.
10. I justify my behavior to reduce negative reactions from others.

Disclaimer

11. I offer explanations before doing something that others might think is wrong.
12. I try to get the approval of others before doing something they might perceive negatively.
13. When I believe I will not perform well, I offer excuses beforehand.
14. I justify beforehand actions others may not like.
15. I offer an excuse for possibly not performing well before taking a very difficult test.

Self-handicapping

16. Anxiety interferes with my performances.
17. I do not prepare well enough for exams because I get too involved in social activities.
18. I put obstacles in the way of my own success.
19. I get sick when under a lot of pressure to do well.
20. Poor health has been responsible for my getting mediocre grades in school.

Apology

21. I apologize when I have done something wrong.
22. I accept blame for bad behavior when it is clearly my fault.
23. I express remorse and guilt when I do something wrong.
24. I try to make up for any harm I have done to others.

25. If I harm someone, I apologize and promise not to do it again.

Ingratiation

- 26. When I want something, I try to look good.
- 27. I tell others about my positive qualities.
- 28. I use flattery to win the favor of others.
- 29. I compliment people to get them on my side.
- 30. I express the same attitudes as others so they will accept me.
- 31. I express opinions that other people will like.
- 32. I do favors for people in order to get them to like me.
- 33. I help others so they will help me.

Intimidation

- 34. I intimidate others.
- 35. I behave in ways that make other people afraid of me.
- 36. I do things to make people afraid of me so that they will do what I want.
- 37. I use my size and strength to influence people when I need to.
- 38. I threaten others when I think it will help me get what I want from them.

Supplication

- 39. I ask others to help me.
- 40. I tell others they are stronger or more competent than me in order to get others to do things for me.
- 41. I lead others to believe that I cannot do something in order to get help.
- 42. I hesitate and hope others will take responsibility for group tasks.
- 43. I use my weaknesses to get sympathy from others.

Entitlement

- 44. I claim credit for doing things I did not do.
- 45. I point out the positive things I do which other people fail to notice.
- 46. I tell people about my positive accomplishments.
- 47. When working on a project with a group I make my contribution seem greater than it is.
- 48. When telling someone about past events, I claim more credit for doing positive things than was warranted by the actual events.

Enhancement

- 49. When I succeed at a task, I emphasize to others how important the task was.
- 50. I exaggerate the value of my accomplishments.
- 51. I tell people when I do well at tasks others find difficult.
- 52. In telling others about things that I own, I also tell them of their value.

53. I do correct people who underestimate the value of gifts that I give to them.

Blasting

54. I make negative statements about people belonging to rival groups.

55. I have put others down in order to make myself look better.

56. I say negative things about unpopular groups.

57. I point out the incorrect positions of the opposing political party.

58. I exaggerate the negative qualities of people who compete with me.

Exemplification

59. I try to set an example for others to follow.

60. I try to serve as a model for-how a person should behave.

61. I try to get others to act in the same positive way I do.

62. I act in ways I think others should act.

63. I try to induce imitation by others by serving as a positive example.

Tactic Descriptions

Defensive

1. Excuses

a. Denying responsibility for negative events

2. Justifications

a. Providing reasons for negative behavior as justified, but accepting responsibility

3. Disclaimers

a. Expressions offering explanations before predicaments occur

4. Self-Handicapping

a. Producing an obstacle to success with the intention of preventing observers from making dispositional inferences about one's failures

5. Apologies

a. A confession of responsibility for any harm done to others or negative events and expressions of remorse and guilt

Assertive

1. Ingratiation

a. Actions to get others to like the actor as to gain an advantage from them

b. Can be self-enhancing communication, flattery, opinion conformity, or favors

2. Intimidation

a. Actions that have the intent to project an identity of the actor as someone who is powerful and dangerous

3. Supplication

a. Project as weak and displaying dependence to solicit help from a target

4. Entitlement
 - a. Claims by an actor of responsibility and credit for positive achievements
5. Enhancement
 - a. Persuading others that the outcomes of their behavior are more positive than they might have originally believed
6. Blasting
 - a. Behavior intended to produce or communicate negative evaluations of another person with which the actor is merely associated
7. Exemplification
 - a. Behavior presenting the actor as morally worthy and as having integrity so as to elicit respect, imitation, or admiration

Hypersensitivity Narcissism Scale (HSNS)

Please answer the following questions by deciding to what extent each item is characteristic of your feelings and behavior. Fill in the blank next to each item by choosing a number from the scale printed below.

1 = very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree

2 = uncharacteristic

3 = neutral

4 = characteristic

5 = very characteristic or true, strongly agree

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

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

Instructions: Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree, circle **SA**. If you agree with the statement, circle **A**. If you disagree, circle **D**. If you strongly disagree, circle **SD**.

