

Narcissism, beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, and moral disengagement in sport coaches

Doris Matosic , Nikos Ntoumanis , Ian D. Boardley & Constantine Sedikides

To cite this article: Doris Matosic , Nikos Ntoumanis , Ian D. Boardley & Constantine Sedikides (2020) Narcissism, beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, and moral disengagement in sport coaches, International Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 18:5, 592-606, DOI: 10.1080/1612197X.2018.1549580

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1612197X.2018.1549580>



© 2018 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group



Published online: 29 Nov 2018.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 1405



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 3 View citing articles [↗](#)

Narcissism, beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, and moral disengagement in sport coaches

Doris Matosic ^{a*}, Nikos Ntoumanis ^b, Ian D. Boardley ^a and Constantine Sedikides ^c

^a*School of Sport, Exercise & Rehabilitation Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK;*

^b*Physical Activity and Well-being Lab, School of Psychology, Curtin University, Perth, Australia;* ^c*Centre for Research on Self and Identity, Psychology Department, University of Southampton, Southampton, UK*

(Received 11 February 2018; accepted 19 October 2018)

We tested the relations among narcissism (including both its adaptive and maladaptive facets), effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, controlling coach behaviours, and moral disengagement in sport coaches. Participants were 210 sport coaches, representing a variety of sports and levels of coaching. Coaches completed a multi-section questionnaire assessing the study variables. Path analyses revealed that global narcissism and maladaptive narcissism were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours. Furthermore, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours, while controlling coach behaviours were positively associated with coach moral disengagement. Finally, adaptive narcissism had an indirect effect on controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness beliefs about a controlling interpersonal style. These findings contribute to the literature on antecedents and outcomes of controlling coach behaviours, as reported by coaches.

Keywords: adaptive narcissism; maladaptive narcissism; controlling coach behaviours; self-determination theory; coaching

Introduction

Coaches are key authority figures in sport, hence, the interpersonal styles they utilise when communicating with their athletes can play a critical role in shaping athletes' psychological experiences in sport. Although some interpersonal styles can be beneficial in that they support athletes' psychological needs, other styles can be controlling and have the potential to undermine athletes' psychological needs and well-being (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, Ryan, Bosch, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2011). A theoretical framework for studying a controlling interpersonal communication style is self-determination theory (SDT; Ryan & Deci, 2017). According to SDT, such a style reflects a set of behaviours whereby the agent (e.g. coach) acts in pressuring or coercive ways, imposing ways of thinking, feeling, and behaving upon their athletes (Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2009). A controlling interpersonal style has been associated with negative athlete outcomes, such as psychological need frustration, ill-being, and athlete moral disengagement (Curran, Hill, Ntoumanis, Hall, & Jowett, 2016; Healy, Ntoumanis, van Zanten, & Paine, 2014; Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015). Although considerable research efforts have expended on how controlling coaching can shape athletes' experiences, there is limited evidence on the role of personality antecedents of a

*Corresponding author. Email: matosicdoris@gmail.com

controlling coach interpersonal style (Occhino, Mallett, Rynne, & Carlisle, 2014). We focus on this putative antecedent category, and in particular on coach narcissism.

Narcissism is a personality trait that can be distinguished between grandiose and vulnerable types (Thomaes, Brummelman, & Sedikides, 2018). Our study focuses on grandiose narcissism, as it is mostly relevant to the coach population and has been extensively addressed in the leadership literature (Schoel, Stahlberg, & Sedikides, 2015; Sedikides & Campbell, 2017). Grandiose narcissism (hereafter narcissism) is a self-centred, arrogant, and manipulative interpersonal orientation (Arthur, Woodman, Ong, Hardy, & Ntoumanis, 2011; Roberts, Woodman, & Sedikides, 2018). Of potential importance from a sport coaching perspective, narcissistic leaders strive to assume leadership positions and engage in situations that provide them with opportunities for admiration and self-enhancement (Mathieu & St-Jean, 2013; Woodman, Roberts, Hardy, Callow, & Rogers, 2011). Further, narcissists take credit for successes, but displace blame for failures on others (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000). They also crave validation and seek out situations involving social interaction where they can exhibit their superiority over others (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001). In addition, they exploit others for personal gain (Sedikides, Campbell, Reeder, Elliot, & Gregg, 2002), are unwilling to treat others respectfully (Campbell, Hoffman, Campbell, & Marchisio, 2011), and lack moral sensibility due to a preoccupation with the self (Roberts, 2001).

Perhaps unsurprisingly, narcissism has been linked with negative leadership qualities and lack of leadership effectiveness (Grijalva, Harms, Newman, Gaddis, & Fraley, 2015; Schoel et al., 2015; Sedikides & Campbell, 2017). Narcissistic leadership has also been recently explored within the coaching domain. Matosic et al. (2017) recruited coaches from a variety of sports (e.g. swimming, football) and levels (e.g. national, international). Coaches responded to scenarios in which they experienced self-threat. Coaches higher (compared to those lower) in narcissism reported that they would implement more often controlling behaviours toward their athletes, such as yelling, belittlement, or guilt-inducement. In another study, Matosic, Ntoumanis, Boardley, Stenling, and Sedikides (2016) also sampled coaches and athletes from a variety of sports and levels. Coaches higher in narcissism were perceived as more controlling by their athletes. In line with literature on narcissistic leaders (Schoel et al., 2015), Matosic et al. explained their results by arguing that coaches high in narcissism behave in an authoritarian manner, take advantage of others, are hypersensitive to criticism, and use guilt-inducing tactics to express their disappointment to seemingly underperforming athletes. These coaches implement the abovementioned controlling strategies in order to gain self-enhancement benefits, such as admiration and reflected glory, as well as to establish authority and superiority over their athletes (Mathieu & St-Jean, 2013; Woodman et al., 2011).

