2022

Perception of Narcissism in College Professors

Harry M. Wallace
Trinity University, hwallace@trinity.edu

A. Carrillo

Jack Kelley
Trinity University

Publication Details
The Journal of Social Psychology

Perceptions of Narcissism in College Professors

Harry M. Wallace[1], Alejandro Carrillo[2], and Jack Kelley[1]

[1] Department of Psychology, Trinity University

[2] Department of Psychology, Michigan State University

Author Note

We thank Kelsi Ballard, Alexandra Gonzalez-Van Wart, Anna Hagee, Elizabeth Peters, Stephanie Simon, Zack Speer, and Brigitte Taylor for contributing to the research from which this paper emerged.

Correspondence should be addressed to Harry Wallace, Department of Psychology, Trinity University, San Antonio, TX 78212. E-mail: hwallace@trinity.edu

Abstract

We conducted three studies to examine perceptions of grandiose narcissism in college professors. Narcissism might appear incompatible with the profession if professors are viewed fundamentally as helpers or as introverted bookworms. Then again, people might expect professors to display big egos congruent with the prestige of their profession and their privileged public platforms. Our research indicates that professors are generally not seen as highly narcissistic according to the criteria of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire, though they are viewed as more narcissistic than elementary school teachers. More professor narcissism was expected at colleges that prioritize scholarly productivity over teaching excellence. Male professors were viewed as more narcissistic, but only for narcissism dimensions associated with interpersonal hostility and for judgments of whether professors are "narcissistic." We discuss possible implications for narcissistic professors' ability to exploit the gap between academic ideals and reward system realities.

Keywords: narcissism, professor, teaching, academia, stereotype

`

Perceptions of Narcissism in College Professors

Narcissism is a multifaceted personality trait entailing self-absorption, an inflated sense of self-importance and entitlement, exhibitionism, status seeking, arrogance, and a willingness to exploit others for personal gain (see review by Miller & Campbell, 2011). This paper examines lay perceptions of narcissism in college professors. More specifically, our research examines perceptions of the degree to which professors typically display a form of narcissism typically labeled grandiose narcissism, a personality trait that people possess to varying degrees. Compared with vulnerable narcissism, a form of narcissism often linked with the clinical diagnosis of narcissistic personality disorder, grandiose narcissism predicts less guilt, lower neuroticism, and—in some contexts—relatively adaptive outcomes (see Miller & Campbell, 2008; Pincus & Roche, 2011 for reviews of the distinctions between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism).[1]

Our interest in this topic emerged from observations about professors' diverse and potentially competing professional obligations. Given that narcissistic individuals tend to be less helpful than others when no self-benefits are anticipated (e.g., Brunell et al., 2014; Konrath et al., 2016), narcissism appears incompatible with the elements of a professor's job that entail providing help to students and peers without fanfare. However, narcissism could easily be an advantage for scholarship production—at least for categories not highly dependent on collaboration—because narcissists are enabled by audacious intellectual self-confidence (e.g., Farwell & Wohlwend-Lloyd, 1998; Gabriel et al., 1994), a willingness to cut corners (e.g., Jonason & O'Connor, 2017; Williams et al., 2010), and high motivation to publicly display superior intelligence (e.g., Zajenkowski & Czarna, 2015; Zajenkowski & Szymaniak, 2019),

`

seek prestige (e.g., Grapsas et al., 2020; Roberts & Robins, 2000), and maximize their material wealth (e.g., Fatfouta et al., 2018; Rose, 2007).

If narcissistic professors shirk their helping responsibilities in favor of more dedication to producing and promoting personal scholarship achievements, they could be well-positioned to exploit the reward structure of academia. Most institutions of higher learning—including liberal arts colleges—give professors more rewards for publishing scholarship, securing external grant funding, and attracting attention through public presentations (activities that enhance the prestige of professors and their universities) than for displaying high dedication and effectiveness in teaching, mentoring, and service (see Fairweather, 2005; Melguizo & Strober, 2007). Indeed, the evidence suggests that devotion to helping others may harm professors' likelihood of attaining tenure, promotion, and higher salaries by depleting time and energy available for scholarship endeavors (e.g., Binder et al., 2012; Fender et al., 2015).

The studies we introduce did not endeavor to confirm whether academic reward systems do in fact favor narcissistic professors; however, our research on perceptions of professor narcissism may have implications for professors' ability to escape substantial pushback for narcissistic behavior. Tolerance for narcissistic professors within academic culture should be higher if narcissism is congruent with professor stereotypes (for similar reasoning, see Eagly & Karau, 2002; Festinger, 1957). If flagrant displays of narcissism violate academic culture norms, they could damage professors' capacity to garner the admiration and respect that narcissists crave (see review by Grapsas et al., 2020 for evidence of narcissists' status-seeking). In such an environment, narcissistic professors could not fully exploit the academic reward system without risk of being viewed negatively or ostracized within their institution.

`

Our question of whether professors are viewed as narcissistic is not easily answered from consulting the existing academic literature because previous studies have not firmly established what traits in general—narcissistic or otherwise—people ascribe to professors. To be sure, a substantial body of research has examined how students view various professor traits, but this research has mostly focused on how evaluations vary across different categories of professors (e.g., male vs. female) without documenting the details of how views of professors compare with views about other people.

In principle, inferences about perceptions of college professors' narcissism could be drawn from evidence regarding the reality of narcissism in professors. However, to our knowledge, only one published study has directly measured professors' narcissism: Hill and Yousey (1998) reported Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988) scores from professors who volunteered to respond to a mailed survey. Responding professors' mean NPI score was relatively low compared to the politicians who were also surveyed, and compared to NPI scores documented in other samples. Unfortunately, the representativeness of the sample recruited by Hill and Yousey could be questioned, considering that narcissistic individuals are comparatively less likely to volunteer if no potential self-benefits are anticipated (see review by Konrath & Tian, 2018). Furthermore, even if more information about base rates of professor narcissism was known, this information might not clarify how professors are perceived because views of professors may not align with reality.

To the extent that professors are viewed as teachers, evidence suggests professors may not be viewed as narcissistic. Miller et al. (2015) found that American primary school teachers are perceived to be low in narcissism. In addition, Anderson (2010) found that professors are viewed as "warm" (narcissism is associated with interpersonal antagonism and hostility, not

`

warmth; Back et al., 2013; Kernis & Sun, 1994), although this research did not clarify whether professors were viewed as more or less warm than other categories of people.

In contrast, evidence suggesting that professors may be viewed as relatively narcissistic could be drawn from research showing that professors are perceived to have a high level of agency orientation (i.e., striving for power, status, and dominance), and only a moderate level of communion orientation (i.e., displaying trustworthiness, warmth, and sincerity) (Imhoff & Koch, 2017). Narcissists self-aggrandize in agentic domains (e.g., by overclaiming knowledge and intelligence; Jones & Paulhus, 2017; Macenczak et al., 2016; Tracy et al., 2009), but they show little concern about their standing within communal domains (e.g., Campbell et al., 2002; Paulhus et al., 2003; see review by Grijalva & Zhang, 2016). Moreover, Feist (1994) found that people think at least one particular academic subspecies—highly eminent scientists—possess the narcissistic traits of arrogance, hostility, and exploitativeness.

Summary of Experiments

In sum, the extent to which professors are viewed as narcissistic is unclear, so we conducted three studies to directly examine perceptions of professors' narcissism. Each study was a survey-based experiment that asked participants, most of whom had college experience, to judge the extent to which elements of narcissism matched their views of professors. Study 1 compared perceptions of narcissism possessed by college professors and elementary school teachers. Study 2 examined whether perceptions of professor narcissism vary according to whether the professor is rewarded more for teaching or scholarship. Study 3 tested whether professors are viewed as more narcissistic than people in general, and compared views of professor narcissism within different academic disciplines. Each study manipulated the professional context of the hypothetical individuals being judged.

