This article was downloaded by: [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones]
On: 04 March 2014, At: 14:14
Publisher: Routledge
Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK

Memory
Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:
http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/pmem20

Clever and crude but not kind: Narcissism, self-esteem, and the self-reference effect

Lara L. Jones[a] & Amy B. Brunell[b]
[a] Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA
[b] Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University at Mansfield, OH, USA
Published online: 03 Apr 2013.

To cite this article: Lara L. Jones & Amy B. Brunell (2014) Clever and crude but not kind: Narcissism, self-esteem, and the self-reference effect, Memory, 22:4, 307-322, DOI: 10.1080/09658211.2013.778999

To link to this article: http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2013.778999

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions

Memory, 2014
Vol. 22, No. 4, 307–322, http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/09658211.2013.778999

Routledge
Taylor & Francis Group

Clever and crude but not kind: Narcissism, self-esteem, and the self-reference effect

Lara L. Jones[1] and Amy B. Brunell[2]

[1]Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI, USA
[2]Department of Psychology, The Ohio State University at Mansfield, OH, USA

According to the agency model of narcissism (Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006) narcissists view themselves as high on agentic traits but low on communal traits. To test if this self-view extends to recall, two experiments examined the extent to which narcissism was associated with self-ratings and recall of agentic and communal traits that varied in valence. Across both experiments a trait description task was followed by a surprise recall task for the trait words and then completion of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Within the self-reference condition narcissism was related to higher selection in the trait description task and to higher recall of positive-agentic (e.g., clever) traits. This general pattern of results occurred for narcissism even while controlling for the related personality variables of self-esteem, agency, and communion. In contrast to narcissism, within the self-referent group self-esteem predicted higher recall for positive-communal traits (e.g., kind) but lower recall for negative-communal traits, a finding consistent with mnemic neglect. Overall, results supported the agency model of narcissism and extended this model to suggest that narcissists rate themselves more highly not only on positive-agentic traits but also on negative-communal traits.

Keywords: Self-reference effect; Narcissism; Self-esteem; Mnemic neglect; Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI).

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

Narcissism is characterised by a positive and agentic self-schema as well as the need to maintain this mental representation of oneself via self-enhancement (Hepper, Gramzow, & Sedikides, 2010; Hepper, Hart, Gregg, & Sedikides, 2011; Vazire & Funder, 2006). The agency model of narcissism (Campbell, Brunell, & Finkel, 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007) predicts that narcissists'[1] self-beliefs and self-enhancement tendencies are specific to agentic (self-focused) rather than to communal (other-focused) positive traits. This positive agentic schema is demonstrated in narcissists' beliefs that they are leaders (Brunell et al., 2008) and better than average on traits reflecting an agentic orientation (e.g., intelligent, energetic; Campbell, Rudich, & Sedikides, 2002). Narcissism is even implicitly associated with agency but not communion (Campbell, Bosson, Goheen, Lakey, & Kernis, 2007). This self-focus is further exemplified by the different perceptions they hold surrounding their own actions versus those of others. For example, narcissism in college students was related to their self-reported academic dishonesty but not to their perceptions of other students' academic dishonesty (Brunell, Staats, Barden, & Hupp, 2011).

The current study further contrasts narcissists' perceptions of the self versus perceptions of

[1] As a matter of convenience and convention we use the term ''narcissists'' to refer to individuals with above-average scores on the NPI, and ''non-narcissists'' to refer to those with below-average NPI scores.

Address correspondence to: Lara L. Jones, Department of Psychology, Wayne State University, 5057 Woodward Ave., 7th Floor, Detroit, MI 48202, USA. E-mail: larajones@wayne.edu

© 2013 Taylor & Francis

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

others by examining how narcissism influences the rating of traits as self-relevant or other-relevant as well as the encoding and retrieval of these traits in a surprise recall task. The self-reference effect explains the superior memory found for self-relevant traits in comparison to other-relevant traits (Kuiper & Rogers, 1979; Lord, 1980). The self acts as a schema promoting both the elaboration and organisation of information during encoding (Markus, 1977; Symons & Johnson, 1997), as demonstrated by the higher recall of self-descriptive traits rather than unrelated traits following a self-reference task (Bellezza, 1992). In addition to the self-schema promoting elaboration, such elaboration may result from a quick search of autobiographical memory for instances of the given trait, the emotions evoked upon presentation of the trait (Serbun, Shih, & Gutchess, 2011), or a focus on the unique aspects of the self in comparison to others (Gutchess, Kensinger, & Schacter, 2010). Using a self-reference versus other-reference trait description task manipulation we examined whether narcissists' positive agentic self-schema differentially influenced the recall of four types of trait words (i.e., positive agency, positive communion, negative agency, and negative communion). Although our primary focus concerned the influence of narcissism on the selection and recall of traits (Experiments 1 and 2), in Experiment 2 we also examined the influence of other individual difference variables (e.g., self-esteem).

VALENCE AND AGENCY

Many social information processing studies have focused on either the dimension of valence (e.g., D'Argembeau, Comblain, & Van der Linden, 2005) or the dimensions of agency and communion (e.g., Abele & Wojciszke, 2007), with relatively few studies examining both dimensions simultaneously (but see Abele & Bruckmüller, 2011). Most relevant to our present study, D'Argembeau and colleagues (2005) found that free recall was greater for *positive* traits following a self-referent task than following an other-referent task in which participants rated the extent to which each trait described a well-known celebrity. In contrast, recall for negative traits did not differ between the referent task conditions. Our research investigates the extent to which the greater recall for positive traits in the self-referent task may be additionally influenced by whether that trait is agentic (e.g., clever) or communal (e.g., kind). Likewise, the recall and descriptiveness of negative traits may also be influenced by whether that trait is agentic (e.g., stupid) or communal (e.g., crude).

Similarly, earlier studies investigating the agency model of narcissism in self-perception conflated the agency and valence of traits. Campbell, Rudich, et al. (2002) found a direct relationship between narcissism and the perception of being above average on positive traits, which included a mixture of both agentic (e.g., intelligent) and communal (e.g., dependable) items, but no such relationship was found for the mixed set of agentic and communal negative traits (e.g., insecure, complaining). In contrast to the lack of a relationship with narcissism, self-esteem was inversely related to the negative items. Additionally, narcissism was positively associated with the self-perception of intelligence and with traits reflecting extraversion but inversely related to morality and to the personality factor of agreeableness (see also Miller, Price, & Campbell, 2012). Notably, across their three studies, there was a greater focus on both agentic and communal positive traits with relatively less inclusion of negative traits, making the association between narcissism and the self-perception of negative traits less clear. Moreover, the authors acknowledged the need for future research to examine "the link between narcissism, self-esteem, and self-beliefs on communion" with a more "pure" measure of communal bias than morality and agreeableness (p. 366). Thus our first step was to develop an item set which systematically varied agency and valence, and controlled for word frequency.

NARCISSISM AND MEMORIAL DISTORTIONS

In addition to the selection of traits as being self-descriptive, narcissists' self-enhancement tendencies (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; Collins & Stukas, 2008; Hepper et al., 2010; Vazire & Funder, 2006) may lead to distortions in memory when recalling recent events (Gosling, John, Craik, & Robins, 1998; Rhodewalt & Eddings, 2002), feedback (Hepper et al., 2011; Sedikides & Green, 2000, 2009) as well as autobiographical memories (Hart et al., 2011; Wang, 2001). For example, narcissists' self-reports

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

of their desirable actions during a group discussion task were more positively distorted than non-narcissists' self-reports (Gosling et al., 1998) and tended to be more agentic (e.g., "I took charge of things at the meeting") than communal (e.g., "Expressed agreement with another group member"). Similarly, those higher in narcissism included more agentic references in their descriptions of a nostalgic event in their lives (Hart et al., 2011) and were more likely to endorse agentic items (e.g., overcoming challenges; having time to myself) rather than communal items (e.g., reunions with family or friends; the way society was) on a nostalgic inventory.