Matosic et al. (2016, 2017) examined narcissism at the global level. However, narcissism has also been differentiated in terms of its adaptive and maladaptive facets (Barry & Malkin, 2010). Adaptive narcissism pertains to viewing oneself as authoritative and self-confident, whereas maladaptive narcissism pertains to feeling entitled, being motivated to gain status over others, and seeking attention or admiration. More relevant to the objectives of the current study, adaptive narcissism is unrelated to social misconduct (e.g. aggression) when controlling for the “effects” of maladaptive narcissism, whereas maladaptive narcissism is positively related to social misconduct (Barry, Frick, & Killian, 2003; Barry, Pickard, & Ansel, 2009). As such, it is possible that maladaptive, but not adaptive, narcissism is associated with controlling coach behaviours. In addition, global narcissism could be associated with controlling coach behaviours due to its maladaptive facet.

Extending the work of Matosic et al. (2016, 2017), in this study we tested potential relations between narcissism and controlling behaviours via coaches’ effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, respectively. Such beliefs have been previously examined

as potential antecedents of controlling behaviours (Reeve et al., 2014), and, as such, may constitute an explanatory mechanism for coaches' use of controlling behaviours. Effectiveness beliefs (Reeve et al., 2014) refer to how successful or impactful an interpersonal style is judged by individuals in positions of authority (e.g. coaches, teachers). Normalcy beliefs refer to how normative (i.e. common, accepted, or expected) an interpersonal style is judged by individuals in positions of authority. Both effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style are positively associated with use of controlling behaviours by teachers (Reeve et al., 2014). One reason for this association is that teachers think controlling behaviours (e.g. offering rewards) promote students' engagement (Boggiano, Barrett, Weiher, McClelland, & Lusk, 1987). Another reason is that teachers – especially those in schools characterised by competition, external evaluation, and strict time constraints – regard controlling behaviours as the norm (Barrett & Boggiano, 1988). What is considered as normative may also be considered effective, and therefore teachers who endorse normalcy and effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style view controlling strategies as acceptable (Reeve et al., 2014). By implication, coaches who consider controlling interpersonal style as effective may also consider it as a norm, and will therefore be likely to enact controlling behaviours when interacting with their athletes.

We examined whether effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style represent mechanisms through which narcissism may be associated with coaches' use of controlling behaviours. This process has the potential to explain why coaches high in narcissism report more frequent engagement in controlling behaviours (Matosic et al., 2016, 2017). Specifically, coaches high in narcissism may hold favourable effectiveness and normalcy beliefs regarding controlling interpersonal style, and this allows them to view controlling behaviours as legitimate and justifiable. Consistent with this contention, higher levels of global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism have been positively related to normalcy beliefs regarding aggression and bullying (e.g. social exclusion, verbal threat), and these beliefs have been linked to stronger engagement in such behaviours (Blinkhorn, Lyons, & Almond, 2016; Onishi, Kawabata, Kurokawa, & Yoshida, 2012). For example, in a school setting, narcissistic individuals are more likely to be aggressive when perceiving higher levels of classroom norms for aggression (Onishi et al., 2012). Additionally, adaptive and maladaptive narcissists engage in more aggressive and bullying behaviours, respectively, because they believe these behaviours are acceptable and normative (Ang, Tan, & Mansor, 2011; Blinkhorn et al., 2016). However, although adaptive narcissism appeared to be positively linked to antisocial behaviour, the effects may be due to the confluence of this construct and that of maladaptive narcissism (i.e. maladaptive narcissism was not covaried out from adaptive narcissism). A recent meta-analysis of the narcissism and leadership literature further bolsters the relevance of effectiveness beliefs (Grijalva et al., 2015). The meta-analysis reported positive relations among global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism with self-reported leadership effectiveness. It also showed that global narcissists engaged in aggressive behaviours as a means of influencing and guiding others. Given the established links between aggressive and bullying behaviours and controlling coach behaviours (Bartholomew et al., 2009), we surmise that a similar process operates between narcissism (global, adaptive, maladaptive) and controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style.

As well as aiming to understand more deeply antecedents of controlling coach behaviours, we investigated coaches' moral disengagement as a potential outcome of controlling coach behaviours. SDT literature has found that controlling coach behaviours may lead to detrimental outcomes (Ntoumanis, 2012). A group of detrimental outcomes that has been scarcely examined refers to morality-related, and, as such, we focus on coach moral disengagement.

Moral disengagement is a collective term for eight psychosocial mechanisms (e.g. moral justification, displacement of responsibility, attribution of blame) that allow people to justify or rationalise inappropriate behaviour (Bandura, 2002). These mechanisms facilitate such conduct

by reducing or eliminating the emotional consequences that normally follow one’s untoward action, and would ordinarily deter it. Importantly, moral disengagement can be used socially to justify or rationalise one’s harmful conduct to others (Bandura, 2016). As such, coaches who behave in a controlling manner may engage in moral disengagement to justify or rationalise their controlling behaviours to others. Thus, higher frequency of controlling coach behaviours may be associated with increased moral disengagement. To date, researchers have reported a positive relation between athletes’ perceptions of controlling coach behaviours and athlete moral disengagement (Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015), but the relation between controlling coach behaviours and coach moral disengagement has not been addressed.

