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The Joint Effects of Narcissism and Gender on Group Networking Event Performance: Implications for Big Four Accounting Firm Hiring Decisions

Abstract

To facilitate on-campus recruiting, public accounting firms often rely on group events where a large number of students interact with firm employees. We conduct a simulated recruiting event with former public accounting firm employees as evaluators to test theory about how narcissists perform during on-campus group recruiting events. Consistent with social role theory, we find that the success narcissists enjoy during group recruiting events depends on their gender. While more narcissistic male students receive higher evaluations than other male students, more narcissistic female students receive lower evaluations than other female students during these events. We report some similar findings from a paper-based experiment where students read scenarios about on-campus group recruiting events and self-report the extent they can make favorable impressions on recruiters. We further discuss theory and report some evidence suggesting that more narcissistic employees can help facilitate important objectives of public accounting firms. Collectively, our results contribute to a better understanding of survey and field evidence suggesting that entry-level male and female public accounting firm employees have different personalities which could ultimately influence their career trajectories within the firm.
I. INTRODUCTION

Employee selection is an important component of the accounting control environment. Through investments in recruiting activities, employers can identify potential employees with the personalities and characteristics that drive them to further the values and goals of the organization (Campbell 2012; Abernethy, Dekker, and Schulz 2015). While prior accounting research explores the implications of recruiting activities in general, we investigate the role on-campus group-based recruiting events potentially play in helping public accounting firms identify employees with the personalities and characteristics that promote the firms’ objectives.

Public accounting firms in general, and Big Four accounting firms in particular, invest heavily in recruiting events designed to attract large groups of students. For example, a database of registered recruiting events held at a business school with a highly-ranked professional accounting program reveals that Big Four firms formally host over twenty on-campus group recruiting events each year. These events range from relatively unstructured mix-and-mingle events to events with more formal activities such as competitions, games, and leadership training activities.

These events are often an initial point of contact between public accounting firm recruiters and the large group of students attending these events. Moreover, the impressions that students make on firm recruiters during these events can serve as an important input into the determination of which students advance in the recruiting process. As such, public accounting firm websites, professional organization articles, and student blogs all stress the importance of making good impressions at these events in order to progress in the recruiting process.1

1 For evidence suggesting that performance on group recruiting events is an important input to hiring decisions see the following: Crowe BGK’s recruiting tips for students https://crowebgk.com/careers/top-7-tips-for-on-campus-recruiting-season/; advice from the Accounting Resume and Career Guide website https://crowebgk.com/careers/top-7-tips-for-on-campus-recruiting-season/; and ncaCPA blogger Jeremy Jacobs post
For many students, making a favorable impression in these group recruiting events is challenging. Navigating these events requires students to identify and confidently approach key decision makers in the firm. To get noticed, students often must aggressively self-promote themselves to recruiters. Adding to the challenge, students often have to fight through their peers in an attempt to make a good impression, as key recruiters are often surrounded by many others also looking to make a good impression (Kacmar and Carlson 1999; Kristof-Brown 2000; Kristof-Brown, Barrick, and Franke 2002). In all, students participating in group recruiting events need to confidently inject themselves into conversations, draw attention to themselves, and deftly crowd their classmates out of the conversation to impress key recruiters.

We develop and test theory suggesting that more narcissistic students are particularly well-suited to overcome the challenges of group recruiting events. In general, narcissists are outwardly confident and enjoy competitive environments such as recruiting events where ample opportunities for self-promotion exist (Morf and Rhodewalt 2001; Luchner et al. 2011). Additionally, those higher in narcissism tend to prioritize agentic interests (i.e., getting ahead) over communal interests (i.e., getting along with others) (Jones and Paulhus 2010). As such, they would be more likely to inject themselves into conversations and be relatively less concerned with how their actions might negatively impact the recruiting prospects of their classmates.

That said, psychology research suggests that the efficacy of these strategies will depend on the gender of the student recruit. Social role theory suggests that recruiters will tend to evaluate prospective employees relative to the following stereotypes: (1) males should exhibit more agentic characteristics often possessed by narcissists (competitive, dominant, independent, 

https://www.ncacpa.org/blog/meet-the-firms-tips-from-a-former-accounting-student/. All cites were accessed on October 23, 2017.
and assertive), and (2) females should exhibit more communal characteristics that narcissists often lack (friendly, sensitive, inclusive, and selfless) (Grijalva et al. 2015). Psychology research suggests job-seeking students could face a “backlash” in the form of less favorable evaluations for deviating from these gender stereotypes (Rudman 1998; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, and Phelan 2012). As such, to the extent students high in narcissism aggressively self-promote themselves at group-recruiting events, these strategies would more likely garner higher evaluations for male students relative to female students.