In addition to the better recall for positive-agentic information, those higher in narcissism and/or self-esteem may also be more likely to have poorer recall for negative self-relevant (but not other-relevant) information in comparison to self-affirming positive information, which is referred to as *mnemic neglect* (Green, Pinter, & Sedikides, 2005; Green & Sedikides, 2004; Pinter, Green, Sedikides, & Gregg, 2011; Sedikides & Green, 2000, 2004; Sedikides & Gregg, 2008). Mnemic neglect affects recall but not recognition (Green, Sedikides, & Gregg, 2008) and occurs for information that is more central to the self-concept rather than peripheral (Green et al., 2008; Pinter et al., 2011). Thus it is possible that narcissists will engage in mnemic neglect by recalling positive, central aspects of the self (e.g., positive agentic traits) while failing to recall negative self-relevant traits (e.g., negative agentic traits) in order to self-protect.

APPROACH/AVOIDANCE AND SELF-ENHANCEMENT/SELF-PROTECTION MOTIVES

According to research, narcissists tend to have a strong approach orientation for ego-affirming information (e.g., positive-agentic traits) and a weak tendency to avoid negative ego-threatening information such as negative agentic traits (Campbell & Foster, 2007; Foster & Brennan, 2011; Foster, Misra, & Reidy, 2009; Foster & Trimm, 2008; Morf & Rhodewalt, 1993; Rhodewalt & Eddings, 2002). This approach motivation for favourable information may be manifested not only in self-perception and behaviour but also during information processing. For instance, narcissists may be more likely to view positive-agentic traits as self-descriptive, and also be better able to recall these traits in comparison to other traits. This strong approach/weak avoidance aspect of narcissism does not apply to communal traits, which narcissists are less likely to view as particularly important in comparison to those high in self-esteem (Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002).

Self-enhancement motives (e.g., rating oneself as better than average; Sekikides & Gregg, 2008; for review see Alicke & Sedikides, 2009) focus on maximising positive self-views (Hepper et al., 2010) and are related to approach motivation. In contrast, self-protection motives focus on minimising negative self-views and are related to avoidance motivation (Hepper et al., 2010; Sedikides & Green, 2000). Mnemic neglect is a self-protective rather than self-enhancing memorial distortion (Pinter et al., 2011). Both narcissism and self-esteem are related to self-enhancement and self-protection (e.g., Campbell et al., 2000; Hepper et al., 2011) although likely to differing degrees and in different domains. For example, narcissism is more strongly related to self-enhancing behaviours than is self-esteem (e.g., Hepper et al., 2010; Horvath & Morf, 2010; Robins & Beer, 2001). In addition, one difference between narcissists and those with high self-esteem is the domain where positivity resides, with narcissists valuing agency and those with high self-esteem valuing both agency and communion (Campbell et al., 2002). Thus, narcissism and self-esteem might predict mnemic neglect in different ways.

OVERVIEW OF EXPERIMENTS

Across two experiments we tested the predicted effects of narcissism on the explicit perception of how well the traits described oneself or a familiar other and on the recall of these traits following the trait description task. In Experiment 1 we first focused on our primary variable of interest, narcissism. Then in Experiment 2 we included the additional individual difference variables of self-esteem, agency, and communion to determine whether any obtained effects in Experiment 1 are attributable to these related variables rather than to narcissism, and to compare and contrast the predictive influence of narcissism versus these other three variables on trait perception and recall. Based on the agency model and prior results (Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002; Campbell et al., 2007), we predicted that narcissism would

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

be associated with greater selection and recall of the positive agentic traits in the self-reference task condition. Due to narcissists' positive and agentic self-schema, and their strong approach motivation for ego-affirming information, we predicted narcissism would be related to the selection and recall of positive agentic but not positive communal traits. However, given their weak avoidance motivation for ego-threatening information, we expected narcissism would be unrelated to the selection or recall of negative-agentic traits (e.g., lazy, stupid). Finally, considering that narcissists' perceptions of themselves often differ from those they hold for others (Brunell et al., 2011), we expected the relationship between narcissism and the selection and recall of positive agentic traits to apply primarily to themselves (i.e., to obtain in the self-reference task but not in the other-reference task).

EXPERIMENT 1

Method

Participants. A total of 201 undergraduates from Francis Marion University ($n = 135$) and Wayne State University ($n = 66$) participated for partial course credit.[2] The total sample consisted of 92 Caucasians, 79 African Americans, 14 Asians, and 16 other ethnicities; 151 participants were female. Participants ($M_{age} = 20.55$, $SD_{age} = 3.56$) were randomly assigned to a self-referent task ($n = 103$) or other-referent task ($n = 98$). An additional 66 students participated in stimuli norming tasks as described below.

Stimuli norming and materials. We created an initial set of 241 trait words sampled from Alicke (1985) and Anderson (1968). The frequency of these traits, which also served as a proxy for familiarity, was assessed using the HAL log-frequency measure provided by the English Lexicon Database (Balota et al., 2002; http://elexicon.wustl.edu) with higher values indicating greater written frequency. From this initial set 40 words having a log-frequency index < 6.20 were eliminated and 30 participants rated the valence of the remaining 201 trait words using a 7-point scale (-3 = negative, 0 = neutral, 3 = positive). We then eliminated 41 neutral words having a mean valence rating between -1.0 and $+1.0$ from our set of traits. Next a different group of participants ($N = 36$) indicated whether each of the remaining 160 trait words was agentic (defined as describing only the self) or communal (defined as describing one's interactions with others). The proportions of agentic judgements served as the dependent measure.

Then 80 trait words were selected and evenly divided among the four Valence × Agency conditions (see Appendix). Mean frequencies, valence ratings, and agency proportions as well as examples are presented for each condition in Table 1. Frequency, valence, and agency measures were assessed in a 2 (Valence: positive, negative) × 2 (Agency: agentic, communal) factorial ANOVA. Frequencies were equivalent across all four trait types as evidenced by the lack of reliable main effects or interaction. Analyses further confirmed that differences in valence were consistent across the two agency conditions, and that differences in agency were consistent across the two valence conditions. Hence agency and valence were not conflated.

Procedure. Participants indicated whether each of the 80 traits described themselves or a nationally recognised other (Hillary Clinton). Traits were presented individually on a computer screen until a response was provided ("J" key for "yes" or the "F" key for "no"). The order of traits was randomised across participants. Immediately following the trait description task participants were given up to 10 minutes to type into a textbox as many of these traits as they could recall. Finally participants completed the 40-item NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988), a commonly used and well-validated measure of narcissism ($\alpha = .85$, $M = 18.27$, $SD = 6.57$).

Results and discussion

Self-reference effect. Demographic data and recall data for each of the two referent groups are shown in Table 2. As expected, independent-samples *t*-test results replicated the robust self-reference effect (SRE) with greater correct recall than in the other-referent task.

Trait description task. We predicted that the more narcissistic individuals would have a higher

[2] Independent-samples *t*-tests confirmed that there were no differences between the Wayne State University and Francis Marion University participants on NPI score, number of correct items recalled, or the number of recalled items within each of the four trait-types (all $ps > .55$). Hence all subsequent analyses collapsed across university.