Hypotheses

We first tested a model in which global narcissism predicted controlling behaviours via effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style. This model expands on Matosic et al. (2016, 2017) who obtained a positive link between global narcissism and controlling coaching behaviours. Similar to Barry et al. (2003) and Barry and Malkin (2010), we report the results for overall narcissism first, followed by a more elaborate version of that model that differentiates between adaptive and maladaptive narcissism. In these two models, we hypothesised that global and maladaptive, but not adaptive, narcissism would be positively and directly associated with controlling coach behaviours. We also hypothesised that effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style would be positively associated with controlling coach behaviours, and that controlling coach behaviours would be positively associated with coach moral disengagement. Finally, we hypothesised that global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism would be positively linked with controlling coach behaviours indirectly, via both effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style (Figures 1 and 2).

Method

Participants

Participants were 210 coaches (164 men, 46 women) from a variety of team (e.g. football, rugby) and individual (e.g. swimming, athletics) sports, as well as levels of competition (e.g. national, international, regional). Coaches’ ages ranged from 18 to 88 years ($M = 35.76$, $SD = 13.53$; 23




Figure 1. Hypothesised model linking global narcissism, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, controlling coach behaviours, and moral disengagement.




Figure 2. Hypothesised model linking adaptive and maladaptive narcissism, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, controlling coach behaviours, and moral disengagement.

participants did not report their age). Coaches had on average 12.99 ($SD = 9.59$) years of coaching experience and were predominantly White British (83.10%).

Measures

Narcissism

We assessed coach (global) narcissism with the 40-item, forced-choice Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988). We opted for the NPI over other measures of narcissism (e.g. Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire; Back et al., 2013), because the NPI is the standard scale to assess grandiose narcissism (Boldero, Bell, & Davies, 2015; Miller, Lynam, & Campbell, 2016a, 2016b), and this would allow us to compare our results with relevant findings in the literature. For each item, participants chose between a narcissistic (e.g. “I think I am a special person”) and a non-narcissistic (e.g. “I am no better or no worse than most people”) statement. Scores range from 0 to 40, with higher scores reflecting higher levels of narcissism. Evidence support the NPI’s construct validity and internal consistency in the sports domain (Roberts et al., 2018; Woodman et al., 2011).

Narcissism has been subdivided into two facets, adaptive and maladaptive (Barry et al., 2003; Barry & Malkin, 2010). As per Barry et al. (2003) and Barry and Malkin (2010), we calculated adaptive narcissism scores by averaging items of the Authority (e.g. “I like to have authority over others”) and Self-sufficiency (e.g. “I always know what I am doing”) subscales of the NPI. Further, we calculated maladaptive narcissism score by averaging items from Exploitativeness (e.g. “I can make anybody believe anything I want them to”), Entitlement (e.g. “I expect a great deal from other people”), and Exhibitionism (e.g. “I really like to be the centre of attention”) subscales of the NPI (Barry et al., 2003; Barry & Malkin, 2010). All subscales have good construct validity and internal consistency (Barry et al., 2003; Barry & Malkin, 2010).

Controlling coach behaviours

We assessed controlling coach behaviours using the 15-item Controlling Coach Behaviors Scale (CCBS; Bartholomew, Ntoumanis, & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, 2010). Responses ranged from 1

(*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*), with higher scores reflecting more controlling behaviours. For the purposes of this study, we modified the CCBS to refer to coach self-perceptions (e.g. “I try to control what athletes do during their free time;” for a similar approach, see Stebbings, Taylor, & Spray, 2011) rather than athlete perceptions (e.g. “My coach tries to control what I do during my free time”). Evidence supports the modified scale’s construct validity and internal consistency ($\alpha = .83$; Stebbings et al., 2011).

Controlling interpersonal style beliefs

For each of the controlling coaching behaviours items (CCBS; Bartholomew et al., 2010), the participants were asked to answer two questions about how effective and two questions about how normative the behaviour captured by this item was. The effectiveness and normalcy beliefs regarding controlling interpersonal style were assessed via a questionnaire developed by Reeve et al. (2014). Two items measured coaches’ effectiveness beliefs about a controlling interpersonal style (i.e. “How effective would this approach to coaching be in terms of motivating and engaging your athletes?” and “If you coach this way, how much would your athletes benefit in terms of learning and achievement?”). For effectiveness beliefs, responses ranged from 1 (*extremely ineffective, it would not work at all*) to 7 (*extremely effective, it would certainly work*) for the first item, and from 1 (*no benefit at all*) to 7 (*a great deal of benefit*) for the second item. Additionally, two items measured coaches’ normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style (i.e. “Does this approach describe what the other coaches you know and work with do as coaches?” and “How typical or common is this approach to coaching for the coaches you know and work with?”). For normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style responses ranged from 1 (*no, not at all*) to 7 (“*yes, very much*”) for the first item, and from 1 (*extremely atypical, uncommon*) to 7 (*extremely typical, common*) for the second item. The scale has good construct validity and internal consistency (e.g. Reeve et al., 2014).