`

In all three studies, perceptions of professor narcissism were initially assessed with items from validated self-report narcissism measures—none of which included explicit reference to the word narcissism. Then, at the end of each study, participants were asked about whether they thought professors were "narcissistic." This coda to each study was included as an exploratory measure to assess whether perceptions of the connotations of narcissism align with perceptions of the elements that denote narcissism in validated measures of the construct. We are not aware of previous research that has systematically tested correspondence between perceptions of "narcissism" and perceptions of the elements that formally comprise narcissism.

Each study also systematically varied the sex of the professors being judged because we had reason to expect that male professors would be viewed as more narcissistic than female professors. Compared with male professors, female professors are assumed to be more nurturing in their orientation toward students (e.g., Meltzer & McNulty, 2011; Sprague & Massoni, 2005) and more willing to embrace voluntary service (e.g., El-Alayli et al., 2018; O'Meara et al., 2017)—traits uncharacteristic of narcissism. Moreover, students are more likely to view male college instructors as "professors" and female college instructors as "teachers" (e.g., Miller & Chamberlin, 2000; Mitchell & Martin, 2018). Although men have been found to be only slightly more narcissistic than women (see review by Grijalva et al., 2015), we reasoned that the perceived sex difference in narcissism might be greater than the reality, as the communal qualities that narcissists eschew tend to be viewed as stereotypically feminine, whereas the agentic priorities and domineering tendencies that narcissists display are viewed as stereotypically masculine (e.g., Eagly & Karau, 2002; Heilman & Chen, 2005; Rudman et al., 2012).

Study 1

`

Study 1 examined people' views of narcissism in college professors and elementary school teachers. We assessed perceptions of elementary school teachers to provide a comparison standard of educators perceived to be low in narcissism (see Miller et al., 2015). The narcissism projected by the targets being judged was defined by the content of items from the NPI, the instrument that has been used most often to assess grandiose narcissism in subclinical populations. The end of the survey included an item that asked participants explicitly about whether professors are "narcissistic." This item was included because NPI content includes no explicit reference to the word narcissism, and it was not clear whether participants' sense of what narcissism entails would correspond to the narcissism components defined by the NPI.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited via Amazon Mechanical Turk (M-Turk) to complete a "Judgments of Educators" survey requiring fewer than 15 minutes for compensation of $0.40 USD. Our M-Turk participant eligibility criteria included only two restrictions: U.S. residency and age of 18 or older. The sample (N = 216; 67% male; 33% female; M_{age} = 32, SD = 9.72) excluded 40 participants who did not respond to all items pertaining to narcissism judgments. Most participants (62%) reported having earned a bachelor's degree or the equivalent; 24% reported having no form of college degree.[2]

Design

The experiment design included the independent variables of target job (college professor or elementary school teacher) and target sex (male or female), both of which were manipulated between-participants by random assignment.

Materials and Procedure

`

Each participant judged whether 26 statements seemed characteristic of the target. specifically, participants judged whether each statement "sounds like something a (male/female) (college professor/elementary school teacher) would think." Each statement was one of the 26 response options from the forced-choice 13-item (short form) version of the NPI (NPI-13; Gentile et al., 2013). For example, one NPI-13 forced-choice item pairs the nonnarcissistic statement "I try not to be a show off" (nonnarcissistic option) with the statement "I will usually show off if I get the chance" (narcissistic option). Responses were provided on a 5-point agreement scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). After reverse scoring responses to the 13 nonnarcissistic statements, a NPI-13 target judgment index was created by calculating participants' mean response to each of the 26 statements ($\alpha = .81$ across experiment conditions).

After completing judgments of NPI-13 response options, participants provided judgments of college professors' explicit narcissism by reporting their agreement with the statement, "(Male/Female) professors tend to be narcissistic" (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). The sex of the professor being judged was always consistent with the target sex corresponding to NPI-13 judgments. Judgments of the targets' NPI narcissism were correlated with explicit judgments of the targets' narcissism within each target category (*r*s ranged from .37 to .62).

Results and Discussion

Table 1 displays the means corresponding to NPI-13 and explicit narcissism judgments of college professors and elementary school teachers. A 2 (target job) x 2 (target sex) between-subjects ANOVA probing judgments of NPI-13 narcissism norms revealed a single statistically significant (main) effect: Narcissism ratings were higher for professors ($M = 2.94$, $SD = 0.39$) than teachers ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.36$), $F(1, 212) = 17.89$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$. When the dependent variable was changed from an index of items representing the NPI-13 to an index of items

`

representing one of the three NPI-13 subscales identified by Gentile et al. (2013), the same pattern of outcomes was observed. The target job main effect was significant for the subscales of leadership/authority ($\alpha = .72$; $M_{professor} = 3.10$, $M_{teacher} = 2.82$; $F(1, 212) = 16.10$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$) and entitlement/exploitativeness ($\alpha = .50$; $M_{professor} = 2.98$, $M_{teacher} = 2.71$; $F(1, 212) = 20.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$). The target job main effect for the grandiose exhibitionism subscale was nonsignificant, but the direction of the difference did not change ($\alpha = .69$; $M_{professor} = 2.79$, $M_{teacher} = 2.67$; $F(1, 212) = 3.37$, $p = .068$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$).

When participant sex was added as a third factor to the ANOVA models, the target job main effects remained (and became statistically significant for the grandiose exhibitionism subscale analyses), and only one (main) effect involving participant sex was found: Female participants gave higher target ratings for the leadership/authority facet of narcissism than male participants ($M_{difference} = 0.24$), $F(1, 208) = 9.81$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$.

Participants' responses to the item that explicitly probed whether professors were viewed as narcissistic revealed that male professors were perceived as more narcissistic than female professors (see Table 1). No additional effects were observed when explicit judgments of professors' narcissism were tested with 2 x 2 ANOVA models including the target sex factor and a second factor of either college experience or participant sex.

In summary, Study 1 indicated that professors are viewed as more narcissistic than elementary school teachers. Professors sometimes take offense at being characterized as teachers, but our participants clearly recognized a difference between these categories of educators. However, comparing participants' mean judgments of professors' narcissism with the response scale midpoint suggests that professors were not perceived to be highly narcissistic, whether being narcissistic was defined implicitly by NPI-13 items or by explicit use of the word

`

"narcissistic."[3] Clear differences were observed between judgments of NPI-13 and explicit narcissism for perceptions of the overall level of narcissism (less explicit narcissism perceived for professors) and for perceptions of sex differences. Our interpretation of these differences is that the connotations of narcissism are probably more unfavorable than the form of narcissism assessed by the NPI-13, and men are apparently viewed as more likely to display more odious forms of narcissism.

Study 2

Some of a professor's responsibilities may be perceived as more compatible with narcissism than others. Study 2 examined differences in the perceptions of professors at colleges that primarily reward professors for quality of teaching compared with professors at colleges that primarily reward professors for scholarship productivity. Those familiar with the realities of academic reward structures could question whether *any* college truly rewards its professors for teaching quality, but we reasoned that few if any of our participants would recognize or be confused by this nuance. Perceptions of professors rewarded for teaching quality could plausibly be dominated by thoughts of a person selflessly spending their time helping students or, alternatively, thoughts of self-assured authoritarian sages on stages who enjoy hearing the sound of their own voice. Perceptions of professors rewarded for scholarship could feasibly be dominated by thoughts of introverts in libraries obsessing over finer points of obscure details that few people care about or, alternatively, thoughts of egotistical people obsessed with cranking out prestigious publications and presentations to put and keep their name in the spotlight.