TABLE 1
Frequency, valence, and agency means from stimuli norming task

Trait type	*Frequency*	*Valence*	*Agency*	*Examples*
Positive Agentic	8.32 (1.04)	+1.85 (0.37)	0.72 (0.11)	clever, attractive, ambitious
Positive Communal	8.18 (1.39)	+1.95 (0.35)	0.34 (0.12)	kind, generous, sympathetic
Negative Agentic	8.21 (1.04)	−1.78 (0.28)	0.67 (0.12)	lazy, stupid, irrational
Negative Communal	8.22 (1.32)	−1.92 (0.42)	0.33 (0.11)	jealous, deceptive, insulting

Standard deviations are in parentheses. Frequency = log HAL frequencies, with higher values indicating greater written frequencies. Valence Scale = −3 (negative) to 0 (neutral) to +3 (positive). Agency = proportion of traits judged as agentic.

number of positive-agentic traits selected as self-descriptive and that this relationship would hold only within the self-reference task. Hence we conducted a 2 (Valence) × 2 (Agency) ANCOVA within each reference task with NPI as a covariate. Because NPI scores are higher in males than in females (e.g., Foster, Campbell, & Twenge, 2003), we included gender as an additional covariate (coding: 0 = female, 1 = male). There were no reliable interactions with gender in either the self-referent (*p*s > .20) or other-referent (*p*s > .25) conditions. The Valence × Agency × NPI interaction was reliable within the self condition, $F(1, 100) = 6.39$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$, but did not reach significance within the other condition, $F(1, 95) = 2.81$, $p < .10$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. In order to better examine these interactions, and to test our specific hypotheses based on the agency model of narcissism, four separate multiple regression analyses were conducted using narcissism and gender as predictors of the selection of (a) positive-agentic traits, (b) negative-agentic traits, (c) positive-communal traits, and (d) negative-communal traits. One set of analyses were conducted for the self-referent condition and another set of analyses were conducted for the other-referent condition (Table 3).

In the self-referent condition narcissistic individuals were significantly more likely to select both positive-agentic traits and negative-communal traits as self-descriptive. Hence results supported the agency model's prediction that narcissism is uniquely related to viewing oneself positively but only in reference to self-oriented or agentic traits (e.g., viewing oneself as clever but not kind). The relationship between NPI and negative-communal traits corroborates prior evidence of narcissists' blatant disregard for others (Reidy, Zeichner, Foster, & Martinez, 2008) and, perhaps not surprisingly, suggests that narcissists possess a self-awareness of this disregard. Importantly, this relationship between narcissism and negative-communal traits held only for the self. Whereas narcissists in the self condition were more likely to select only positive-agentic traits, in the other condition narcissistic individuals were significantly more likely to select both positive-agentic *and* positive-communal traits to describe Hillary Clinton. Finally, consistent with prior studies on gender and agency and communion (e.g., Helgeson & Fritz, 1999), women were more likely to select positive-communal traits as self-descriptive.

TABLE 2
Experiment 1: Means and *SD* of variables in self and other condition

	Self (n = *103*)		*Other* (n = *98*)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	t
Narcissism	17.46	6.09	18.27	7.10	−0.87
Age	20.25	2.94	20.55	4.16	−0.59
Correctly Recalled Traits	17.13	5.26	12.49	4.64	6.61***
Positive Agentic	4.95	2.20	3.77	2.01	3.98***
Negative Agentic	4.68	1.92	2.90	2.05	6.37***
Positive Communal	3.90	1.98	2.85	2.06	3.68***
Negative Communal	3.60	2.04	2.97	1.58	2.41*
Incorrectly Recalled Traits	2.50	2.04	3.08	2.53	−1.81#

#$p \leq .10$; *$p \leq .05$; ***$p \leq .001$.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

TABLE 3
Experiment 1: Regression of NPI and control factors on trait selection (number of traits judged as descriptive of self or other)

	Self (n = *103*)				*Other* (n = *98*)			
Variable	*Positive Agentic*	*Negative Agentic*	*Positive Communal*	*Negative Communal*	*Positive Agentic*	*Negative Agentic*	*Positive Communal*	*Negative Communal*
Narcissism	.21*	.01	.10	.22*	.19#	−.18#	.26**	−.19#
Gender	−.10	.07	−.19*	.06	−.13	.07	−.14	.05
R^2	.05#	.01	.05#	.05#	.05#	.04	.09*	.04

Standardised betas (β) and overall R^2 from multiple regression analyses. Gender was coded female = 0 and male = 1.
#$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$.

Free recall task. We ran an initial ANCOVA with NPI and Gender as covariates. The expected Valence × Agency × NPI interaction was reliable within the self-referent, $F(1, 100) = 4.35$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, but not within the other-referent, $F(1, 95) < 1$, $p = .37$, condition. Gender, however, did not interact with any of the other variables in either the self- ($ps > .45$) or other-referent ($ps > .70$) conditions.

As before, in order to assess the nature of these interactions as well as testing our hypothesis of greater recall for the positive-agentic items, we again conducted separate regression analyses for each trait. In addition to including narcissism (NPI) and gender as predictors, for each trait we also included the total number of correctly recalled items for the other three trait types in order to control for individual variation in recall ability. Not surprisingly, the overall number of other traits correctly recalled was generally the most robust predictor of recall for each of the four traits (Table 4). Yet, even controlling for Gender and recall ability, narcissism predicted recall of positive-agentic traits in the self but not in the other condition. Moreover, narcissism was not a significant predictor of trait recall for the negative-agentic, positive-communal, nor negative-communal traits within the self condition nor for any of the traits in the other condition. Within both referent conditions, Gender was not a reliable predictor of recall for any of the four traits.

Our experiment is the first investigation of narcissism and the self-reference effect. The current experiment replicates previous findings (Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002; Campbell et al., 2007) that narcissism is associated with a positive-agentic self-perception and notably extends these findings to an association between narcissism and a negative-communal self-perception. For participants in the self-referent condition, narcissism was positively associated with the recall of positive-agentic traits in the recall task and with the judgement of traits as being self-descriptive in the trait description task. Narcissism was not associated with the ratings and recall of negative-agentic traits, possibly because strong approach motivation appears to be a more central aspect of the narcissistic personality than weak avoidance motivation (Foster & Brennan, 2011). These results add to the prior evidence supporting the agency model of narcissism (e.g., Campbell

TABLE 4
Experiment 1: Regression of NPI and control factors on trait recall (number of traits correctly recalled of each trait type)

	Self (n = *103*)				*Other* (n = *98*)			
Variable	*Positive Agentic Recall*	*Negative Agentic Recall*	*Positive Communal Recall*	*Negative Communal Recall*	*Positive Agentic Recall*	*Negative Agentic Recall*	*Positive Communal Recall*	*Negative Communal Recall*
Narcissism	.26**	−.02	−.07	.06	−.05	−.04	−.06	.13
Gender	.00	−.01	.08	−.07	.03	−.03	−.03	−.07
Other Recalled Traits	.33***	.31**	.36***	.27**	.35***	.22*	.26**	.08
R^2	.19***	.10*	.12**	.09*	.13**	.05	.07#	.03

Standardised betas (β) and overall R^2 from multiple regression analyses. Gender was coded female = 0 and male = 1.
*$p < .05$, $p < .01$**, ***$p < .001$.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

et al., 2007) and further demonstrate an influence of narcissism on self-related memory (e.g., Gosling et al., 1998; Rhodewalt & Eddings, 2002).

EXPERIMENT 2

Self-esteem and other personality variables related to narcissism (e.g., agency, communion), may similarly or differentially influence the types of self-relevant traits selected as self-descriptive and recalled. For example, D'Argembeau and Van der Linden (2008) found that those higher in self-esteem had richer autobiographical memories (e.g., greater visual detail; feelings of reliving the event) for events that produced a feeling of pride than did those low in self-esteem. However, though narcissism and self-esteem are positively correlated, narcissists are high in agency and low in communion, whereas those high in self-esteem possess a high degree of both agency and communion (Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002; Campbell et al., 2006). So then, in the self-referent condition, narcissists would favour the positive-agentic traits as being self-descriptive, whereas those who possess higher self-esteem would favour *both* the positive-agentic and positive-communal traits. Hence in Experiment 2 we sought to examine whether narcissism uniquely explained the pattern of results found in Experiment 1 (i.e., for narcissists, greater selection of positive-agentic and negative communal traits as self-descriptive and greater recall of positive-agentic traits) by including other predictors that are related to narcissism (self-esteem, agency, and communion).