Moral disengagement

We assessed moral disengagement using the 8-item Moral Disengagement in Sport Scale-Short (MDSS-Short; Boardley & Kavussanu, 2008). A sample item is: “Shouting at the opponent is okay as long as it does not end in violent conduct.” Responses ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Evidence supports this scale’s construct validity and internal consistency ($\alpha = .87$; Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015). As the scale was originally validated with athletes, we examined its factorial validity with the present sample of coaches using confirmatory factor analysis. Initial specification of the 8-item unidimensional model from Boardley and Kavussanu (2008) resulted in poor fit, $\chi^2(20) = 78.7, p \leq .01$, CFI = .84, RMSEA = .12, SRMR = .07. However, specification of a model that accounted for a significant correlation between the error terms of two items identified through model misfit statistics resulted in very good model fit, $\chi^2(19) = 35.1, p \leq .05$, CFI = .96, RMSEA = .06, SRMR = .06. Specifying correlated errors when present is important to prevent possible inaccurate parameter estimates (see Kline, 2015).

Procedures

Following approval from the ethics committee of the first author’s institution, we recruited coaches via national governing bodies, sport club websites, social media, and personal contacts. We explained the purpose and procedure of the study to coaches via email or in person. We emphasised that their participation was voluntary and all information would be confidential. Prior to completing the 15-min online (collected via the Lime Survey online application) or

hardcopy (collected in person) multi-section questionnaire, we provided coaches with a consent form (online or face-to-face). We received 204 online and 11 hardcopy responses. Out of 215 participants, three were duplicates, one was not based in the United Kingdom, and one requested withdrawal. Thus, the final data set consisted of 210 participants (199 online and 11 hardcopy responses). Upon completion of the survey, participants were able to enter a prize draw. We randomly selected two participants to win a £50 Amazon voucher each as compensation.

Data analyses

In preliminary analyses, we calculated means, standard deviations, correlations, and tested for internal reliabilities, as well as univariate and multivariate normality (i.e. skewness and kurtosis), using SPSS 22.0 software. We averaged scores in all subscales we used. We then evaluated the main study hypotheses by conducting path analyses with maximum likelihood (ML) estimation using Mplus 7.2 software (Muthén & Muthén, 1998–2014). We assessed model fit using the χ^2 goodness-of-fit index, root mean-square error of approximation (RMSEA), comparative fit index (CFI), Tucker-Lewis index (TLI), and square root mean residual (SRMR). CFI and TLI values exceeding .95 are indicative of good fit, while SRMR and RMSEA values \leq .08 and .06, respectively, are considered satisfactory (Hu & Bentler, 1999). We calculated indirect effects using bias-corrected (BC) bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (CIs) with 5000 resamples, as recommended by Preacher and Hayes (2008). We report the standardised version of specific indirect effects and their BC-CIs. A 95% CI not containing zero indicated a statistically significant indirect effect (Preacher & Hayes, 2008).

Results

We present descriptive statistics, Cronbach Alpha's (α) coefficients, and inter-correlations for all study variables in Table 1. All the variables had high internal consistency and were normally distributed (skewness range: $-.238$ – $.706$, kurtosis range: -1.36 – $-.001$). Correlation coefficients were in the expected direction (see Table 1) and ranged in effect size from small to large (Cohen, 1988).

Table 1. Descriptive statistics and correlations between study variables ($N = 210$).

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Global narcissism	.86						
2. Adaptive narcissism	.81**	.71					
3. Maladaptive narcissism	.89**	.53**	.74				
4. Effectiveness beliefs	.12	.18**	.05	.95			
5. Normalcy beliefs	.05	.09	.03	.41**	.87		
6. Controlling coach behaviours	.31*	.21*	.30**	.30**	.30**	.84	
7. Moral disengagement	.18*	.10	.22**	.23**	.16*	.43**	.82
Possible Range	0–40	0–1	0–1	1–7	1–7	1–7	1–7
<i>M</i>	14.25	.52	.26	4.18	3.85	2.43	2.46
<i>SD</i>	6.76	.21	.18	2.00	1.47	.89	1.06
Skewness	.47	.06	.77	-.24	-.19	.35	.45
Kurtosis	-.21	-.56	-.00	-1.36	-.53	-.62	-.60

Note: Cronbach Alpha's (α) coefficients are in bold on the diagonal.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$.




Figure 3. Path analysis of a model linking global narcissism, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, controlling coach behaviours, and moral disengagement. Note: We present standardised regression coefficients. Dashed lines represent non-significant paths. ** $p < .01$.

Direct and indirect effects

We conducted path analyses to test our models (Figures 3 and 4). The fit indices for our first *a priori* hypothesised model indicated good model fit: $\chi^2(3) = 3.27, p = 0.35, CFI = 1.00, TLI = .99, RMSEA = .02, SRMR = .03$. As shown in Figure 3, global narcissism was positively associated with controlling coach behaviours, but not to effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal styles. Effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal styles were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours. Finally, controlling coach behaviours was positively associated with coach moral disengagement. In the first model, the proposed indirect effect between global narcissism and controlling behaviours via effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style was not significant (Table 2). Additionally, the indirect effects of narcissism on moral disengagement via effectiveness belief and controlling




Figure 4. Path analysis of a model linking adaptive and maladaptive narcissism, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, controlling coach behaviours, and moral disengagement. Note: We present standardised regression coefficients. Dashed lines represent non-significant paths. ** $p < .01$.

Table 2. Total and indirect effects of global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism on controlling behaviours via effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style.

Independent variable	Criterion variable	Total indirect effect (95% CI)	Specific indirect effect	
			Effectiveness Beliefs (BC 95% CI)	Normalcy Beliefs (BC 95% CI)
Global narcissism	Controlling behaviours	.03 (-.01-.07)	.02 (-.00-.05)	.01 (-.02-.03)
Adaptive narcissism	Controlling behaviours	.06 (.01-.11)*	.04 (.01-.08)*	.02 (-.01-.05)
Maladaptive narcissism	Controlling behaviours	-.02 (-.06-.03)	-.01 (-.04-.02)	-.00 (-.03-.02)

Note: Standardised beta coefficients are presented with biased-corrected 95% confidence intervals.