To test this theory, we hosted live recruiting events on our campus. We invited junior-level accounting students, most of whom were in the midst of interviewing with public accounting firms. When they arrived at the event, we read a set of instructions and then walked them to the event room. The event room contained food, drink, and two former Big Four accounting firm employees (one female and one male). Student attendees were free to mingle with these two former employees and their fellow students for as long as they desired. Once all students left the event, the former employees together evaluated each student based on the extent that s/he would be a good hire for a public accounting firm. Each student received $25 for participating in the event, and each student who received an evaluation in the top ten percent of all attendees received an additional $100. In addition to attending the event, students completed several personality surveys including the NPI-16 narcissism measure (Ames et al. 2006), the Ten-Item Personality Inventory for the “Big Five” personality traits (Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003), and the Hurtt (2010) measure of professional skepticism.

We find results consistent with social role theory. For male students, those higher in narcissism receive higher evaluations following the simulated recruiting event than those lower in this trait. For female students, those higher in narcissism receive lower evaluations following
the simulated recruiting event than those lower in this trait. We further demonstrate that females who possess higher levels of a communal trait (agreeableness) receive higher evaluations during the simulated recruiting event, a relation that we did not find in our sample of male students.

To investigate the generalizability of these results beyond our simulated events, we asked a different group of junior-level accounting students to complete a paper-based experiment. Student-participants read descriptions of two group-based recruiting events hosted by a Big Four public accounting firm. One event was a mix-and-mingle event described similarly to our simulated recruiting event. The other event involved formal activities that the employers and students engaged in together. After reading about these events, presented in counterbalanced order, students rated the extent that they could make a good impression at the event and completed several personality measures.

For the event with activities, we again find results consistent with social role theory. More narcissistic males believe that they will make a better impression at the event than less narcissistic male students. In contrast, female students with more communal traits believe that they will make a better impression at the event relative to those lower in the trait. We did not observe much separation between these groups’ impressions in the mix-and-mingle event, suggesting that the propensity for more narcissistic males and more communal females to make a more favorable impression on recruiters is stronger when the event has planned activities in addition to networking opportunities.

While impressions made during on-campus group recruiting events would be just one input into the recruiting process, our results match up well with recent personality surveys of accounting practitioners and students. Specifically, this research suggests that male practitioners in public accounting firms register higher degrees of narcissism than female practitioners (Akers,
Giacomino, and Weber 2014). Moreover, this research suggests that newly hired public accounting firm employees register higher degrees of narcissism than a sample of accounting students (Brown, Akers and Giacomino 2013; Akers, Giacomino, and Weber 2014).

While we do not contend that these firms formally consider narcissism levels in their hiring decisions, theory suggests that those with this trait have the dispositions to promote important firm objectives. Considering core auditing tasks, research suggests that individuals high in narcissism are suspicious of the motives of other people (Ross, Rausch, and Canada 2003; Jones and Figueredo 2013; Hobson, Stern, and Zimbelman 2017). The tendency to be skeptical of the motives of others likely spills over to other areas of the individual’s life such that narcissism would be positively related to professional skepticism, a trait prior research suggests is positively related to performance on important audit tasks (Hurtt 2010). Consistent with this reasoning, we find that narcissism is positively associated with a measure of trait professional skepticism across both of our samples (Hurtt 2010). Additionally, research illustrates that those higher in narcissism are more extraverted, socially adept, and confident, which are all skills that could help drive sales and promote client relationships (Vinchur et al. 1998).