- | | | | | | |
|-----|--|----|---|---|----|
| 1. | On the whole, I am satisfied with myself. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 2.* | At times, I think I am no good at all. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 3. | I feel that I have a number of good qualities. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 4. | I am able to do things as well as most other people. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 5.* | I feel I do not have much to be proud of. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 6.* | I certainly feel useless at times. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 7. | I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 8.* | I wish I could have more respect for myself. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 9.* | All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure. | SD | D | A | SA |
| 10. | I take a positive attitude toward myself. | SD | D | A | SA |

Items with an asterisk are reverse scored.

BIS/BAS

Each item of this questionnaire is a statement that a person may either agree with or disagree with. For each item, indicate how much you agree or disagree with what the item says. Please respond to all the items; do not leave any blank. Choose only one response to each statement. Please be as accurate and honest as you can be. Respond to each item as if it were the only item. That is, don't worry about being "consistent" in your responses. Choose from the following four response options:

- 1 = very true for me
- 2 = somewhat true for me
- 3 = somewhat false for me
- 4 = very false for me

1. A person's family is the most important thing in life.
 2. Even if something bad is about to happen to me, I rarely experience fear or nervousness.
 3. I go out of my way to get things I want.
 4. When I'm doing well at something I love to keep at it.
 5. I'm always willing to try something new if I think it will be fun.
 6. How I dress is important to me.
 7. When I get something I want, I feel excited and energized.
 8. Criticism or scolding hurts me quite a bit.
 9. When I want something I usually go all-out to get it.
 10. I will often do things for no other reason than that they might be fun.

 11. It's hard for me to find the time to do things such as get a haircut.
 12. If I see a chance to get something I want I move on it right away.
 13. I feel pretty worried or upset when I think or know somebody is angry at me.
 14. When I see an opportunity for something I like I get excited right away.
 15. I often act on the spur of the moment.
 16. If I think something unpleasant is going to happen I usually get pretty "worked up."
 17. I often wonder why people act the way they do.
 18. When good things happen to me, it affects me strongly.
 19. I feel worried when I think I have done poorly at something important.
 20. I crave excitement and new sensations.

 21. When I go after something I use a "no holds barred" approach.
 22. I have very few fears compared to my friends.
 23. It would excite me to win a contest.
 24. I worry about making mistakes.
-

Items other than 2 and 22 are reverse-scored.

BAS Drive: 3, 9, 12, 21

BAS Fun Seeking: 5, 10, 15, 20

BAS Reward Responsiveness: 4, 7, 14, 18, 23

BIS: 2, 8, 13, 16, 19, 22, 24

Items 1, 6, 11, 17, are fillers.

Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Please read each item and decide whether the statement is true or false as it applies to you. For each item, please circle TRUE or FALSE.

1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates. TRUE or FALSE
2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble. TRUE or FALSE
3. *It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged. TRUE or FALSE
4. I have never intensely disliked anyone. TRUE or FALSE
5. *On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life. TRUE or FALSE
6. *I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way. TRUE or FALSE
7. I am always careful about my manner of dress. TRUE or FALSE
8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out at a restaurant. TRUE or FALSE
9. *If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it. TRUE or FALSE
10. *On a few occasions I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability. TRUE or FALSE
11. *I like to gossip at times. TRUE or FALSE
12. *There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority, even though I knew they were right. TRUE or FALSE
13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener. TRUE or FALSE
14. *I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something. TRUE or FALSE
15. *There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone. TRUE or FALSE
16. I am always willing to admit when I made a mistake. TRUE or FALSE
17. I always try to practice what I preach. TRUE or FALSE
18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people. TRUE or FALSE
19. *I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget. TRUE or FALSE
20. When I don't know something, I don't mind at all admitting it. TRUE or FALSE
21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable. TRUE or FALSE

-
22. *At times I have really insisted on having things my own way. TRUE or FALSE
-
23. *There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things. TRUE or FALSE
-
24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrong-doings. TRUE or FALSE
-
25. I never resent being asked to return a favour. TRUE or FALSE
-
26. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own. TRUE or FALSE
-
27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car. TRUE or FALSE
-
28. *There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others. TRUE or FALSE
-
29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off. TRUE or FALSE
-
30. *I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favours of me. TRUE or FALSE
-
31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause. TRUE or FALSE
-
32. *I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved. TRUE or FALSE
-
33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings. TRUE or FALSE
-

Brief Loquaciousness and Interpersonal Responsiveness Test (BLIRT; i.e., Verbal Impulsivity)

Rate your agreement with each of the following statements on a scale from one to five, in which 1 = strongly disagree; 5 = strongly agree

1. If I have something to say, I don't hesitate to say it. _____
2. *It often takes me a while to figure out how to express myself.* _____
3. *If I disagree with someone, I tend to wait until later to say something.* _____
4. I always say what's on my mind. _____
5. *Sometimes I just don't know what to say to people.*
6. I never have a problem saying what I think.
7. *When emotions are involved, it's difficult for me to argue my opinion.* _____
8. I speak my mind as soon as a thought enters my head. _____

Italicized items are reverse-scored.