* $p < 0.05$.

behaviours, as well as via normalcy beliefs and controlling behaviours, were tiny and not significant $b = .01$ (BC CI $-.00-.02$), and $b = .00$ (BC CI $-.01-.01$), respectively.

The fit indices for our second *a. priori* hypothesised model also indicated good model fit: $\chi^2(4) = 6.28$, $p = 0.18$, CFI = .98, TLI = .94, RMSEA = .05, SRMR = .03. As shown in Figure 4, adaptive narcissism was positively associated with effectiveness beliefs, but was unrelated to normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style. Also, adaptive narcissism was not directly related to controlling behaviours. Maladaptive narcissism was not associated with either of the beliefs, but had a direct significant positive link with controlling behaviours. Additionally, effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours. Finally, controlling coach behaviours was positively associated with coach moral disengagement. In the second model, the total indirect effect between adaptive narcissism and controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style was statistically significant. The indirect effect accounted for 81.58% of the total effect (Preacher & Kelley, 2011). In addition, the specific indirect effect between adaptive narcissism and controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style was statistically significant. This specific indirect effect explained 56.58% of the total effect (see Table 2). No other significant indirect effects emerged.

Discussion

We advanced prior research on coaching from a SDT perspective by testing models that linked antecedents (global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism; effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style) and consequences (moral disengagement) of coaches' controlling behaviours. We obtained support for all our direct-effect hypotheses such that: (a) global and maladaptive, but not adaptive, narcissism were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours, (b) effectiveness and normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style were positively associated with controlling coach behaviours, and (c) controlling coach behaviours were positively associated with coach moral disengagement. However, only the indirect effect of adaptive narcissism on controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style was supported. Stated otherwise, adaptive narcissism was positively associated with controlling behaviours through effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style. Indirect effects of maladaptive narcissism on controlling coach behaviours via effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, and adaptive and maladaptive narcissism on

controlling coach behaviours via normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, respectively, were not supported.

Antecedents of controlling coach behaviours

As expected and also previously found by Matosic et al. (2016, 2017), coach global narcissism was moderately positively associated with controlling coaching behaviours. In line with literature on narcissistic leaders (Grijalva et al., 2015; Schoel et al., 2015; Sedikides & Campbell, 2017), such coaches may pressure their players to the limit in order for the coaches to gain self-enhancement benefits, such as admiration and reflected glory (Mathieu & St-Jean, 2013; Woodman et al., 2011). As hypothesised with regard to the direct effects, maladaptive, but not adaptive, narcissism was associated with controlling coach behaviours. Put otherwise, entitlement, exhibitionism, and exploitativeness, but not authority or self-sufficiency, are likely to explain the frequency of controlling coach behaviours. For example, coaches who feel entitled to demand a great deal from their athletes, require unconditional praise and admiration from them, are comfortable in “using” them, and pressurise hard their athletes to the limit of their performance in order to achieve their own (i.e. coaches’) desired ends. Adaptive narcissism was not directly associated with controlling behaviours, as expected, when controlling for the effects of maladaptive narcissism (Barry et al., 2003).

Adaptive narcissism – but not global or maladaptive narcissism – was positively indirectly associated with controlling behaviours via coaches’ effectiveness beliefs about a controlling interpersonal style. Higher levels of adaptive narcissism in coaches were associated with stronger effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, which in turn was associated with more frequent controlling behaviours. According to Barry and Malkin (2010), adaptive narcissists evaluate situations before taking action to ensure that they are confident of their success. Thus, it is possible that coaches with higher levels of adaptive narcissism tend to use controlling behaviours when they believe those behaviours are effective. In contrast, most of the effect of global and maladaptive narcissism on controlling behaviours was direct; effectiveness beliefs about controlling interpersonal style did not have unique predictive ability over and above narcissism. This could be because coaches high in maladaptive narcissism feel that they are entitled to use controlling behaviours over their athletes (in a demonstration of power over them), irrespectively of whether such behaviours are deemed as effective.

There were no significant indirect effects of global, adaptive, and maladaptive narcissism on controlling coach behaviours via coaches’ normalcy beliefs about controlling interpersonal style, although those beliefs were positively associated with controlling behaviours, in line with findings from the education literature (Reeve et al., 2014). The non-significant indirect effects could be explained through global, adaptive, and maladaptive aspects of narcissism being linked with the need to be different from others (Raskin & Terry, 1988), making individuals high in these traits less inclined to be influenced by beliefs about norms. For example, coaches who believe they are extraordinary (i.e. adaptive trait) and who like to be the centre of attention (i.e. maladaptive trait) are disinclined from following the norm, as this practice may not benefit them directly.

Controlling coach behaviours and moral disengagement

As hypothesised, controlling coach behaviours were positively associated with coach moral disengagement. In other words, coaches who reported using more controlling coach behaviours were more inclined to morally disengage. Controlling coaches may use moral disengagement to justify and rationalise athletes’ engagement in aggressive and transgressive behaviours, because they see the potential for competitive advantage stemming from such athlete behaviour. This novel finding

is consistent with past research that has linked coaches' controlling behaviours with athletes' moral disengagement (Hodge & Gucciardi, 2015; Hodge & Lonsdale, 2011; Hodge, Hargreaves, Gerrard, & Lonsdale, 2013). Integration of relevant theory (Bandura, 2016) with the findings from the present research and those of Hodge and Gucciardi (2015), Hodge et al. (2013), and Hodge and Lonsdale (2011) is consistent with the possibility that controlling coaches promote athletes' moral disengagement through their own use of it. Further investigations that expand our model to examine whether coaches' use of moral disengagement fosters athlete moral disengagement are therefore encouraged.