Collectively, in light of our results, it is interesting to reconsider field research highlighting that females are proportionately represented in the staff ranks but underrepresented at the senior ranks (e.g., Anderson-Gough, Grey, and Robson 2005), despite heavy firm investments to reverse this trend (Kornberger, Carter, and Ross-Smith 2010). A potential contributing factor to these results is that a prevalent on-campus recruiting practice of public accounting firms appears to favor the more agentic qualities in males that prior research suggests is positively associated with career trajectories (Spurk, Keller, and Hirschi 2016), but more communal properties in females. Said another way, our findings together with prior evidence
suggest that male and female staff recruited from college campuses represent fundamentally different personality traits which could ultimately affect career trajectories. This explanation is consistent with prior survey evidence at a public accounting firm suggesting that, while females at the junior ranks tend to possess more communal personalities than their male counterparts, females at the senior ranks tend to possess similar levels of agentic personalities relative to their male counterparts.2

Our results also contribute to the literature examining hiring processes more generally. Research suggests that females exhibiting more agentic communication styles are not negatively evaluated and sometimes positively evaluated in one-on-one interviews (e.g., Sacco et al. 2003; Paulhus et al. 2013; Levashina et al. 2013), suggesting that social role theory may not necessarily apply in settings where agentic characteristics are thought to be important drivers of career success. However, group-based recruiting events are unique environments where candidates simultaneously vie for the recruiter’s attention in order to make a good impression and compete with each other as a salient part of the recruiting task. As such, more aggressive strategies are likely needed to stand out from the crowd and would be more salient in the minds of recruiters. Thus, a group recruiting event setting provides us with an important context where it is likely easier to test and observe gender as a moderator of link between narcissism and job prospects. Moreover, to the extent that group recruiting events affect the pool of candidates that receive one-on-one interviews, then the impact of social role theory would likely impact hiring decisions.

2 Moreover, additional field evidence highlights that a common reason for females exiting public accounting firms at more senior ranks is a concern as to whether the some of the service offerings being sold are value-enhancing for the client (Wallace 2009), a concern that would more likely be held of a communal personality type.
Section 2 discusses background literature and provides theoretical development. Section 3 describes our live recruiting event to test our theory. Section 4 presents our results. Section 5 discusses a supplemental experiment and results, and Section 6 provides a conclusion.

II. BACKGROUND AND THEORY DEVELOPMENT

Background

This section presents evidence that Big Four public accounting firms invest heavily in on-campus group networking events. To do so, we analyze the on-campus recruiting activities at the business school of a large state university with a highly ranked professional accounting program. For calendar years 2014 through 2016, we received a database of every corporate event registered through the Business Career Services Office of this business school. The database contains the name of the organization hosting the event and an event title. Each event is also given a code denoting its primary purpose. We analyze all group events with one of the following purposes: (1) information sessions where employees want to disseminate information to a large group of students, (2) networking events where employees of an organization want to talk and mingle with students, and (3) competitions where employees interact with students while they engage in a case or other competition as these events often reserve specific times for networking opportunities. The database contained 315 registered events.

Across these three years, the Big Four public accounting firms each hosted an average of 5.67 of these group recruiting events. Only 40 percent of these events were primarily for information dissemination. Thus, each firm hosted over three events where students and firm employees had opportunities to informally mingle and network.

---

3 We did not include events where students sign up to meet recruiters on a one-on-one basis. Moreover, we did not include events held exclusively for students pre-selected for one-on-one interviews.
4 That said, given that many other group networking events at the university are hosted not by business career services but by student groups such as the Accounting Society and Beta Alpha Psi, this number is understated.
These more networking-oriented events varied based on how much the firm structured the time spent during the event. Some of these events were fairly unstructured, with no planned activities other than mingling and networking over food and drink. These events included: Cupcakes with the Firm and Welcome Back Events with Food and Beverages. Other events were more structured around activities, including carnival games, leadership activities, and group case or other mini-competitions.

For the non-Big Four organizations appearing in the database, the average number of events per year was 0.6 per organization. While the majority of Big Four public accounting firm events were geared towards mingling and networking, over 70 percent of the group events hosted by other organizations were solely for information dissemination. Typically, employees of the organization hosting the event would provide presentations about the company and their various job opportunities with limited time for networking.

Collectively, this evidence suggests that Big Four public accounting firms invest heavily in group-based on-campus recruiting events. Moreover, the firms design these events to promote mingling and networking among students and firm employees, which is atypical of other organizations. The sections that follow explore the implications of utilizing impressions that students make during group-based networking events as an important input to hiring decisions.