Effectiveness of Self-Presentation Tactics

Please respond to each item on a scale from 1 to 9 (1 = *not at all effective*; 9 = *extremely effective*).

(The target tactic is listed after each item here, but it was not for participants).

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to convince others that the outcomes of his/her behavior are more positive than they originally believed? ____ (enhancement)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to show others he/she is powerful and, at times, even capable of doing harm to others or their possessions (e.g., by making threats)? ____ (intimidation)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to take credit for positive achievements? ____ (entitlement)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to get others to like him/her (e.g., flattery, favors, gifts, opinion conformity) to get something from them? ____ (ingratiation)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to get others to think less of another person/group (e.g., by gossiping) to make himself/herself look good in comparison? ____ (blasting)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person behaves like they have integrity to get respect or admiration from others? ____ (exemplification)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person tries to show others he/she is weak and dependent to get something from them? ____ (supplication)

.....

When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it - prior to an action or performance (e.g., sports, games, speech) - telling observers that s/he might not perform well to reduce high expectations? _____ (disclaimer)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person makes a mistake, he/she apologizes to those people that were affected by the mistake? _____ (apology)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person makes a mistake, he/she tries to convince others that it wasn't really his/her fault? _____ (excuse-making)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when a person explains why their negative behavior was justified, but accepts responsibility for it? _____ (justification)

.....
When you are trying to make a good impression...

How effective is it when prior to an action or performance, a person intentionally puts obstacles in the way of success so others will be impressed by his/her success and unsurprised by his/her failure? _____ (self-handicapping)

Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale

Read each of the following statements carefully and indicate how characteristic it is of you according to the following scale:

- 1 = Not at all characteristic of me
- 2 = Slightly characteristic of me
- 3 = Moderately characteristic of me
- 4 = Very characteristic of me
- 5 = Extremely characteristic of me

- _____ 1. I worry about what other people will think of me even when I know it doesn't make any difference.
- _____ 2. I am unconcerned even if I know people are forming an unfavorable impression of me.
- _____ 3. I am frequently afraid of other people noticing my shortcomings.
- _____ 4. I rarely worry about what kind of impression I am making on someone.
- _____ 5. I am afraid others will not approve of me.
- _____ 6. I am afraid that people will find fault with me.
- _____ 7. Other people's opinions of me do not bother me.
- _____ 8. When I am talking to someone, I worry about what they may be thinking about me.
- _____ 9. I am usually worried about what kind of impression I make.
- _____ 10. If I know someone is judging me, it has little effect on me.
- _____ 11. Sometimes I think I am too concerned with what other people think of me.
- _____ 12. I often worry that I will say or do the wrong things.

APPENDIX B:

IRB APPROVAL LETTER

To ensure optimal image resolution, the letter is provided on the next page. The IRB approval letter shown on the next page was used for both Study 1 and Study 2. The letter is addressed to my advisor (Will Hart), as he was listed as the primary investigator in our application.



October 26, 2014

William P. Hart, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
College of Arts and Sciences
The University of Alabama
Box 870348

Re: IRB # 10-OR-323-R5 "Thoughts and Goals in Daily Life 2"

Dear Dr. Hart:

The University of Alabama Institutional Review Board has granted approval for your renewal application.

Your renewal application has been given expedited approval according to 45 CFR part 46. You have also been granted the requested waiver of informed consent. Approval has been given under expedited review category 7 as outlined below:

(7) Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

Your application will expire on October 25, 2016. If your research will continue beyond this date, complete the relevant portions of the IRB Renewal Application. If you wish to modify the application, complete the Modification of an Approved Protocol Form. Changes in this study cannot be initiated without IRB approval, except when necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants. When the study closes, complete the appropriate portions of the IRB Study Closure Form.

Please use reproductions of the IRB stamped documents.

Should you need to submit any further correspondence regarding this proposal, please include the above application number.

Good luck with your research.



358 Rose Administration Building
Box 870127
Tuscaloosa, Alabama 35487-0127
(205) 348-8461



Office of Research Compliance