Study 2 also used a different measure of narcissism. Instead of using the NPI, Study 2 measured views of professors' narcissism with items from the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (NARQ; Back et al., 2013). Unlike the NPI, the NARQ was intentionally

`

constructed to produce balanced subscales that distinguish different dimensions of narcissism. Aside from this advantage, we also opted to define narcissism via the NARQ rather than the NPI in Study 2 (and Study 3) to establish generalizability across different narcissism measures, and because the short-form version of the NARQ was more adaptable for our procedures than short-form versions of the NPI.

The NARQ distinguishes between the admiration and rivalry components of narcissism. Admiration narcissism is a potentially adaptive dimension that entails striving for uniqueness, grandiose fantasies, and extraverted, self-assured behavior. Rivalry narcissism is a more socially toxic component that entails striving for supremacy, devaluation of others, and aggressiveness. Admiration narcissism, which correlates strongly with NPI narcissism, is often viewed by others as charming, whereas rivalry narcissism, which only correlates moderately with NPI narcissism, typically elicits negative responses from others (Back et al., 2013; Geukes et al., 2017).

In addition to using the NARQ as a tool for assessing participants' judgments of others, Study 2 also used the instrument to assess self-reported narcissism. Previous studies have found that narcissists tend to view others as narcissistic (Lamkin et al., 2014) and view others' narcissism positively (e.g., Hart & Adams, 2014; Wallace et al., 2015).

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited via M-Turk to complete a "Judgments of Professors" survey requiring fewer than 15 minutes for compensation of $0.50 USD. Our M-Turk participant eligibility criteria included only two restrictions: U.S. residency and age of 18 or older. The sample (N = 237; 57% male; 43% female; M_{age} = 34, SD = 11.07) excluded 33 participants who did not respond to all relevant items, failed attention checks, or were suspected of completing the

`

survey more than once. Most participants (60%) reported having earned a bachelor's degree or the equivalent; 23% reported having no form of college degree.

Design

The experiment design included two independent variables. College type (reward-research or reward-teaching) was manipulated within-participants (order was randomly assigned). Target sex (male or female) was manipulated between-participants by random assignment for judgments of admiration and rivalry narcissism, and within-participants for judgments of explicit narcissism.

Materials and Procedure

After reporting their sex, age, and college experience, participants reported their own narcissism by completing the 6-item short-form version of the NARQ (NARQ-S). NARQ-S responses were provided on a 6-point agreement scale (1 = *not agree at all*; 6 = *agree completely*; $M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.07$, $\alpha = .81$). Three of the NARQ-S items measured admiration narcissism (e.g., "I deserve to be seen as a great personality"); the other three measured rivalry narcissism (e.g., "Most people are somehow losers"). The subscales representing participants' admiration narcissism ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 1.32$, $\alpha = .83$) and rivalry narcissism ($M = 2.42$, $SD = 1.15$, $\alpha = .67$) were correlated ($r = .51$, $p < .001$).

Next, the survey noted that "Some college professors work at colleges that reward faculty for scholarly productivity more than quality of teaching. Other professors work at colleges that reward faculty for quality of teaching more than scholarly productivity." Participants were then asked to "Imagine the traits of a (male/female) professor at a college that rewards faculty for (scholarly productivity more than quality of teaching/quality of teaching more than scholarly productivity)." Participants then judged whether each NARQ-S item statement "sounds like

`

something this professor would think" using a 5-point agreement scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Participants made six judgments about a professor from one type of college before making the same six judgments about a professor from the other type of college. Judgments of professors' admiration narcissism ($\alpha_{reward\text{-}research}$ = .81; $\alpha_{reward\text{-}teaching}$ = .79) and rivalry narcissism ($\alpha_{reward\text{-}research}$ = .80; $\alpha_{reward\text{-}teaching}$ = .76) were correlated ($r_{reward\text{-}research}$ = .62, $r_{reward\text{-}teaching}$ = .60; $p < .001$). The professors that each participant judged were either all male or all female.

The final four survey items asked for explicit judgments of professor narcissism (no NARQ-S items include any form of the word narcissism). These four items manipulated the variables of college type and target sex within-participants in random order: "(Male/Female) college professors at colleges that reward faculty for (scholarly productivity more than quality of teaching/quality of teaching more than scholarly productivity) tend to be narcissistic." Responses were provided on a 5-point agreement scale (1 = *strongly disagree*; 5 = *strongly agree*). Judgments of professors' admiration and rivalry narcissism were correlated with explicit judgments of professors' narcissism within each professor category (*r*s ranged from .41 to .60).

Results and Discussion

Table 2 displays the admiration, rivalry, and explicit narcissism ratings assigned to male and female professors. Each of these narcissism dimensions was treated as a dependent variable in separate factorial ANOVA models. For each dependent variable, we first report outcomes of two-factor ANOVA testing effects of the independent variables of college category and professor

`

sex, and then we report results of expanded ANOVA models probing for effects of participant sex, and participant narcissism.

A 2 (college category) x 2 (professor sex) mixed-design ANOVA examining admiration narcissism judgments revealed a single statistically significant effect: Professors at reward-research colleges were viewed as more narcissistic (M = 3.54, SD = 0.93) than professors at reward-teaching colleges (M = 3.06, SD = 0.96), $F(1, 235) = 39.94$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$. Adding a third factor of participant sex to the model yielded no additional effects. Judgments of professors' admiration narcissism were positively correlated with participants' self-reported admiration narcissism ($r = .48$, $p < .001$) and rivalry narcissism ($r = .41$, $p < .001$), but no interactions were observed when the full range of participants' admiration narcissism scores was added as a third factor.

The pattern of results observed for analyses of rivalry narcissism judgments resembled the results observed for admiration narcissism judgments. A 2 (college category) x 2 (professor sex) mixed-design ANOVA examining rivalry narcissism judgments revealed a single (main) effect: Professors at reward-research colleges were viewed as more narcissistic (M = 2.99, SD = 1.00) than professors at reward-teaching colleges (M = 2.21, SD = 0.87), $F(1, 235) = 100.22$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .30$. Adding a third factor of participant sex to the model yielded no additional effects. Judgments of professors' rivalry narcissism were positively correlated with participants' self-reported admiration narcissism ($r = .32$, $p < .001$) and rivalry narcissism ($r = .41$, $p < .001$), but no interactions were observed when the full range of participants' rivalry narcissism scores was added as a third factor.

A 2 (college category) x 2 (professor sex) within-participants ANOVA testing judgments of the typicality of explicit narcissism for professors yielded two statistically significant main

`

effects. Male professors were viewed as more narcissistic (M = 2.94, SD = 0.77) than female professors (M = 2.77, SD = 0.80), $F(1, 235) = 23.51$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. In addition, professors from reward-research colleges were viewed as more narcissistic (M = 3.20, SD = 0.99) than professors from reward-teaching colleges (M = 2.51, SD = 0.99), $F(1, 235) = 65.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .22$. When a third factor of participant sex was added to the model, a professor sex x participant sex interaction emerged, $F(1, 234) = 18.43$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. Female participants perceived more narcissism in male professors than female professors ($M_{difference} = 0.34$), but male participants did not perceive differences in the narcissism of male and female professors ($M_{difference} = 0.04$).