Method

Participants. A total of 227 Wayne State University undergraduates (131 females) participated for partial course credit. The sample consisted of 82 Caucasians, 58 African Americans, 29 Asian/Indian, 41 Arabic/Middle Eastern, and 17 other ethnicities. Participants (M_{age} = 22.24, SD_{age} = 5.34) were randomly assigned to a self-referent task (n = 114) or other-referent task (n = 113).

Materials and procedure. The same 80 traits and general procedures were used as in Experiment 2 with the following three modifications. First, for purposes of generalisation, Hillary Clinton was replaced with an internationally recognisable male other-referent (Barack Obama). Second, in place of the yes/no binary judgements in the trait description task, participants rated the extent to which the given trait described themselves or the other-referent on a 7-point scale ("1 = not at all . . . 4 = somewhat descriptive . . . 7 = very descriptive"). Finally we added measures of self-esteem, agency, and communion, in order to determine whether narcissism uniquely predicted the pattern of results obtained in Experiment 1. Narcissism was again assessed by the 40-item NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1988) and had good internal reliability (α = .82, M = 17.32, SD = 6.56). Self-esteem was measured using the 10-item Rosenberg Self-Esteem Inventory (RSE; Rosenberg, 1965) and also had good internal reliability (α = .85, M = 41.21, SD = 6.90). Participants rated their agreement to these 10 items (e.g., "I feel that I have a number of good qualities") on a 5-point scale (1 = strong disagreement to 5 = strong agreement), and thus the possible scores ranged from 10 to 50. The agency and communion subscales of the Communion-Agency Scale (CAS; Hirokawa & Dohi, 2007) were chosen for the current study. The six agentic items (e.g., "I assert my opinion" and "I have confidence in myself") reflect Bakan's (1966) characterisation of agency as having a focus on individualisation and self-assertion, and the six communal items (e.g., "I am kind to others" and "I can express my thanks") reflect a focus on cooperation and the creation of unions. For each of the agentic and communal items, participants indicated how descriptive each item was on a 4-point scale (1 = "not at all true" to 4 = "very true), hence possible scores on each subscale ranged from 4 to 24. Both the agency (M = 19.34, SD = 2.94) and communal (M = 21.16, SD = 2.59) scales had acceptable internal reliabilities (αs = .68). As in Experiment 1 participants first completed the trait description task, followed by the surprise recall task, and then the personality measures. Presentation order of the personality scales was randomised across participants. Following completion of all four personality scales, participants reported their gender, age, and ethnicity.

Results and discussion

Inter-correlations among personality variables. Inter-correlations among the four personality variables ranged from weak to moderate. Consistent with prior studies (e.g., Brunell et al., 2011; Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002; Campbell et al., 2007; Konrath, Bushman, & Grove, 2009),

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

narcissism (NPI scores) was only weakly related to self-esteem (RSE; $r = .33$, $p < .001$). Narcissism was moderately related to agency (CAS; $r = .46$, $p < .001$), but not to communion (CAS; $r = .08$, $p = .21$). Self-esteem was related more strongly to agency ($r = .53$, $p < .001$) than to communion ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), and agency was only weakly related to communion ($r = .29$, $p < .001$). Given these weak to moderate relationships, it is unlikely that the results in Experiment 1 were attributable to self-esteem or agency rather than to narcissism. Indeed, as previously described, those high in self-esteem should exhibit a different pattern of results from those high in narcissism. Likewise, those high in agency or communion may also exhibit a different pattern from that of narcissists. To investigate this we analysed the data as in Experiment 1, but with self-esteem, agency, and communion included as predictors along with narcissism and gender.

Self-reference effect. As shown in Table 5, age, narcissism, agency, and communion were equivalent between the two referent groups. As in Experiment 1, independent-samples *t*-tests again revealed a reliable self-reference effect with more traits recalled within the self than within the other condition (Table 5).

Trait description task. Trait ratings and recall data within each Referent condition were further analysed in separate ANCOVAs to investigate the interactions with valence and agency for each of our four personality variables and gender. Few of the results within the other-referent condition were reliable in comparison to the self-referent condition, in which these personality variables were more influential. Therefore, for brevity, we report these interactions only for the self-referent condition in Table 6 and compare the critical interactions reported in the table to those in the other-referent condition below.

As in Experiment 1, the most critical Valence × Agency × Narcissism interaction was reliable for the trait ratings within the self-referent (see Table 6) but not within the other-referent, $p = .34$, condition. The Valence × Agency × Self-esteem interaction approached significance ($p = .12$) in the self-referent condition but was not reliable in the other-referent condition, $p = .62$. The personality variables of agency and communion (denoted as P-Agency and P-Communion) also were each reliable in a three-way interaction with Valence and Agency within the self (Table 6) but not within the other condition ($p = .80$ and $p = .21$, respectively). Within the other-referent condition, only the Valence × P-Communion interaction was reliable, $(1, 107) = 5.56$, $p < .05$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$.

To examine these interactions in more detail and our hypotheses regarding the influence of narcissism and self-esteem in the perceived self-relevance for each trait, we conducted multiple regressions within each referent group with the four personality variables and gender as predictors (see Table 7). Narcissism was not a significant predictor of the positive-agentic trait ratings when self-esteem, agency, communion, and gender were included in the model, although the non-significant

TABLE 5
Experiment 2: Means and *SD* of variables in self and other condition

	Self (n = *114*)		*Other* (n = *113*)		
Variable	M	SD	M	SD	t
Narcissism	17.17	6.25	17.48	6.89	−0.36
Self-Esteem	42.08	6.64	40.34	7.08	1.91#
P-Agency	19.39	2.86	19.29	3.02	0.24
P-Communion	21.10	2.67	21.23	2.52	−0.39
Age	22.56	6.29	21.92	4.19	0.90
Correctly Recalled Traits	15.31	6.63	12.61	4.79	3.51***
Positive Agentic	4.11	2.26	3.65	2.18	1.56
Negative Agentic	4.08	1.97	2.71	1.66	5.67***
Positive Communal	3.98	2.61	3.13	1.78	2.87**
Negative Communal	3.14	2.03	3.12	1.69	0.07
Incorrectly Recalled Traits	2.42	2.95	3.06	2.84	−1.67#

P-Agency refers to the individual difference variable of agency assessed by the CAS measure. Likewise, P-Communion (CAS) refers to the personality variable.
#$p \leq .10$; **$p \leq .01$; ***$p \leq .001$.