Limitations and future directions

Our study was based on coach self-reports, which could have been influenced to some degree by socially desirable responding. However, broadly similar findings were reported by Matosic et al. (2016), who collected data from both coaches and athletes. Nevertheless, follow-up research may incorporate alternative or additional methods of assessing coach behaviours, including observational techniques (i.e. blind rating of coach behaviours), to guard against such influences (Smith et al., 2015). Also, our study used a cross-sectional design and hence our findings do not allow causal inferences. Longitudinal designs are needed to help identify the temporal sequencing of relations between variables. Another way forward would be to implement interventions designed to influence coach effectiveness beliefs and ensuing controlling behaviours in samples of coaches with varying levels of narcissism.

Interestingly, researchers have distinguished between narcissism admiration (e.g. striving for uniqueness, charmingness) and narcissism rivalry (e.g. striving for supremacy, aggressiveness) as the bright and dark sides of narcissism, respectively (Back et al., 2013). Arguably, these concepts are complementary to adaptive and maladaptive narcissism components (Back et al., 2013). The adaptive component of narcissism (e.g. "I have a natural talent for influencing people") is highly comparable to narcissism admiration (e.g. "Mostly, I am very adept at dealing with other people"), and the maladaptive component of narcissism (e.g. "I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public") is highly comparable to narcissism rivalry (e.g. "I react annoyed if another person steals the show from me"). The admiration-rivalry distinction is new in the narcissism literature, and its conceptual and operational overlap with adaptive-maladaptive narcissism should be explored in future research.

Future work could also investigate the relations between grandiose and vulnerable forms of narcissism and controlling interpersonal style (cf. Sedikides, Ntoumanis, & Sheldon, 2018). Our study has addressed the relations between grandiose narcissism (i.e. narcissistic personality trait) and its facets (i.e. adaptive and maladaptive narcissism) with controlling interpersonal style. No research, however, has examined pathological form of narcissism (i.e. vulnerable narcissism; Thomaes et al., 2018) within sport context. Such research on vulnerable narcissism (using the hypersensitivity narcissism scale; Hendin & Cheek, 1997) may provide new insights into narcissism in sport coaches. Finally, assessment of additional "dark" personality traits, such as psychopathy and Machiavellianism (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), as antecedents of controlling coach behaviours would be useful. Psychopathy and Machiavellianism share maladaptive characteristics with narcissism, such as striving for self-promotion, lacking empathy, engaging in aggressive behaviours, and failing to show organisational success (Eisenbarth, Hart, & Sedikides, 2018; Muris, Merckelbach, Otgaar, & Meijer, 2017).

Conclusion and implications

Our research makes several unique contributions to the literature, particularly in regards to understanding antecedents of a controlling interpersonal style. First, we replicated and extended

previous findings by showing that global narcissism and its maladaptive facet qualify as antecedents of controlling coaching behaviours. Second, we illustrated a positive indirect effect between adaptive narcissism and controlling coaching via effectiveness beliefs about controlling coaching. Finally, we demonstrated that controlling coaching behaviours were positively associated with coaches' reports of moral disengagement.

Extending on Matosic et al. (2017), our findings could inform coach-focused education programmes that aim to promote adaptive coaching environments in sport. From a motivational perspective, literature identifies specific examples of controlling coach behaviours and ways in which they can be substituted by autonomy-supportive ones (Ntoumanis, Quested, Reeve, & Cheon, 2018). From a narcissism perspective, evidence outside sport indicates that increasing empathy (Hatcher et al., 1994; Hepper, Hart, & Sedikides, 2014) or self-affirmation (Thomaes, Bushman, Orobio de Castro, Cohen, & Denissen, 2009) can reduce narcissistic tendencies. Our findings showcase the potential for combining the two perspectives. One could develop coach-education programmes that reduce narcissistic tendencies, challenge beliefs regarding the effectiveness of controlling coaching behaviours, and train coaches to replace such behaviours with autonomy-supportive ones. In doing so, one might curtail coach moral disengagement, in light of evidence that moral disengagement is positively linked to antisocial sport behaviour (Boardley & Kavussanu, 2011).

Acknowledgments

The research in this manuscript was supported by a PhD studentship awarded to the first author by the Economic and Social Research Council (Award No: ESJ50001X/1).

Funding

The research in this manuscript was supported by a PhD studentship awarded to the first author by the Economic and Social Research Council (Award No: ESJ50001X/1).

ORCID

Doris Matosic  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6448-7418>

Nikos Ntoumanis  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7122-3795>

Ian D. Boardley  <http://orcid.org/0000-0001-5651-7816>

Constantine Sedikides  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-3681-4332>

Funding

The research in this manuscript was supported by a PhD studentship awarded to the first author by the Economic and Social Research Council (Award No: ESJ50001X/1).