Judgments of professors' explicit narcissism were positively correlated with participants' self-reported admiration narcissism ($r = .32$, $p < .001$) and rivalry narcissism ($r = .42$, $p < .001$). When the full range of participants' total narcissism score (combining admiration and rivalry components) was added as a third factor to the general linear model testing explicit narcissism judgments, two statistically significant interactions involving participant narcissism emerged. The two-way college category x participant narcissism interaction, $F(1, 234) = 7.62$, $p = .006$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, reflected a stronger positive correlation between participants' narcissism and their judgments of professors' explicit narcissism at reward-research colleges ($r = .20$, $p = .002$) versus reward-teaching colleges ($r = .43$, $p < .001$). This effect was qualified by the three-way interaction, $F(1, 234) = 4.02$, $p = .046$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$, which highlighted the larger difference between the correlations between participants' narcissism and their judgments of reward-research versus reward-teaching colleges for male participants ($r_{difference} = .33$) than female participants ($r_{difference} = .15$).

`

Study 2 demonstrated that the level of narcissism people associate with professors depends on the college context. Professors were perceived as narcissistic if their college primarily rewarded them for scholarly productivity. In contrast, faculty were not judged as narcissistic if their college primarily rewarded them for the quality of their teaching. These findings applied to admiration, rivalry, and explicit narcissism judgments. The relevance of college type was not subtle: The narcissism ascribed to reward-research college professors was above the scale midpoint for both explicit and admiration narcissism, and near the midpoint for rivalry narcissism; in contrast, the narcissism ascribed to reward-teaching college professors was below the scale midpoint for both explicit and rivalry narcissism, and near the midpoint for admiration narcissism.

Participants perceived higher explicit narcissism in male professors as they did in Study 1; however, this sex effect was not statistically significant for participants' NARQ-S ratings, even for the rivalry narcissism dimension, which we anticipated would show more of a sex difference than the admiration narcissism dimension. The means for explicit narcissism judgments essentially split the difference between the means for admiration and rivalry judgments, suggesting that neither admiration nor rivalry components of narcissism dominated people's subjective appraisals of explicit narcissism.

Study 3

Study 3 extended our examination of perceptions of professors and addressed limitations of our first two studies. The first two studies showed that professors are generally not viewed as extremely high or low in narcissism, but they did not clarify how perceptions of professors compare with perceptions of the other adults. To address this shortcoming, the design of Study 3 included a control adult target to allow for direct comparison of judgments of professors and

`

teachers with judgments of adults who are not professors or teachers.

Our first two studies were also limited by not specifying the academic disciplines of the professors being judged. Study 3 examined the relevance of academic discipline by probing judgments of professors from five different academic categories: art and music, business, humanities, social science, and STEM. We had no strong objective basis for making predictions about which professor disciplines would be associated with more or less narcissism. Research has found that college students pursuing degrees in business tend to have higher narcissism levels than other college students (Sautter et al., 2008; Vedel & Thomsen, 2017; Westerman et al., 2012), but it was not clear a priori whether this evidence would parallel judgments of professors from different disciplines. Perceptions of business professors' narcissism may not correlate with business students' (or professors') self-reported narcissism. Moreover, the personality traits and motivational orientations possessed by business majors may not match up with the characteristics of business professors. For example, it seems reasonable to speculate that some students choose to major in business with the goal of accumulating substantial material wealth, but we presume people would view academia as a better option for job security than for striving to maximize potential earnings.

Method

Participants

Participants were recruited via M-Turk to complete a "Judgments of College Professors" survey requiring fewer than 15 minutes for compensation of $0.50 USD. Our M-Turk participant eligibility criteria included only two restrictions: U.S. residency and age of 18 or older. The sample (N = 244; 47% male; 53% female; M_{age} = 38, SD = 12.03) excluded 70 participants who did not respond to all relevant items, failed an attention check, or gave suspiciously bizarre

`

responses to an open-ended request for comment.[4] Most participants (63%) reported having earned a bachelor's degree or the equivalent; 16% reported having no form of college degree.

Design

Target sex (male or female) was randomly assigned between-participants. Participants made three sets of narcissism judgments (representing admiration, rivalry, and explicit narcissism) across seven different job categories varied within-participants (3 x 7 = 21 total target judgments). Order of job category was randomized within each of the three judgment sets.[5]

Materials and Procedure

As in Study 2, participants reported their sex, age, and college experience before self-reporting their narcissism via the six-item NARQ-S (1 = *not agree at all*; 6 = *agree completely*; admiration subscale $M = 2.79$, $SD = 1.29$, $\alpha = .84$; rivalry subscale $M = 2.31$, $SD = 1.08$, $\alpha = .70$; correlation between admiration and rivalry subscales = .49). Next, participants were asked to make judgments about how each of seven different categories of people would likely respond to the NARQ-S items. Specifically, participants were shown two separate clusters, each consisting of the three items representing either admiration narcissism or rivalry narcissism (order of admiration and rivalry cluster presentation was randomized). In response to the items in each cluster, they used a 6-point response scale (1 = *probably strongly disagree*; 6 = *probably strongly agree*) to provide a single answer to the question, "What response to these 3 statements would be most likely from each of the categories of people listed below?" The seven all-male or all-female job categories included five categories of professors, an "elementary school teacher", and a control target ("adult who is not a college professor or elementary school teacher"). The five professor categories were distinguished by academic department: "business" ("e.g., accounting, finance, management, marketing"), "fine arts and/or music", "STEM" ("e.g.,

`

biology, engineering, chemistry, physics"), "humanities" ("e.g., classics, English, history, philosophy"), and "social/behavioral science" ("e.g., anthropology, economics, political science, sociology"). After judging how the seven targets would likely respond to the clusters of admiration and rivalry narcissism items, participants made an explicit narcissism judgment about each of the seven same targets by using an 11-point scale (0 = *not at all narcissistic*; 10 = *extremely narcissistic*) to "rate the level of narcissism that you associate with the following categories of people." Judgments of the targets' admiration and rivalry narcissism were correlated with explicit judgments of the targets' narcissism within each target category (*r*s ranged from .29 to .64).

Results

Table 3 displays the mean judgments of admiration, rivalry, and explicit narcissism associated with male and female professors, teachers, and control adults. The results described below reflect all possible comparisons of the seven category judgments within type of narcissism measure using 2 (job category) x 2 (target sex) mixed-design ANOVA models. We only report statistically significant outcomes from these analyses that are not redundant with the sex comparison statistics provided in Table 3. Because Study 3 was purposefully designed to probe for nuances in the differences between subcategories of targets, we report comparisons between these subcategories without regard to the statistical significance of omnibus models.

Admiration Narcissism Judgments

Job category main effects from analyses probing perceptions of admiration narcissism showed that control adults (M = 3.59, SD = 1.27) were judged to be less narcissistic than professors of business (M = 3.89, SD = 1.38), $F(1, 242) = 10.03$, $p = .002$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$, STEM (M = 3.84, SD = 1.44), $F(1, 242) = 6.15$, $p = .014$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$, and art (M = 3.81, SD = 1.43), $F(1, 242)$

`

= 5.51, p = .020, η_p^2 = .02. Humanities professors (M = 3.59, SD = 1.39) were judged as less narcissistic than professors of business, $F(1, 242) = 12.23$, p = .001, η_p^2 = .05, STEM, $F(1, 242) = 8.12$, p = .005, η_p^2 = .03, and art, $F(1, 242) = 6.82$, p = .010, η_p^2 = .03. Social science professors (M = 3.63, SD = 1.39) were viewed as less narcissistic than professors of business, $F(1, 242) = 11.41$, p = .001, η_p^2 = .05, and STEM, $F(1, 242) = 6.67$, p = .010, η_p^2 = .03. Elementary school teachers (M = 2.93, SD = 1.37) were seen as lower in admiration narcissism than all other job categories, $F(1, 242) \geq 64.38$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .21$.