TABLE 6
Experiment 2: ANCOVA Results for Self-referent condition

	Trait ratings			*Recalled traits*		
Variable	F	p	η_p^2	F	p	η_p^2
Valence	**15.59**	**<.01**	**.13**	1.17	.28	.01
Valence × Narcissism	.87	.35	.01	.59	.44	<.01
Valence × Self-Esteem	**22.56**	**<.01**	**.17**	2.60	.11	.02
Valence × P-Agency	.49	.49	<.01	.43	.51	<.01
Valence × P-Communion	**13.44**	**<.01**	**.11**	.24	.62	<.01
Valence × Gender	**8.31**	**<.01**	**.07**	.77	.38	<.01
Agency	.96	.33	.01	**5.57**	**.02**	**.05**
Agency × Narcissism	1.16	.28	.01	1.01	.32	.01
Agency × Self-Esteem	.55	.46	.01	1.16	.28	.01
Agency × P-Agency	<.01	.99	<.01	.55	.46	.01
Agency × P-Communion	1.06	.31	.01	1.62	.21	.01
Agency × Gender	.88	.35	.01	.76	.39	<.01
Valence × Agency	.19	.67	<.01	.15	.70	<.01
Valence × Agency × Narcissism	**10.16**	**<.01**	**.09**	**4.03**	**<.05**	**.04**
Valence × Agency × Self-Esteem	2.46	.12	.02	**8.65**	**<.01**	**.07**
Valence × Agency × P-Agency	**7.94**	**<.01**	**.07**	.21	.65	<.01
Valence × Agency × P-Communion	**9.47**	**<.01**	**.08**	2.80	.10	.02
Valence × Agency × Gender	1.05	.31	.01	.67	.42	<.01

Agency refers to the extent to which trait is agentic, whereas P-Agency refers to the individual difference variable of agency assessed by the CAS measure. Likewise, P-Communion (CAS) refers to the personality variable.

trend was in the same direction as in Experiment 1.[3] Consistent with Experiment 1, narcissism predicted higher ratings of negative communal traits (albeit not reliably, $p = .07$). In contrast, narcissism was not predictive of ratings for any of the four traits within the other condition. As predicted based on prior findings of narcissism and self-esteem (e.g., Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002), within the Self condition, self-esteem was positively (and robustly) associated with both higher ratings for positive-agentic *and* positive-communal traits, as well as negatively associated with ratings for negative agency and negative communion. Agency scores (CAS) were also positively associated with higher ratings for positive-agentic items but not for any of the other traits. Communion scores (CAS) were associated with positive-agentic and positive-communal trait ratings and inversely related to negative-communal trait ratings. Consistent with Experiment 1 and past findings (Helgeson & Fritz, 1999), females were more likely to endorse positive-communal traits. Females were more likely to also rate positive-agentic traits as being more self-descriptive, and males were more likely to endorse the negative-agentic traits. In the other condition communion scores were associated with higher ratings on the positive-agentic and positive-communal traits. Males were more likely to give Obama higher scores on the negative-agentic and negative-communal traits. No other values were statistically significant.

Trait recall. As in Experiment 1, ANCOVAs were first conducted within each Referent condition to assess whether each of the four personality variables and gender interacted with Valence and Agency (see Table 6). As before, the Valence × Agency × Narcissism interaction was reliable within the self-referent condition, although it was not reliable within the other-referent condition ($p = .07$). The Valence × Agency × Self-Esteem interaction was reliable within the self-referent but not the other-referent condition ($p = .49$). No other interactions were reliable.

Separate multiple regressions were conducted within the two referent groups to test our specific hypotheses regarding the influence of narcissism

[3] Notably, the failure of narcissism to predict positive-agentic ratings contrasts with that found in Experiment 1. Therefore we further investigated the relationship between NPI scores and positive-agentic ratings first by visual inspection of a scatterplot. The scatterplot and subsequent regression analyses revealed an emergence of narcissism as a predictor of positive-agentic ratings for NPI scores ≥13 (≥ −.67 standard deviations from the mean). For this subset of 88 self-referent group participants with NPI scores ≥ 13, narcissism was a reliable predictor of positive-agentic ratings, $\beta = .21$, $t = 2.24$, $p < .05$. For all other variables the pattern of results for these 88 participants did not differ from the overall self-referent sample.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

TABLE 7
Experiment 2: Regression of personality variables on trait ratings in the Self and Other referent conditions

	Self (n = *114*)				*Other* (n = *113*)			
Variable	*Positive Agentic Ratings*	*Negative Agentic Ratings*	*Positive Communal Ratings*	*Negative Communal Ratings*	*Positive Agentic Ratings*	*Negative Agentic Ratings*	*Positive Communal Ratings*	*Negative Communal Ratings*
Narcissism	.12	.08	−.08	.18#	−.002	−.02	−.01	.05
Self-Esteem	.27**	−.36**	.37***	−.40***	.11	−.11	.16	−.10
P-Agency	.23*	−.04	.07	.09	.02	−.08	.03	−.09
P-Communion	.18*	−.16#	.34***	−.24**	.30**	−.14	.26**	−.10
Gender	−.19*	.21*	−.17*	.14	−.07	.21*	−.09	.18#
R^2	.38***	.25***	.41***	.26***	.12*	.10*	.12*	.07

P-Agency refers to the individual difference variable of agency assessed by the CAS measure. Likewise, P-Communion (CAS) refers to the personality variable. Standardised betas (β) and overall R^2 from multiple regression analyses. Gender was coded female = 0 and male = 1.
#$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

and self-esteem on recall for each trait. In addition to the four personality variables, gender, and total number of other correctly recalled traits were included as predictors (see Table 8). As before, the number of other recalled traits was generally the most reliable predictor of recall for each trait. Consistent with the results of Experiment 1, within the self-referent condition, narcissism was positively associated with recall of positive-agentic traits, even while controlling for self-esteem, agency, communion, and gender. Narcissism was not associated with the recall of negative-agentic trait words or communal trait words. The inclusion of self-esteem yielded important results as well. In corroboration of our finding of a direct relationship between self-esteem and endorsement of positive-communal traits (see also Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002), self-esteem was associated with recalling positive-communal traits words and inversely related to recall of negative-communal trait words. Communion scores were inversely related to recalling negative-agentic traits, whereas agency scores were not related to recall for any of the four traits. In sum, results replicate the direct association between narcissism and recall of positive-agentic traits found in Experiment 1, and extend these findings by demonstrating a unique pattern for narcissism as a predictor of trait recall in comparison to self-esteem, agency, and communion.

In the other condition with Barack Obama as the referent narcissism was directly related to recalling positive-agentic traits and inversely related to the recall of positive-communal traits.

TABLE 8
Experiment 2: Regression of personality variables on trait recall in the Self and Other referent conditions

	Self (n = *114*)				*Other* (n = *113*)			
Variable	*Positive Agentic Recall*	*Negative Agentic Recall*	*Positive Communal Recall*	*Negative Communal Recall*	*Positive Agentic Recall*	*Negative Agentic Recall*	*Positive Communal Recall*	*Negative Communal Recall*
Narcissism	.19*	−.08	−.09	.003	.19#	−.05	−.24*	−.08
Self-Esteem	−.10	.005	.28**	−.16#	.11	.12	.05	.09
P-Agency	−.05	−.02	−.05	.06	−.12	.08	.06	−.01
P-Communion	.04	−.16#	.02	.14	−.003	.03	−.10	−.13
Gender	−.08	−.08	−.05	.08	.002	−.04	−.19*	−.03
Other Recalled Traits	.57***	.57***	.51***	.50***	.42***	.33***	.19*	.31**
R^2	.35***	.34***	.32***	.27***	.21***	.15**	.16**	.15**

P-Agency refers to the individual difference variable of agency assessed by the CAS measure. Likewise, P-Communion (CAS) refers to the personality variable. Standardised betas (β) and overall R^2 from multiple regression analyses. Other Recalled Traits reflects the total number of the words recalled for the other three traits. Gender was coded female = 0 and male = 1.
#$p < .10$, *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

In other words, the higher the participants' narcissism, the more likely they were to recall positive-agentic traits for Obama and the less likely they were to recall the positive-communal traits for him. These results differed from those of Experiment 1, which used Hillary Clinton as the well-known other-referent, and found no reliable associations between narcissism and the number of traits recalled. Nonetheless, the overall pattern of results for narcissism as a predictor of trait self-descriptiveness and recall within the self-referent condition was consistent across both experiments and differed from that found in the other-referent condition.