References

- Ang, R. P., Tan, K., & Mansor, A. T. (2011). Normative beliefs about aggression as a mediator of narcissistic exploitativeness and cyberbullying. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*, 2619–2634. doi:10.1177/0886260510388286
- Arthur, C. A., Woodman, T., Ong, C. W., Hardy, L., & Ntoumanis, N. (2011). The role of athlete narcissism in moderating the relationship between coaches' transformational leader behaviours and athlete motivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 33*, 3–19.
- 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*, 1013–1037. doi:10.1037/a0034431

- Bandura, A. (2002). Selective moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Moral Education, 31*, 101–119. doi:10.1080/0305724022014322
- Bandura, A. (2016). *Moral disengagement: How people do harm and live with themselves*. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.
- Barrett, M., & Boggiano, A. K. (1988). Fostering extrinsic orientations: Use of reward strategies to motivate children. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 6*, 293–309. doi:10.1521/jsep.1988.6.3-4.293
- Barry, C. T., Frick, P. J., & Killian, A. L. (2003). The relation of narcissism and self-esteem to conduct problems in children: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 32*, 139–152. doi:10.1207/S15374424JCCP3201_13
- Barry, C. T., & Malkin, M. L. (2010). The relation between adolescent narcissism and internalizing problems depends on the conceptualization of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 44*, 684–690. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2010.09.001
- Barry, C. T., Pickard, J. D., & Ansel, L. L. (2009). The associations of adolescent invulnerability and narcissism with problem behaviors. *Personality and Individual Differences, 47*, 577–582. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2009.05.022
- Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., Ryan, R. M., Bosch, J. A., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2011). Self-determination theory and diminished functioning: The role of interpersonal control and psychological need thwarting. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*, 1459–1473. doi:10.1177/0146167211413125
- Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2009). A review of controlling motivational strategies from a self-determination theory perspective: Implications for sports coaches. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 2*, 215–233. doi:10.1080/17509840903235330
- Bartholomew, K. J., Ntoumanis, N., & Thøgersen-Ntoumani, C. (2010). The controlling interpersonal style in a coaching context: Development and initial validation of a psychometric scale. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 32*, 193–216.
- Blinkhorn, V., Lyons, M., & Almond, L. (2016). Drop the bad attitude! Narcissism predicts acceptance of violent behaviour. *Personality and Individual Differences, 98*, 157–161. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.0125
- Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2008). The moral disengagement in sport scale-short. *Journal of Sports Sciences, 26*, 1507–1517. doi:10.1080/02640410802315054
- Boardley, I. D., & Kavussanu, M. (2011). Moral disengagement in sport. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 4*, 93–108. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2011.570361
- Boggiano, A. K., Barrett, M., Weiher, A. W., McClelland, G. H., & Lusk, C. M. (1987). Use of the maximal-operant principle to motivate children's intrinsic interest. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*, 866–879.
- Boldero, J. M., Bell, R. C., & Davies, R. C. (2015). The structure of the narcissistic personality inventory with binary and rating scale items. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 97*, 626–637. doi:10.1080/00223891.2015.1039015
- Campbell, W. K., Hoffman, B. J., Campbell, S. M., & Marchisio, G. (2011). Narcissism in organizational contexts. *Human Resource Management Review, 21*, 268–284. doi:10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.007
- Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 329–347. doi:10.1006/jrpe.2000.2282
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Curran, T., Hill, A. P., Ntoumanis, N., Hall, H. K., & Jowett, G. E. (2016). A three-wave longitudinal test of self-determination theory's mediation model of engagement and disaffection in youth sport. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 38*, 15–29. doi:10.1123/jsep.2015-0016
- Eisenbarth, H., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Do psychopathic traits predict professional success? *Journal of Economic Psychology, 64*, 130–139. doi:10.1016/j.joep.2018.01.002
- Grijalva, E., Harms, P. D., Newman, D. A., Gaddis, B. H., & Fraley, R. C. (2015). Narcissism and leadership: A meta-analytic review of linear and nonlinear relationships. *Personnel Psychology, 68*, 1–47. doi:10.1111/peps.12072
- Hatcher, S. L., Nadeau, M. S., Walsh, L. K., Reynolds, M., Galea, J., & Marz, K. (1994). The teaching of empathy for high school and college students: Testing rogerian methods with the interpersonal reactivity index. *Adolescence, 29*, 961–974.
- Healy, L. C., Ntoumanis, N., van Zanten, J. V., & Paine, N. (2014). Goal striving and well-being in sport: The role of contextual and personal motivation. *Journal of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 36*, 446–459.
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A re-examination of Murray's narcissism scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 588–599. doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204