Table 3 shows that target sex differences for admiration narcissism were only observed for elementary school teachers. Female teachers were perceived to be more narcissistic than male teachers, a finding that may reflect participants' assumption that narcissistic men would be disinclined to join a profession stereotyped with some justification as a female domain. Job category x target sex interactions were confirmed for each of the job category comparisons involving elementary school teachers, $F(1, 242) \geq 7.45$, $p \leq .007$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$.

Participant sex had no effect on judgments of professors' admiration narcissism when this variable was added to ANOVA models as a third factor. Participant narcissism was positively correlated with admiration narcissism judgments for all job categories ($r_{admiration} \geq .28$, $p < .001$; $r_{rivalry} \geq .13$, $p \leq .046$). When the full range of participants' total narcissism score (combining admiration and rivalry components) was added as a third factor to the general linear models testing admiration narcissism judgments, no additional effects emerged.

Rivalry Narcissism Judgments

Job category main effects from analyses probing perceptions of rivalry narcissism showed that control adults (M = 3.11, SD = 1.27) and business professors (M = 3.14, SD = 1.58) were judged to be more narcissistic than professors of STEM (M = 2.76, SD = 1.57), art (M =

`

2.53, *SD* = 1.42), social science (*M* = 2.57, *SD* = 1.43), and humanities (*M* = 2.49, *SD* = 1.42), $F(1, 242) \geq 12.59$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .05$. STEM professors were viewed as more narcissistic than professors of art, social science, and humanities, $F(1, 242) \geq 7.66$, $p \leq .007$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$. Elementary school teachers (*M* = 1.99, *SD* = 1.24) were seen as lower in rivalry narcissism than all other job categories, $F(1, 242) \geq 46.01$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .16$.

Table 3 shows that the rivalry narcissism means were consistently higher for male targets across job categories, and this target sex difference was statistically significant for all categories except for art professors and elementary school teachers. Job category x target sex interactions indicating stronger target sex effects for control adults were observed when control adults were compared with elementary school teachers and business professors, $F(1, 242) \geq 7.82$, $p \leq .006$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$.

When participant sex was added as a third factor to the 2 (job category) x (target sex) ANOVA models, job category x participant sex interactions emerged for comparisons of control adults with four of the five professor categories, $F(1, 240) \geq 7.59$, $p \leq .006$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$. Male participants perceived slightly less narcissism in control adults than female participants ($M_{difference}$ = 0.15), but male participants perceived more narcissism in their professor judgments than female students when considering professors of business ($M_{difference}$ = 0.18), STEM ($M_{difference}$ = 0.26), social science ($M_{difference}$ = 0.44), and humanities ($M_{difference}$ = 0.36).

Participant narcissism was positively correlated with rivalry narcissism judgments for all job categories ($r_{admiration} \geq .22$, $p \leq .001$; $r_{rivalry} \geq .31$, $p < .001$). When the full range of participants' total narcissism score was added as a third factor to the general linear models testing admiration narcissism judgments, no additional effects emerged.

Explicit Narcissism Judgments

`

Job category main effects from analyses probing perceptions of explicit narcissism showed that control adults (M = 4.56, SD = 2.55) were judged to be less narcissistic than professors of business (M = 5.32, SD = 2.92) and STEM (M = 4.95, SD = 2.95), $F(1, 242) \geq 4.66$, $p \leq .032$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .02$. Business professors were viewed as more narcissistic than all other categories of professors, $F(1, 242) \geq 6.25$, $p \leq .013$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$. STEM professors were viewed as more narcissistic than professors of social science (M = 4.53, SD = 2.78) and humanities (M = 4.23, SD = 2.77), $F(1, 242) \geq 7.68$, $p \leq .006$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .03$. Art professors (M = 4.76, SD = 2.90) received higher narcissism ratings than professors of humanities, $F(1, 242) = 17.69$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$.

Table 3 shows that the explicit narcissism means were consistently higher for male targets across job categories, and this target sex difference was statistically significant for all categories except for elementary school teachers. Job category x target sex interactions indicating weaker target sex effects for elementary school teachers were observed when teachers were compared with business, STEM, social science, and humanities professors, $F(1, 242) \geq 4.19$, $p \leq .042$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .02$. Interactions indicating weaker target sex effects for art professors were observed when art professors were compared with professors of business and STEM, $F(1, 242) \geq 3.94$, $p \leq .048$, $\eta_p^2 \geq .02$.

Participant sex had no effect on judgments of professors' explicit narcissism when this variable was added to ANOVA models as a third factor. Participant narcissism was positively correlated with explicit narcissism judgments for all job categories ($r_{\text{admiration}} \geq .16$, $p \leq .011$; $r_{\text{rivalry}} \geq .26$, $p < .001$). When the full range of participants' total narcissism score (combining admiration and rivalry components) was added as a third factor to the general linear models testing admiration narcissism judgments, no additional effects emerged.[6]

Discussion

`

Study 3 provided more confirmation that some types of professors are perceived as more narcissistic than others. Most notably, business professors were judged to be more narcissistic than all other categories of professors across admiration, rivalry, and explicit narcissism measures, and they received higher admiration and explicit narcissism ratings than adults who were not professors or teachers. Study 3 also showed that, compared with participants' views of adults who were not professors nor teachers, the perceived narcissism of professors from disciplines other than business was found to be no different (for admiration and explicit narcissism) or lower (for rivalry narcissism). In addition, Study 3 adds to the evidence that judgments of professors' narcissism may be influenced by the sex of the professor under consideration. Compared with female professors, male professors were viewed as higher in rivalry and explicit narcissism across all academic categories; however, consistent with the outcomes of Study 2, sex of professor had no effect on judgments of professors' admiration narcissism. Observed effects of professor sex on narcissism judgments paralleled target sex effects observed for judgments of adults who were not professors or teachers, suggesting that participants did not view the target sex variable as uniquely relevant to judgments of professors. Finally, the results of Study 3 (in combination with the results of Study 1) unequivocally demonstrate that elementary school teachers were viewed as low in narcissism relative to the judgment scale midpoints and relative to perceptions of professors and other adults.

General Discussion

Our research provides mixed evidence about the extent to which people view college professors as narcissistic. Study 1 showed that participants did not consciously think college professors are narcissistic, because they generally did not agree with the proposition that "professors tend to be narcissistic." Of course, participants' understanding of what narcissism

`

entails may not precisely match the construct of narcissism represented by validated narcissism measures. When narcissism was defined by the possession of narcissistic traits not labeled explicitly as narcissistic, the results of our studies were more varied. When judging the narcissism of professors based on items from the NPI or the admiration subscale of the NARQ—measures that capture a mix of potentially adaptive and maladaptive dimensions of narcissism, most participants provided ratings near the midpoint of the narcissism scales (in all three studies) or ratings that resembled their judgments of adults who are not professors or teachers (in Study 3). In contrast, when professors' narcissism was judged according to the rivalry subscale of the NARQ—a measure of more interpersonally toxic narcissism elements, professors typically received narcissism ratings below the scale midpoints (in Studies 2 and 3) and lower than the narcissism ratings assigned to adults who were not professors or teachers (in Study 3). Still, professors were viewed as substantially more narcissistic than elementary school teachers (in Studies 1 and 3), regardless of how narcissism was measured. On the whole, our research suggests that people do not strongly associate college professors with either high or low narcissism, though the perceived association may strengthen in one direction or the other when professors and their college contexts are narrowly defined.