Challenges Navigating On-Campus Mingling and Networking Events

While the Big Four public accounting firms appear to invest heavily in on-campus group mingling and networking events, these events pose challenges for students attempting to make favorable impressions on firm recruiters and other employees. While the firms send many representatives to these events, the number of students in attendance typically exceeds the number of firm employees in attendance. Therefore, the student-to-firm employee ratio is often
high such that each employee is often surrounded by a number of students. As such, in order to talk to a firm employee, students must be willing to inject themselves into existing conversations. Injecting oneself into a conversation often causes others to be crowded out of the conversation.

To get a sense of the tactics students use to navigate these events, we attended a meeting organized by Business Career Services where senior accounting students who accepted a job offer from a Big Four accounting firm advised more junior students as to strategies for navigating group-based networking events. Many pieces of advice involved how to get in front of an influential firm employee when they are surrounded by other students. One memorable piece of advice involved approaching an acquaintance in a favorable position within the crowd, getting into a short conversation with this acquaintance, and then stepping in front of the acquaintance to secure the favorable spot in front of the firm employee.

Students successfully fighting through the crowd still need to communicate to the firm employee in such a way to make a favorable impression. Prior research suggests that job seekers who use impression-management tactics often receive favorable evaluations from recruiters. Moreover, self-promotion (including communicating one’s skills, abilities, and knowledge) often leads to higher perceptions that the job seeker would be a good fit for the position. Collectively, in an attempt to make a good impression at a group recruiting event, students need to fight through crowds for an opportunity to promote oneself to influential firm employees (Kacmar and Carlson 1999; Kristof-Brown 2000; and Kristof-Brown et al. 2002).

**The Role of Narcissism in On-Campus Mingling and Networking Events**

The difficulties arising in on-campus group recruiting events imply that success can be best obtained by individuals who are willing and able to inject themselves into conversations, crowd out their classmates, and promote themselves to recruiters. Stated another way,
individuals should be more concerned with “getting ahead” than with “getting along” with their peers, two main goals of social interaction (Bakan 1966). Psychologists often describe interpersonal behavioral tendencies using the interpersonal circumplex, defined by a vertical axis for “getting ahead” concerns and a horizontal axis for “getting along” concerns (Wiggins 1979). Jones and Paulhus (2010) identify narcissism as falling in the high “getting ahead”/low “getting along” quadrant of this circumplex. Narcissistic individuals are also characterized by a grandiose sense of self-importance or uniqueness, indifference of others, and a lack of empathy (Raskin and Terry 1988).

Narcissists particularly enjoy and perform well in competitive environments such as recruiting events with opportunities for self-promotion (Morf and Rhodewalt 2001; Luchner et al. 2011). This research suggests that, in on-campus group recruiting events, narcissistic individuals would be more willing to inject themselves into conversations and be relatively less concerned with the negative impact it might have on their classmates’ recruiting prospects. While these strategies will get students noticed by firm employees, will these techniques lead to higher evaluations? We explore this question next.

**Gender and the Link between Narcissism and Favorable Networking Event Impressions**

While theory suggests that narcissists will employ strategies that could help them get noticed by firm employees, theory suggests that the success of these strategies at making favorable impressions could ultimately depend on the gender of the student utilizing them. Social role theory provides a framework for understanding gender-based norms, stereotypes, and expectations for individual behavior (Eagly 1987; Eagly and Wood 1999, 2012). Historically, gender has been a natural dimension used to efficiently divide tasks among different people because of basic physical differences between males and females (Eagly and Wood 2012). Over
time and through observation of this practice, individuals are socialized into gender roles, which leads to the formation of different social expectations for males relative to females (Eagly and Wood 2012).

Psychology research suggests that gender-based stereotypes fall into two primary categories. Agentic characteristics, which are stereotypically male, include for example: competitive, dominant, independent, and assertive. In contrast, communal characteristics, which are stereotypically female, include for example: friendly, sensitive, inclusive, and selfless (Grijalva et al. 2015). Social role theory suggests that there is an implied social pressure for individuals to conform their behavior to gender-based stereotypes (Grijalva et al. 2015). If individual behavior deviates from the gender stereotype, then research suggests the possibility of a social cost, or “backlash” for doing so (Rudman 1998; Rudman, Moss-Racusin, Glick, and Phelan 2012). To the extent narcissists prioritize agentic over communal interests (Campbell, Brunell, and Finkel 2006; Campbell and Foster 2007; Foster and Brennan 2011), their actions and behaviors would be more consistent with male and more inconsistent with female gender stereotypes (Grijalva et al. 2015). Thus, females could potentially pay a social cost in terms of lower hiring prospects for exhibiting agentic-type characteristics in group recruiting events.