- Hepper, E. G., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2014). Moving narcissus: Can narcissists be empathic? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *40*, 1079–1091. doi:10.1177/0146167214535812
- Hodge, K., & Gucciardi, D. F. (2015). Antisocial and prosocial behaviour in sport: The role of motivational climate, basic psychological needs, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *37*, 257–273. doi:10.1123/jsep.2014-0225
- Hodge, K., Hargreaves, E., Gerrard, D., & Lonsdale, C. (2013). Psychological mechanism and underlying doping attitudes in sport: Motivation and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *35*, 419–432.
- Hodge, K., & Lonsdale, C. (2011). Prosocial and antisocial behavior in sport: The role of coaching style, autonomous vs. controlled motivation, and moral disengagement. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *33*, 527–547.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cut-off criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *6*, 1–55. doi:10.1080/10705519909540118
- Kline, R. (2015). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (4th ed.). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Mathieu, C., & St-Jean, É. (2013). Entrepreneurial personality: The role of narcissism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *55*, 527–531. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2013.04.026
- Matosic, D., Ntoumanis, N., Boardley, I. D., Sedikides, C., Stewart, B. D., & Chazisantis, N. (2017). Narcissism and coach interpersonal style: A self-determination theory perspective. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine and Science in Sports*, *27*, 254–261. doi:10.1111/sms.12635
- Matosic, D., Ntoumanis, N., Boardley, I. D., Stenling, A., & Sedikides, C. (2016). Linking narcissism, motivation, and doping attitudes in sport: A multilevel investigation involving coaches and athletes. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *38*, 556–566. doi:10.1123/JSEP.2016-0141
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2016a). Measures of narcissism and their relations to DSM-5 pathological traits: A critical reappraisal. *Assessment*, *23*, 3–9. doi:10.1177/1073191114522909
- Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2016b). Rejoinder: A construct validity approach to the assessment of narcissism. *Assessment*, *23*, 18–22. doi:10.1177/1073191115608943
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, *12*, 177–196. doi:10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1
- Muris, P., Merckelbach, H., Otgaar, H., & Meijer, E. (2017). The malevolent side of human nature: A meta-analysis and critical review of the literature on the dark triad (narcissism, machiavellianism, and psychopathy). *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*, 183–204. doi:10.1177/1745691616666070
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998–2014). *Mplus user's guide* (7th ed.). Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén.
- Ntoumanis, N. (2012). A self-determination theory perspective on motivation in sport and physical education: Current trends and possible future research directions. In G. C. Roberts & S. C. Treasure (Eds.), *Motivation in sport and exercise: Volume 3* (pp. 91–128). Champaign, IL: Human Kinetics.
- Ntoumanis, N., Quested, E., Reeve, J., & Cheon, S. H. (2018). Need supportive communication: Implications for motivation in sport, exercise, and physical activity. In B. Jackson, J. A. Dimmock, & J. Compton (Eds.), *Persuasion and communication in sport, exercise, and physical activity* (pp. 155–169). Abingdon: Routledge.
- Occhino, J. L., Mallett, C. J., Rynne, S. B., & Carlisle, K. N. (2014). Autonomy- supportive pedagogical approach to sports coaching: Research, challenges and opportunities. *International Journal of Sports Science & Coaching*, *9*, 401–415. doi:10.1260/1747-9541.9.2.401
- Onishi, A., Kawabata, Y., Kurokawa, M., & Yoshida, T. (2012). A mediating model of relational aggression, narcissistic orientations, guilt feelings, and perceived classroom norms. *School Psychology International*, *33*, 367–390. doi:10.1177/0143034311421433
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *36*, 556–563. doi:10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research Methods*, *40*, 879–891. doi:10.3758/BRM.40.3.879
- Preacher, K. J., & Kelley, K. (2011). Effect size measures for mediation models: Quantitative strategies for communicating indirect effects. *Psychological Methods*, *16*, 93–115. doi:10.1037/a0022658
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*, 890–902. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890

- Reeve, J., Vansteenkiste, M., Assor, A., Ahmad, I., Cheon, S. H., Jang, H., ... Wang, C. K. J. (2014). The beliefs that underlie autonomy-supportive and controlling teaching: A multinational investigation. *Motivation and Emotion, 38*, 93–110. doi:10.1007/s11031-013-9367-0
- Roberts, J. (2001). Corporate governance and the ethics of narcissus. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 11*, 109–127. doi:10.2307/3857872
- Roberts, T., Woodman, T., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Pass me the ball: Narcissism in performance settings. *International Review of Sport and Exercise Psychology, 11*, 190–213. doi:10.1080/1750984X.2017.1290815
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development, and wellness*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Schoel, C., Stahlberg, D., & Sedikides, C. (2015). Psychological insecurity and leadership styles. In P. J. Carroll, R. M. Arkin, & A. L. Wichman (Eds.), *The handbook of personal security* (pp. 55–73). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Sedikides, C., & Campbell, W. K. (2017). Narcissistic force meets systemic resistance: The energy clash model. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 12*, 400–421. doi:10.1177/1745691617692105
- Sedikides, C., Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G., Elliot, A. J., & Gregg, A. P. (2002). Do others bring out the worst in narcissists? The “Others Exist for Me” illusion. In Y. Kashima, M. Foddy, & M. Platow (Eds.), *Self and identity: Personal, social, and symbolic* (pp. 103–123). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Sedikides, C., Ntoumanis, N., & Sheldon, K. M. (2018). I am the chosen one: Narcissism in the backdrop of self-determination theory. *Journal of Personality*, Advance online publication. doi:10.1111/jopy.12402
- Smith, N., Tessier, D., Tzioumaki, Y., Quested, E., Appleton, P., Sarrazin, P., ... Duda, J. L. (2015). Development and validation of the multidimensional motivational climate observation system. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 37*, 4–22. doi:10.1123/jsep.2014-0059
- Stebbins, J., Taylor, I. M., & Spray, C. M. (2011). Antecedents of perceived coach autonomy supportive and controlling and behaviors: Coach psychological need satisfaction and well-being. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology, 33*, 255–272.
- Thomaes, S., Brummelman, E., & Sedikides, C. (2018). Narcissism: A social-developmental perspective. In V. Zeigler-Hill & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of personality and individual differences* (pp. 377–396). New York, NY: Sage.
- Thomaes, S., Bushman, B. J., Orobio de Castro, B., Cohen, G. L., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2009). Reducing narcissistic aggression by buttressing self-esteem: An experimental field study. *Psychological Science, 20*, 1536–1542. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02478.x
- Woodman, T., Roberts, R., Hardy, L., Callow, N., & Rogers, C. H. (2011). There is an “I” in team: Narcissism and social loafing. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 82*, 285–290. doi:10.1080/02701367.2011.10599756