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present set of studies was the first to examine, in the same population, the influence of narcissism and self-esteem on social information processing using both an explicit task (whether and the extent to which traits are self/other descriptive) as well as a more implicit surprise recall task. Results further demonstrate an influence of narcissism on self-relevant memory (e.g., Gosling et al., 1998; Hart et al., 2011), and add personality factors to the literature on individual differences in the self-reference effect, which has examined ageing (e.g., Glisky & Marquine, 2009; Gutchess et al., 2010; Gutchess, Kensinger, Yoon, & Schacter, 2007), depression (e.g., Derry & Kuiper, 1981; Ingram, Smith, & Brehm, 1983), and anxiety (e.g., Smith, Ingram, & Brehm, 1983). Results of the trait description task provide initial support for extending the agency model of narcissism (e.g., Campbell & Foster, 2007) to also include narcissists' *unabashed awareness* of their own negative-communal tendencies (e.g., being crude, deceptive, selfish, etc.).

In contrast to narcissism, self-esteem differentially predicted the rating and recall of traits in Experiment 2. Consistent with previous findings (e.g., Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002), those higher in self-esteem rated themselves favourably on both agentic and communal traits (cf. Table 7). Additional emphasis on the communal traits (but not the agentic ones) was shown in the recall task within the self-referent group. That is, self-esteem predicted recall of more positive-communal traits and to a lesser extent fewer negative-communal traits (Table 8). This last result is especially interesting in light of the stronger relationship between self-esteem and agency ($r = .53$) in comparison to self-esteem and communion ($r = .20$). Although those higher in self-esteem also have an agentic orientation (also demonstrated by the relationship between self-esteem and by the higher ratings for positive-agentic traits in Table 7), they recall the positive-communal traits (e.g., kind) but not the positive-agentic ones (e.g., clever; see Table 8). Hence, in contrast to narcissism, self-esteem is characterised by a more communal than agentic focus in the recall of self-relevant information. On the surface our findings seem to contradict those of D'Argembeau and Van der Linden (2008) who found more detailed and richer autobiographical memories related to their more positive-agentic construct of pride for those higher in self-esteem. However, this discrepancy may simply be due to the possibility that some of the high self-esteem participants in the D'Argembeau and Van der Linden (2008) study also may have been higher in narcissism.

Narcissism predicts self-relevance but not recall of negative communal traits

Our findings suggest that narcissists' positive-agentic self-schemata is associated with both positive-agentic *and* negative-communal self-perception as well as the further elaboration in memory on positive-agentic aspects when they encounter self-relevant information (Markus, 1977; Serbun et al., 2011). The failure to also preferentially encode the self-relevant negative-communal traits may be due to a weak avoidance motivation for the negative information in contrast to a strong approach motivation for the positive-agentic traits (Foster & Brennan, 2011; Foster & Trimm, 2008). Alternatively, it may simply be that narcissists view negative-communal traits (e.g., selfish, crude, insulting) as more neutral than negative, less important, or possibly experience less ego-defence concerning their negative-communal qualities than other qualities. Valence rating tasks and various approach/avoidance paradigms could be used to further investigate these possible explanations for the greater perceived self-relevance but lack of enhanced recall for the negative-communal traits.

Relative influence of self-esteem and narcissism on mnemic neglect

Within the self-referent condition the preferential retrieval of the positive-communal traits over the

other three trait types among those with higher self-esteem suggests deeper processing for these traits, which is likely attributable to a greater integration with the self-schema during the self-reference rating task (Pinter et al., 2011). Moreover, within the self-referent but not the other-referent condition, self-esteem predicted lower ratings and poorer recall of negative communal traits relative to the other three traits. This pattern of findings is consistent with the mnemic neglect model's claim of shallower processing for negative self-relevant traits (Pinter et al., 2011). Narcissism, on the other hand, was not related to poorer recall of negative traits within the self-referent in comparison to the other-referent group. Indeed, narcissism was unrelated to recall of both negative trait-types in both referent-groups. Thus only self-esteem was associated with the mnemic neglect found for the negative traits in this study.

Influence of narcissism on recollection versus familiarity memory processes

The self-reference task "improves the encoding of details in memory rather than a general sense of familiarity" (Serbun et al., 2011, p. 1008). Thus we chose to use a recall task rather than a recognition task following the trait description task in order to focus on the influence of narcissism and our other personality variables on the recollection rather than the familiarity of self-related information. Our results suggest that narcissism led to a greater elaboration of positive-agentic traits during encoding that in turn facilitated recall for these traits. In our study there were an insufficient total number of incorrectly recalled traits to examine whether narcissism was related to the false recall of positive-agentic traits. But narcissism may be likely to influence the false recognition of positive-agentic traits that were similar to but not included in the self-reference task (e.g., false recognition of "smart" instead of the previously presented "intelligent"). Such false recognition would suggest an additional influence of narcissism on familiarity. Memory paradigms such as source memory (Serbun et al., 2011) or remember/know (Tulving, 1985) tasks could be used to investigate the extent to which narcissism influences familiarity versus recollection. For example, "remember" responses would include the additional recollection of episodic thoughts that were associated with the previously presented trait during the self-reference task (e.g., "I remember giving this trait a high rating"), thereby reflecting deeper encoding. In contrast, "know" responses reflect only a vague familiarity with the trait and suggest more shallow processing. If narcissists' greater retrieval for positive-agentic traits is due to deeper encoding rather than (or in addition to) easier access during retrieval, then narcissism would be related to a greater proportion of "remember" responses for the positive-agentic traits than for the other three trait-types.

Likewise autobiographical narrative tasks, such as the assessment of details and phenomenological features of a recalled memory (e.g., D'Argembeau & Van der Linden, 2008; Werner-Seidler, & Moulds, 2011), may be used in order to investigate the influence of narcissism on the richness or vividness in events reflecting the four Valence × Agency conditions. For example, Werner-Seidler and Moulds (2011) found that formerly depressed individuals' positive memories were less vivid than those of never-depressed controls. As previously discussed, narcissists are strongly motivated to maintain their positive-agentic self-schema (e.g., Foster & Brennan, 2011) via self-enhancing memorial distortions (e.g., Gosling et al., 1998; Hart et al., 2011). This strong approach motivation would likely lead to greater visual and/or narrative rehearsal of such positive-agentic events (e.g., winning an award). In turn, memories that are more frequently rehearsed include more phenomenological details (Rubin, Burt, & Fifield, 2003). Hence, given narcissists positive-agentic self-schema (Campbell et al., 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007), narcissists' positive-agentic memories (e.g., "describe a time when you felt clever") should be more accessible and vivid (e.g., contain greater contextual details) than the positive-communal autobiographical memories (e.g., "describe a time when you felt cooperative"). In contrast, based on the results of the current study, those higher in self-esteem, in contrast, may have more accessible and detailed positive-communal memories.

Agency and communion as personality variables

Notably, although many prior studies on narcissism have included self-esteem as a control variable, to our knowledge the present study is the first to also include the related variables of

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

agency and communion as additional personality variables. That is, prior narcissism studies have assessed the type of information recalled, rated, or otherwise processed for agentic and communal characteristics (e.g., Campbell et al., 2007; Hart et al., 2011), but none has also included agency and communion as personality variables. The present study demonstrates that despite the moderate relationship between narcissism and agency ($r = .46$; cf. Experiment 2), the recall of positive-agentic traits was attributable to narcissism rather than simply to possessing a more agentic orientation.

Limitations and future directions

Because the NPI is designed to assess a relatively stable personality trait (del Rosario & White, 2005; Raskin & Terry, 1988), we did not expect that the trait rating and recall tasks would influence responding to the NPI, which was administered after these tasks. However, this possibility cannot be ruled out without further examination. It is possible, for example, that recalling positive-agentic traits made participants more likely to endorse the narcissistic statements on the NPI. Future research could examine this possibility by randomly assigning some participants to first complete the NPI (as well as other personality questionnaires) and then complete the trait rating and recall tasks, whereas other participants complete the trait rating and recall task and then complete the personality questionnaires. Such a study would rule out the possibility that the NPI is sensitive to performance on trait rating and recall tasks that assess agency and communion.