Judgments of professors' narcissism varied across different professor categories. In Study 2, participants who were led to think of professors as scholars rather than as teachers were more likely to view professors as narcissistic. Perhaps participants' concept of professors rewarded for teaching included some of the same selfless, nurturing traits that presumably were a part of their concept of elementary school teachers. In contrast, the concept of a professor rewarded for scholarship may have brought to mind images of accomplished, impressive people with matching big egos. These explanations seem straightforward and possibly obvious in hindsight,

`

but alternative outcomes could have seemed unsurprising as well. For example, one might have guessed that people think of prototypical professors as know-it-all lecturers more oriented toward blowing hard than caring about students. One also could have guessed that the concept of a scholar might bring to mind images of a socially-awkward nerd more obsessed with arcane academic details than with garnering attention.

In Study 3, business professors were consistently viewed as more narcissistic than professors from other branches of academia. Several explanations for the perceived narcissism of business professors seem possible, and we will highlight three. First, the concept of business may have evoked thoughts of people fundamentally driven to maximize earnings and attain the material resources, social influence, and power than money can provide. Second, participants may have associated business with hypercompetitive or exploitative practices, features that correspond with narcissists' self-reported narcissism and behavioral tendencies (e.g., Luchner et al., 2011; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Third, participants may have imagined business as a branch of academia that puts more priority on managing one's physical appearance. Narcissists try harder than others to cultivate an impressive personal appearance (e.g., Back et al., 2010; Holtzman & Strube, 2012), and people associate expensive clothing and markers of personal grooming with narcissism (Vazire et al., 2008).

Our research also revealed sex differences in the perceived narcissism of professors, in the expected direction of male professors being viewed as more narcissistic than female professors; however, these sex effects were limited to judgments of explicit narcissism (in Studies 2 and 3, but not in Study 1) and narcissism defined by the rivalry subfactor of the NARQ (in Study 3, but not in Study 2). Sex effects did not emerge when narcissism was defined by items from the NPI or the admiration subfactor of the NARQ, both of which are weighted toward

`

measuring qualities of narcissism that are more intrapsychic than interpersonal. These findings suggest that people associate "narcissism" with antisocial and stereotypically male dimensions of grandiose narcissism, but they generally do not associate professors with these aspects of narcissism.

On the whole, our research suggests that highly narcissistic professors may not be given a pass for their narcissism within the cultures of most academic institutions, especially female professors at colleges that do not demand high scholarship productivity from their faculty. Narcissism may be adaptive for professors in the sense that it enables them to feel more comfortable spending less time on responsibilities related to helping others that do not directly yield tangible rewards, but unambiguously narcissistic behavior from professors appears to violate people's expectations of how professors are supposed to behave. Therefore, highly narcissistic professors might be viewed with disdain within their academic culture—perhaps with more disdain than narcissists could expect to receive in most other social contexts. Narcissists care deeply about being respected and admired by others; if a reputation for narcissistic behavior undermines professors' ability to earn respect and admiration within their academic institutions, it would be understandable if highly narcissistic people would gravitate toward other professional domains that are more tolerant of narcissism.

Our research has many transparent limitations, including the following. First, our reliance on M-Turk samples is not ideal for establishing generalizability, or for understanding the possibly unique perspectives of professors and academic administrators (the gatekeepers of academic culture norms). Moveover, the minority of participants without college experience may have had minimal or no basis for making some decisions, though college experience did not predict differences in responses. Second, our research draws no conclusions about the reality of

`

professors' narcissism, which remains uncertain. Third, our subcategories of professors and comparison groups were broad and abstract. For example, our conclusions regarding perceptions of business professors obscure differences in how professors of accounting and marketing are perceived. Fourth, our manipulation of target information using within-subjects designs (e.g., for testing college type differences in Study 2) may have magnified observed differences in participants' judgments across experiment conditions. Fifth, our research did not provide concrete clarification of *why* different categories of individuals were perceived differently. Finally, our research did not consider whether participants viewed narcissism as a benefit or a disadvantage for the different job requirements of being a professor.

Intriguing future research directions relevant to our research extend beyond alternative methods designed to address the limitations described above. Assessing perceptions of professor narcissism and related implications for narcissists' fit within academic culture only scratches the surface of compelling underlying questions about the prevalence and adaptiveness of professor narcissism. Academic reward structures appear to favor professors who display selective professional dedication toward narcissistic priorities, but academia may nonetheless repel highly narcissistic people with its peer review constraints, long slogs required for pursuing uncertain job prospects, limited earning potential, and unavoidable responsibilities offering low potential for self-glorification. Indeed, it may be the case that grandiose narcissism (the focus of our research) is less prevalent among academics than communal narcissism, a subspecies of narcissism entailing zealous pursuit of self-enhancement through impressive demonstrations of helping behavior (see Gebauer et al., 2012). If high (grandiose) narcissism is in fact more of the exception than the rule for professors at most institutions, this could be ideal for the narcissistic

`

exceptions if it enables them to escape punishment for their prosocial shortcomings by relying on their peers to pick up their slack.

Conflict of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval: All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee (Trinity University Institutional Review Board) and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards

Informed Consent: Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

Research Materials: Survey content and SPSS datasets for each study can be accessed online: https://doi.org/10.17605/OSF.IO/MX6KA

`

References

Anderson, K. J. (2010). Students' stereotypes of professors: An exploration of the double violations of ethnicity and gender. *Social Psychology of Education, 13*, 459-472. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11218-010-9121-3

Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(6), 1013-1037. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034431

Back, M. D., Schmukle, S. C., & Egloff, B. (2010). Why are narcissists so charming at first sight? Decoding the narcissism-popularity link at zero acquaintance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(1), 132-145. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016338

Binder, M., Chermak, J., Krause, K., & Thacher, J. (2012). The teaching penalty in higher education: Evidence from a public research university. *Economics Letters, 117*, 39-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.econlet.2012.04.021

Brunell, A. B., Tumblin, L., & Buelow, M. T. (2014). Narcissism and the motivation to engage in volunteerism. *Current Psychology, 33*, 365-376. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-014-9216-7

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*(3), 358-368. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202286007

Eagly, A. H., & Karau, S. J. (2002). Role congruity theory of prejudice toward female leaders. *Psychological Review, 109*(3), 573-598. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.109.3.573

El-Alayli, A., Hansen-Brown, A. A., & Ceynar, M. (2018). Dancing backwards in high heels: Female professors experience more work demands and special favor requests,

`

particularly from academically entitled students. *Sex Roles, 79*(3-4), 136-150. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-017-0872-6

Fairweather, J. S. (2005). Beyond the rhetoric: Trends in the relative value of teaching and research in faculty salaries. *Journal of Higher Education, 76*(4), 401-422. https://doi.org/10.1080/00221546.2005.11772290

Farwell, L., & Wohlwend-Lloyd, R. (1998). Narcissistic processes: Optimistic expectations, favorable self-evaluations, and self-enhancing attributions. *Journal of Personality, 66*, 65-83. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.00003

Fatfouta, R., Rentzsch, K., & Schröder-Abé, M. (2018). Narcissisus oeconomicus: Facets of narcissism and socio-economic decision-making. *Journal of Research in Personality, 75*, 12-16. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.05.002

Feist, G. J. (1994). Personality and working style predictors of integrative complexity: A study of scientists' thinking about research and teaching. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67*(3), 474-484. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.3.474

Fender, B. F., Taylor, S. W., & Burke, K. G. (2015). Isn't it ironic? Research rewards and teaching taxes. *Journal of Business and Economics Research, 13*(4), 231-237. https://doi.org/10.19030/jber.v13i4.9454

Festinger, L. (1957). *A theory of cognitive dissonance*. Stanford University Press.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00026-6

`

Gabriel, M. T., Critelli, J. W., & Ee, J. S. (1994). Narcissistic illusions in self-evaluations of intelligence and attractiveness. *Journal of Personality*, *62*(1), 143-155. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1994.tb00798.x

Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*(5), 854-878. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029629

Gentile, B., Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Reidy, D. E., Zeichner, A., & Campbell, W. K. (2013). A test of two brief measures of grandiose narcissism: The Narcissistic Personality Inventory-13 and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16. *Psychological Assessment*, *25*(4), 1120-1136. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033192

Geukes, K., Nestler, S., Hutteman, R., Dufner, M., Küfner, A. C. P., Egloff, B., Denissen, J. J. A., & Back, M. D. (2017). Puffed-up but shaky selves: State self-esteem level and variability in narcissists. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *112*(5), 769-786. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000093

Grapsas, S., Brummelman, E., Back, M. D., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2020). The 'why' and 'how' of narcissism: A process model of narcissistic states pursuit. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(1), 150-172. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691619873350

Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2015). Gender difference in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *141*(2), 261-310. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038231

Grijalva, E., & Zhang, L. (2016). Narcissism and self-insight: A review and meta-analysis of narcissists' self-enhancement tendencies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *42*(1), 3-24. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215611636

`

Hart, W., & Adams, J. M. (2014). Are narcissists more accepting of others' narcissistic traits? *Personality and Individual Differences, 64,* 163-167. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.02.038

Heilman, M. E., & Chen, J. J. (2005). Same behavior, different consequences: Reactions to men's and women's altruistic citizenship behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 90*(3), 431-441. https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.3.431

Hill, R. W., & Yousey, G. (1998). Adaptive and maladaptive narcissism among university faculty, clergy, politicians and librarians. *Current Psychology, 17,* 163-169. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-998-1003-x

Holtzman, N. S., & Strube, M. J. (2012). People with dark personalities tend to create a physically attractive veneer. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4*(4), 461-467. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550612461284

Imhoff, R., & Koch, A. (2017). How orthogonal are the big two of social perception? On the curvilinear relation between agency and communion. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*(1), 122-137. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616657334

Jonason, P. K., & O'Connor, P. J. (2017). Cutting corners at work: An individual differences perspective. *Personality and Individual Differences, 107,* 146-153. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.11.045

Jones, D. N., & Paulhus, D. L. (2017). Duplicity among the dark triad: Three faces of deceit. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 113*(2), 329-342. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000139

Kernis, M. H., & Sun, C. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality, 28,* 4-13. https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1994.1002

`

Konrath, S., Ho, M., & Zarins, S. (2016). The strategic helper: Narcissism and prosocial motives and behaviors. *Current Psychology, 35*(2), 182-194. https://doi.org/10.1007.s12144-016-9417-3

Konrath, S., & Tian, Y. (2018). Narcissism and prosocial behavior. In T. Hermann, A. Brunell, & J. Foster (Eds.), *Handbook of trait narcissism: Key advances, research methods, and controversies* (pp. 371-378). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1077/978-3-319-92171-6_40

Lamkin, J., Clifton, A., Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2014). An examination of the perceptions of social network characteristics associated with grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment, 5*(2), 137-145. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000024

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.06.033

Macenczak, L. A., Campbell, S., Henley, A. B., & Campbell, W. K. (2016). Direct and interactive effects of narcissism and power on overconfidence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 91,* 113-122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.053

Melguizo, T., & Strober, M. H. (2007). Faculty salaries and the maximization of prestige. *Research in Higher Education, 48*(6), 633-668. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11162-006-9045-0

Meltzer, A. L., & McNulty, J. K. (2011). Contrast effects of stereotypes: "Nurturing" male professors are evaluated more positively than "nurturing" female professors. *Journal of Men's Studies, 19*(1), 57-64. https://doi.org/10.3149/jms.1901.57

`

Miller, J., & Chamberlin, M. (2000). Women are teachers, men are professors: A study of student perceptions. *Teaching Sociology, 28*, 283-298. https://doi.org/10.2307/1318580

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality, 76*(3), 449-476. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (Eds.) (2011). *Handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatment*. Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118093108

Miller, J. D., Maples, J. L., Buffardi, L., Cai, H., Gentile, B., Kisbu-Sakarya, Y., Kwan, V. S. Y., LoPilato, A., Pendry, L. F., Sedikides, C., Siedor, L., & Campbell, W. K. (2015). Narcissism and United States' culture: The view from home and around the world. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(6), 1068-1089. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0039543

Mitchell, K. M. W., & Martin, J. (2018). Gender bias in student evaluations. *Political Science and Politics, 51*(3), 648-652. https://doi.org/10.1017/S104909651800001X

O'Meara, K., Kuvaeva, A., Nyunt, G., Waugaman, C., & Jackson, R. (2017). Asked more often: Gender differences in faculty workload in research universities and the work interactions that shape them. *American Educational Research Journal, 54*(6), 1154-1186. https://doi.org/10.3102/0002831217716767

Paulhus, D. L., Harms, P. D., Bruce, M. N., & Lysy, D. C. (2003). The over-claiming technique: Measuring self-enhancement independent of ability. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(4), 890-904. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.84.4.890

`

Pincus, A. L., & Roche, M. J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. In W. K. Campbell & J. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatment* (pp. 31-40). Wiley. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000031

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890-902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890

Roberts, B. W., Edmonds, G., & Grijalva, E. (2010). It is developmental me, not generation me: Developmental changes are more important than generational changes in narcissism—Commentary on Trzesniewski & Donnellan (2010). *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 5*(1), 97-102. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691609357019

Roberts, B. W., & Robins, R. W. (2000). Broad dispositions, broad aspirations: The intersection of personality traits and major life goals. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 26*(10), 1284-1296. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167200262009

Rose, P. (2007). Mediators of the association between narcissism and compulsive buying: The roles of materialism and impulse control. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors, 21*(4), 576-581. https://doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.21.4.576

Rudman, L. A., Moss-Racusin, C. A., Phelan, J. E., & Nauts, S. (2012). Status incongruity and backlash effects: Defending the gender hierarchy motivates prejudice against female leaders. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 165-179. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.10.008

Sautter, J. A., Brown, T. A., Littvay, L., Sautter, A. C., & Bearnes, B. (2008). Attitude and divergence in business students: An examination of personality differences in business

`

and non-business students. *Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, 13*(2), 70-78.

Sprague, J., & Massoni, K. (2005). Student evaluations and gendered expectations: What we can't count can hurt us. *Sex Roles, 53*, 779-793. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-8292-4

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*, 196-213. https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860802505053

Vazire, S., Naumann, L. P., Rentfrow, P. J., & Gosling, S. D. (2008). Portrait of a narcissist: Manifestations of narcissism in physical appearance. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 1439-1447. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.007

Vedel, A., & Thomsen, D. K. (2017). The dark triad across academic majors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 116*, 86-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.04.30

Wallace, H. M., Grotzinger, A., Howard, T. J., & Parkhill, N. (2015). When people evaluate others, the level of others' narcissism matters less to evaluators who are narcissistic. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 6*(7), 805-813. https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550615587985

Westerman, J. W., Bergman, J. Z., Bergman, S. M., & Daly, J. P. (2012). Are universities creating narcissistic employees? An empirical examination of narcissism in business students and its implications. *Journal of Management Education, 36*(1), 5-32. https://doi.org/10.1177/1052562911408097

`

Williams, K. M., Nathanson, C., & Paulhus, D. L. (2010). Identifying and profiling scholastic cheaters: Their personality, cognitive ability, and motivation. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Applied, 16*(3), 293-307. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0020773

Zajenkowski, M., & Czarna, A. Z. (2015). What makes narcissists unhappy? Subjectively assessed intelligence moderates the relationship between narcissism and psychological well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences, 77*, 50-54. https://doi.org/10.1016.j.paid.2014.12.045

Zajenkowski, M., & Szymaniak, K. (2019). Narcissism between facets and domains. The relationships between two types of narcissism and aspects of the Big Five. *Current Psychology*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-019-0147-1

`

Table 1

The Level of Narcissism Ascribed to Male and Female College Professors and Elementary School Teachers in Study 1.