Future research will need to explore the limits of narcissists' preferential recall for positive-agentic information. For instance, similar enhanced recall effects are generally found when a close other (e.g., best friend; mother; romantic partner) is used as the referent in comparison to when the self is used (Serbun et al., 2011; Symons & Johnson, 1987). Would narcissists exhibit a lack of facilitation when a close other is used as the referent given their low regard for close others (e.g., Brunell & Campbell, 2011; Campbell, 1999; Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), or would they actually see close others as extensions of themselves (Mashek, Aron, & Boncimino, 2003)? Recent findings suggest that narcissists would not demonstrate the typical facilitation in memory when a close other referent is used. First, narcissists' exhibit a greater independent and lower interdependent self-construal (Konrath, Bushman, & Grove, 2009). Moreover, narcissism mediates the relationship between self-construal and cognitive-perceptual style, with narcissists demonstrating a more analytical than holistic style. Narcissists' might not be able to extend their self-focus to close others during the encoding phase of a memory task. Second, narcissists tend to recall more downward social comparisons between themselves and close others in which they view themselves as better off (Krizan & Bushman, 2011). Likewise, narcissists' self-perception of superiority in comparison to close others (see also Brunell & Campbell, 2011; Campbell, Rudich, et al., 2002) suggests that their tendency to select and recall more positive-agentic traits would hold only for themselves and not extend to a close other.

Finally it is important to note that the NPI used in our study and in prior studies on narcissism measures *agentic* narcissism (i.e., grandiosity, esteem, entitlement etc. in agentic domains) rather than the recently introduced *communal* narcissism (Gebauer, Sedikides, Verplanken, & Maio, 2012). As the name implies, communal narcissists have grandiose views of themselves on communal rather than agentic dimensions (e.g., ''I am an amazing listener''; ''I am the most helpful person I know''). Communal narcissism and agentic narcissism are independent constructs, but both entail the same underlying self-enhancement motives. Agentic narcissism (as measured by the NPI) was directly related to higher better-than-average judgements on agentic traits and inversely related to these judgements on communal traits. Yet communal narcissism (as measured by the Communal Narcissism Inventory developed by Gebauer et al., 2012) showed the opposite pattern. In contrast to the agentic narcissists in our study, who exhibited a memorial advantage for only the positive-agentic traits, communal narcissists would likely resemble those higher in self-esteem by exhibiting a memorial advantage for only the positive-communal traits. Future research is needed to distinguish how communal narcissists differ from agentic narcissists and with those high in self-esteem on tasks that assess self-relevant schemata.

CONCLUSION

The findings of the two experiments reported here lend support for the Agency Model of

Narcissism (Campbell et al., 2006; Campbell & Foster, 2007). The present research demonstrates that, although narcissists acknowledge that they are highly agentic (e.g., clever) but lacking communion (e.g., crude), they focus their attention on their positive-agentic qualities, which leads to greater recall of these self-relevant aspects.

Manuscript received 5 September 2012
Manuscript accepted 19 February 2013
First published online 2 March 2013

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

REFERENCES

Abele, A. E., & Bruckmüller, S. (2011). The bigger of the "BigTwo"? Preferential processing of communal information. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*, 935–948.

Abele, A. E., & Wojciszke, B. (2007). Agency and communion from the perspective of self versus others. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *93*, 751–763.

Alicke, M. D. (1985). Global self-evaluation as determined by the desirability and controllability of trait adjectives. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *49*, 1621–1630.

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

Anderson, N. H. (1968). Likeabeness ratings of 555 personality-trait words. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *9*, 272–279.

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Balota, D. A., Yap, M. J., Cortese, M. J., Hutchison, K. A., Kessler, B., Loftis, B., . . . Treiman, R. (2007). The English Lexicon Project. *Behavior Research Methods*, *39*, 445–459.

Bellezza, F. S. (1992). Recall of congruent information in the self-reference task. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, *30*, 275–278.

Brunell, A. B., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Narcissism and romantic relationships: Understanding the paradox. In W. K. Campbell & J. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatment* (pp. 344–350). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Brunell, A. B., Gentry, W. A., Campbell, W. K., Kuhnert, K. W., DeMarree, K. G., & Hoffman, B. J. (2008). Leader emergence: The case of the narcissistic leader. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*, 1663–1676.

Brunell, A. B., Staats, S., Barden, J., & Hupp, J. M. (2011). Narcissism and academic dishonesty: The exhibitionism dimension and the lack of guilt. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*, 323–328.

Campbell, W. K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*, 1254–1270.

Campbell, W. K., Bosson, J. K., Goheen, T. W., Lakey, C. E., & Kernis, M. H. (2007). Do narcissists dislike themselves "deep down inside"? *Psychological Science*, *18*, 227–229.

Campbell, W. K., Brunell, A. B., & Finkel, E. J. (2006). Narcissism, interpersonal self-regulation, and romantic relationships: An agency model approach. In E. J. Finkel & K. D. Vohs (Eds.), *Self and Relationships: Connecting Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Processes*. New York: Guilford.

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, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game-playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 340–354.

Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. D., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *34*, 329–347.

Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E. A., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 358–368.

Collins, D. R., & Stukas, A. A. (2008). Narcissism and self-presentation: The moderating effects of accountability and contingencies of self-worth. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*, 1629–1634.

D'Argembeau, A., Comblain, C., & Van der Linden, M. (2005). Affective valence and the self-reference effect: Influence of retrieval conditions. *British Journal of Psychology*, *96*, 457–466.

D'Argembeau, A., & Van der Linden, M. (2008). Remembering pride and shame: Self-enhancement and the phenomenology of autobiographical memory. *Memory*, *16*, 538–547.

del Rosario, P. M., & White, R. M. (2005). The narcissistic personality inventory: Test–retest stability and internal consistency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *39*, 1075–1081.

Derry, P. A., & Kuiper, N. A. (1981). Schematic processing and self-reference in clinical depression. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *90*, 286–297.

Foster, J. D., & Brennan, J. C. (2011). Narcissism, the agency model, and approach-avoidance motivation. In W. K. Campbell & J. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatment* (pp. 89–100). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Twenge, J. M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *37*, 469–486.

Foster, J. D., Misra, T. A., & Reidy, D. E. (2009). Narcissists are approach-oriented toward their money and their friends. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *43*, 764–769.

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.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *5*, 854–878.

Glisky, E. L., & Marquine, M. J. (2009). Semantic and self-referential processing of positive and negative trait adjectives in older adults. *Memory*, *17*, 144–157.

Gosling, S. D., John, O. P., Craik, K. H., & Robins, R. W. (1998). Do people know how they behave? Self-reported act frequencies compared with on-line codings by observers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 1337–1349.

Green, J. D., Pinter, B., & Sedikides, C. (2005). Mnemic neglect and self-threat: Trait modifiability moderates self-protection. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *35*, 225–235.

Green, J. D., & Sedikides, C. (2004). Retrieval selectivity in the processing of self-referent information: Testing the boundaries of self-protection. *Self & Identity*, *3*, 69–80.

Green, J. D., Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2008). Forgotten but not gone: The recall and recognition of self-threatening memories. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*, 547–561.

Gutchess, A. H., Kensinger, E. A., & Schacter, D. L. (2010). Functional neuroimaging of self-referential encoding with age. *Neuropsychologia*, *48*, 211–219.

Gutchess, A. H., Kensinger, E. A., Yoon, C., & Schacter, D. L. (2007). Ageing and the self-reference effect in memory. *Memory*, *15*, 822–837.

Hart, C. M., Sedikides, C., Wildschut, T., Arndt, J., Routledge, C., & Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M. (2011). Nostalgic recollections of high and low narcissists. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *45*, 238–242.

Hepper, E. G., Gramzow, R. H., & Sedikides, C. (2010). Individual differences in self-enhancement and self-protection strategies: An integrative analysis. *Journal of Personality*, *78*, 781–814.

Hepper, E. G., Hart, C. M., Gregg, A. P., & Sedikides, C. (2011). Motivated expectations of positive feedback in social interactions. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *151*, 455–477.

Hegelson, V. S., & Fritz, H. L. (1999). Unmitigated agency and unmitigated communion: Distinctions from agency and communion. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *33*, 131–158.

Hirokawa, K., & Dohi, I. (2007). Agency and communion related to mental health in Japanese young adults. *Gender Roles*, *56*, 517–524.

Horvath, S., & Morf, C. C. (2010). To be grandiose or not to be worthless: Different routes to self-enhancement for narcissism and self-esteem. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *44*, 585–592.

Ingram, R. E., Smith, T. W., & Brehm, S. S. (1983). Depression and information processing: Self-schemata and the encoding of self-referent information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*, 412–420.

Konrath, S., Bushman, B. J., & Grove, T. (2009). Seeing my world in a million little pieces: Narcissism, self-construal, and cognitive-perceptual style. *Journal of Personality*, *77*, 1197–1228.

Krizan, Z., & Bushman, B. J. (2011). Better than my loved ones: Social comparison tendencies among narcissists. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *50*, 212–216.

Kuiper, N. A., & Rogers, T. B. (1979). Encoding of personal information: Self-other differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *37*, 499–514.

Lord, C. G. (1980). Schemas and images as memory aids: Two modes of processing social information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *2*, 257–269.

Markus, H. (1977). Self-schemata and processing information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *35*, 63–78.

Mashek, D. J., Aron, A., & Boncimino, M. (2003). Confusions of self with close others. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *29*, 382–392.

Miller, J. D., Price, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2012). Is the Narcissistic Personality Inventory still relevant? A test of independent grandiosity and entitlement scales in the assessment of narcissism. *Assessment*, *19*, 8–13.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (1993). Narcissism and self-evaluation maintenance: Explorations in object relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *19*, 668–676.

Pinter, B., Green, J. D., Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2011). Self-protective memory: Separation/integration as a mechanism for mnemic neglect. *Social Cognition*, *29*, 612–624.

Raskin, R. N., & Terry, H. (1988). A principle components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 890–902.

Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., Foster, J. D., & Martinez, M. A. (2008). Effects of narcissistic entitlement and exploitativeness on human physical aggression. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *44*, 865–875.

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.

Robins, R. W., & Beer, J. S. (2001). Positive illusions about the self: Short-term benefits and long-term costs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*, 340–352.

Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-?image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Rubin, D. C., Burt, C. D., & Fifield, S. J. (2003). Experimental manipulations of the phenomenology of memory. *Memory & Cognition*, *31*, 877–886.

Sedikides, C., & Green, J. D. (2000). On the self-protective nature of inconsistency-negativity management: Using the person memory paradigm to examine self-referent memory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *79*, 906–922.

Sedikides, C., & Green, J. D. (2004). What I don't recall can't hurt me: Information negativity versus information inconsistency as determinants of memorial self-defense. *Social Cognition*, *22*, 4–29.

Sedikides, C., & Green, J. D. (2009). Memory as a self-protective mechanism. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *3*, 1055–1068.

Sedikides, C., & Gregg, A. P. (2008). Self-enhancement: Food for thought. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*, 102–116.

Serbun, S. J., Shih, J. Y., & Gutchess, A. (2011). Memory for details with self-referencing. *Memory*, *19*, 1004–1014.

Smith, T. W., Ingram, R. E., & Brehm, S. S. (1983). Social anxiety, anxious self-preoccupation, and recall of self-relevant information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44*, 1276–1283.

Symons, C. S., & Johnson, B. T. (1997). The self-reference effect in memory: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *121*, 371–394.

Tulving, E. (1985). Memory and consciousness. *Canadian Psychology*, *26*, 1–12.

Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *10*, 154–165.

Wang, Q. (2001). Culture effects on adults' earliest childhood recollection and self-description: Implications for the relation between memory and self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*, 220–233.

Werner-Seidler, A., & Moulds, M. L. (2011). Autobiographical memory characteristics in depression vulnerability: Formerly depressed individuals recall less vivid positive memories. *Cognition and Emotion*, *25*, 1087–1103.

Downloaded by [Wayne State University], [Lara L. Jones] at 14:14 04 March 2014

APPENDIX

Traits with p(Agentic) responses (shown in bold) and valence ratings

Positive-Agentic		*Negative-Agentic*		*Positive-Communal*		*Negative-Communal*	
wise	**.92**, 2.33	sad	**.86**, −1.40	conversational	**.11**, 1.30	rude	**.17**, −2.63
talented	**.86**, 1.97	moody	**.83**, −1.57	cooperative	**.14**, 1.93	insulting	**.17**, −2.70
neat	**.86**, 1.83	unhealthy	**.83**, −1.90	courteous	**.22**, 2.27	impolite	**.19**, −2.10
clever	**.86**, 1.53	lazy	**.78**, −1.27	friendly	**.22**, 2.10	unpleasant	**.22**, −2.07
eager	**.83**, 1.00	sloppy	**.78**, −1.83	heroic	**.22**, 1.97	irritating	**.22**, −2.30
energetic	**.78**, 1.90	unhappy	**.75**, −1.60	helpful	**.25**, 2.40	annoying	**.25**, −1.73
educated	**.75**, 2.43	stupid	**.75**, −1.93	agreeable	**.28**, 1.60	noisy	**.31**, −1.23
persistent	**.75**, 1.57	insecure	**.69**, −1.67	reliable	**.31**, 2.50	phony	**.31**, −2.33
organised	**.72**, 2.13	vain	**.69**, −1.83	generous	**.33**, 2.03	rebellious	**.31**, −1.20
productive	**.72**, 2.00	selfish	**.69**, −1.93	romantic	**.36**, 2.13	crude	**.33**, −1.93
ambitious	**.69**, 1.83	messy	**.64**, −1.77	outgoing	**.36**, 1.67	unfair	**.33**, −1.97
excited	**.69**, 1.80	reckless	**.64**, −2.00	forgiving	**.39**, 2.33	mean	**.36**, −1.77
disciplined	**.69**, 1.13	wasteful	**.64**, −2.20	sympathetic	**.39**, 1.67	hostile	**.36**, −2.20
attractive	**.64**, 2.10	stubborn	**.61**, −1.40	kind	**.44**, 2.30	dishonest	**.36**, −2.27
cheerful	**.64**, 2.00	cold	**.58**, −1.53	sincere	**.44**, 2.30	jealous	**.39**, −1.70
lively	**.64**, 1.90	irresponsible	**.58**, −2.13	conscientious	**.44**, 1.47	deceptive	**.44**, −1.67
witty	**.64**, 1.37	shallow	**.53**, −1.47	thoughtful	**.47**, 2.00	explosive	**.44**, −1.97
admirable	**.61**, 2.13	incompetent	**.53**, −2.13	obedient	**.47**, 1.73	angry	**.50**, −1.30
warm	**.58**, 1.77	irrational	**.47**, −1.87	amusing	**.47**, 1.40	negligent	**.50**, −1.63
courageous	**.53**, 2.23	unreasonable	**.47**, −2.17	trusting	**.50**, 2.00	boring	**.50**, −1.73