Narcissism measure	Job category	Overall *M* (*SD*)	Male *M* (*SD*)	Female *M* (*SD*)	*t*	*d*
NPI-13	College professors	2.94 (0.39)	2.94 (0.37)	2.95 (0.41)	-0.25	0.05
	Elementary school teachers	2.73 (0.36)	2.76 (0.36)	2.69 (0.35)	1.02	0.19
Explicit	College professors	2.46 (0.92)	2.60 (0.92)	2.33 (0.91)	2.20*	0.30

Note. Higher means indicate more perceived narcissism. The scale of responses ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The *t* and corresponding Cohen's *d* effect size statistics represent male vs. female comparisons within each row. The asterisk denotes a statistically significant comparison ($p < .05$).

`

Table 2

The Level of Narcissism Ascribed to Male and Female College Professors in Study 2.

Narcissism measure	College category	Overall *M* (*SD*)	Male *M* (*SD*)	Female *M* (*SD*)	*t*	*d*
NARQ Admiration	Reward research	3.54 (0.93)	3.63 (0.92)	3.45 (0.96)	1.53	0.20
	Reward teaching	3.06 (0.96)	3.12 (0.93)	3.01 (0.96)	0.88	0.11
NARQ Rivalry	Reward research	2.99 (1.00)	3.11 (1.04)	2.87 (0.95)	1.84	0.24
	Reward teaching	2.21 (0.87)	2.25 (0.90)	2.18 (0.84)	0.66	0.09
Explicit	Reward research	3.20 (0.99)	3.31 (1.06)	3.08 (1.09)	3.95*	0.50
	Reward teaching	2.51 (0.99)	2.57 (1.09)	2.44 (1.05)	2.41*	0.16

Note. Higher means indicate more perceived narcissism. The scale of responses ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The *t* and corresponding Cohen's *d* effect size statistics represent male vs. female comparisons within each row. Asterisks denote statistically significant comparisons ($p < .05$).

`

Table 3

The Level of Narcissism Ascribed to Male and Female College Professors, Elementary School Teachers, and Other Adults in Study 3.

Narcissism measure	Job category	Overall *M* (*SD*)	Male *M* (*SD*)	Female *M* (*SD*)	*t*	*d*
Admiration	Adults (control)	3.59 (1.27)	3.57 (1.22)	3.61 (1.31)	-0.24	0.03
	Art professor	3.81 (1.43)	3.79 (1.41)	3.82 (1.45)	-0.15	0.02
	Business professor	3.89 (1.38)	4.01 (1.41)	3.78 (1.36)	1.29	0.17
	Humanities professor	3.59 (1.39)	3.60 (1.38)	3.59 (1.40)	0.10	0.01
	Social science professor	3.63 (1.39)	3.73 (1.37)	3.53 (1.40)	1.12	0.14
	STEM professor	3.84 (1.44)	3.92 (1.44)	3.76 (1.44)	0.88	0.11
	Elementary school teacher	2.93 (1.37)	2.67 (1.22)	3.19 (1.46)	-3.00*	0.38
Rivalry	Adults (control)	3.11 (1.47)	3.51 (1.46)	2.71 (1.37)	4.45*	0.57
	Art professor	2.53 (1.42)	2.70 (1.42)	2.37 (1.40)	1.87	0.24
	Business professor	3.14 (1.58)	3.55 (1.65)	2.75 (1.42)	4.05*	0.52
	Humanities professor	2.49 (1.35)	2.67 (1.38)	2.31 (1.31)	2.10*	0.27
	Social science professor	2.57 (1.43)	2.80 (1.48)	2.33 (1.35)	2.59*	0.33
	STEM professor	2.76 (1.57)	3.00 (1.59)	2.53 (1.52)	2.37*	0.30
	Elementary school teacher	1.99 (1.24)	2.12 (1.28)	1.87 (1.19)	1.56	0.20
Explicit	Adults (control)	4.56 (2.55)	5.05 (2.42)	4.08 (2.59)	3.02*	0.39
	Art professor	4.76 (2.90)	5.17 (2.90)	4.35 (2.86)	2.24*	0.29
	Business professor	5.32 (2.92)	6.08 (2.82)	4.58 (2.83)	4.16*	0.53
	Humanities professor	4.23 (2.77)	4.82 (2.71)	3.66 (2.73)	3.33*	0.43
	Social science professor	4.53 (2.78)	5.01 (2.73)	4.06 (2.77)	2.70*	0.35
	STEM professor	4.95 (2.85)	5.68 (2.72)	4.23 (2.80)	4.11*	0.53
	Elementary school teacher	2.58 (2.31)	2.71 (2.35)	2.45 (2.28)	0.89	0.11

Note. Higher means indicate more perceived narcissism. The scale of responses for admiration and rivalry narcissism ranged from 1 (*probably strongly disagree*) to 6 (*probably strongly agree*). The scale of responses for explicit narcissism ranged from 0 (*not at all narcissistic*) to 10 (*extremely narcissistic*). The *t* and corresponding Cohen's *d* effect size statistics represent male vs. female comparisons within each row. Asterisks denote statistically significant comparisons ($p < .05$).

`

Footnotes

[1] Our research focused on perceptions of grandiose narcissism rather than vulnerable narcissism for two reasons. First, our interest in perceptions of narcissistic professors arose initially from speculations about possible advantages associated with being a narcissistic professor. Such advantages seem plausible if not likely for grandiose narcissism, but vulnerable narcissism is almost inherently disadvantageous. Second, we had no basis for thinking people might associate professors with the dysfunctional traits that distinguish vulnerable narcissism from grandiose narcissism.

[2] College experience was considered as a two-level factor (some form of college degree or not) added to all ANOVA models reported in this paper. No effects of college experience were observed.

[3] Deriving meaning from comparing responses to scale midpoints is potentially fraught, because the midpoint could be rendered irrelevant by psychometric biases pushing responses in a particular direction. We nonetheless highlight how means compare with scale midpoints here and elsewhere in this paper because the information attained from the comparison seemed noteworthy and because we are unaware of a particular applicable bias that would predictably invalidate our midpoint comparisons.

[4] Our (a priori) participant exclusion criteria became increasingly more stringent over the course of our three studies partly because we added more tools for screening participants (attention checks and open-ended comment opportunities) and partly because we became more sensitive to markers of potential problems in M-Turk samples. Our research was conducted in April 2015 (Study 1), May 2018 (Study 2), and September 2018 (Study 3).

`

[5] Decisions to use various combinations of between- and within-subjects designs in our studies were driven fundamentally by our desire to maximize measurement breadth and statistical power within surveys requiring fewer than 10 min to complete. We opted for within-subjects designs if the timing of survey administration could accommodate and if the item redundancy and independent variable transparency seemed unproblematic.

[6] Participant age correlated negatively with target narcissism ratings across conditions in all three studies. When participant narcissism was measured (in Study 2 and Study 3), participant age correlated negatively with participant narcissism, a typical finding in the narcissism literature (e.g., Foster et al., 2003; Roberts et al., 2010). Controlling for participant narcissism eliminated the participant age effects on narcissism judgments, but controlling for age did not substantially affect the positive relationship between participant narcissism and target narcissism judgments.

`