Despite this prior research, it is an open question as to whether social role theory would apply in professional settings such as recruiting events, where agentic characteristics are thought to be important drivers of career success. In fact, research suggests that this might not be the case. Examining evaluations following one-on-one interviews, females exhibiting more agentic communication styles and behaviors did not make a less favorable impression than other females, and their employment prospects were often rated as favorably as men exhibiting agentic characteristics (e.g., Juodvalkis et al. 2003; Paulhus et al. 2013).
However, unlike an individual interview setting, other candidates (i.e., competitors) are also physically present in group-based recruiting events. This creates a unique environment where candidates, all simultaneously vying for the recruiter’s attention in order to make a good impression, must interact and compete with each other as an important part of the recruiting task. Here, the attention-getting and self-promotion strategies of higher narcissists will likely be more salient to recruiters. Moreover, any conflicts between gender stereotypes and exhibited behaviors would be more salient to recruiters as well. Therefore, if social role theory can in fact generalize to a recruiting setting, then group-based networking events would likely provide a more powerful setting to examine the descriptiveness of this theory to this context.

For male and female students, we make separate hypotheses positing the relation between narcissism and impressions during group recruiting events. First, given theory suggests that male narcissists would receive higher evaluations we make the following directional prediction:

**H1:** More narcissistic male students will make a better impression on employers at group-based recruiting events relative to less narcissistic male students.

However, it is not clear as to the prospects of more narcissistic females in group recruiting events. To the extent social role theory applies to this setting, more narcissistic females could make worse impressions than less narcissistic females. That said, research examining one-on-one interview settings suggest that this might not be the case, whereby research has demonstrated that more narcissistic females have made both similar and more favorable impressions than less narcissistic females. As such, we state our second hypothesis in null form as follows:

**H2 (null):** More narcissistic female students will make similar impressions on employers at group-based recruiting events relative to less narcissistic female students.
Can Hiring Narcissists Promote Important Public Accounting Firm Objectives?

Prior management accounting research highlights that designing recruiting activities to attract the right personnel is an important aspect of management control (Campbell 2012; Abernethy et al. 2015). That is, organizations should use their recruiting activities to identify employees who will carry out important goals and objectives of the organization. Thus, while not a focus of our formal tests, we provide some theory suggesting that those higher in narcissism could help facilitate goals and objectives of professional accounting firms.

First, an important objective for auditors of public accounting firms is to exhibit professional skepticism, and professional standards have affirmed the importance of using professional skepticism to conduct effective audits (American Institute of Certified Public Accountants 1997; Hurtt 2010). Research suggests that more narcissistic individuals are suspicious of the motives of other people (Ross et al. 2003; Jones and Figueredo 2013). That tendency to be skeptical of the motives of others likely spills over to other areas of the individual’s life such that narcissism would be positively related to professional skepticism. Consistent with this statement, Hobson et al. (2017) suggest that narcissistic auditors are more skeptical of the assertions made by managers with whom they have social ties.

Second, an important goal of public accounting firms is managing client relationships and bringing in new clients. Research illustrates that narcissists are more extraverted, socially adept, and confident. These are all skills that could help build sales and promote client relationships (Vinchur et al. 1998). Collectively, theory suggests that hiring narcissists could help promote the goals and objectives of public accounting firms. Moreover, survey evidence suggests that those exhibiting more agentic behaviors and characteristics, which narcissists often do, are more likely
to be found at senior ranks of public accounting firms (Maupin and Lehman 1994). Collectively, this evidence motivates the tests of our hypotheses.

III. METHOD

Participants

To test our hypotheses, we conducted live simulated recruiting events on the campus of a large US state university with a highly-ranked professional accounting program. A total of 51 junior-level accounting student volunteers attended these events, who were currently engaged in attending recruiting functions and interviewing for summer internships. Each volunteer received $25 for their participation. We conducted a total of three sessions, where one session hosted 15 students and the other two sessions hosted 18 students.

Procedures

We invited student volunteers in junior-level accounting classes to participate in a simulated recruiting event where they interact with former employees of a professional services firm. We directed interested students to sign up through a website, which directed them to a Qualtrics survey that included the NPI-16 narcissism survey (Ames et al. 2006).5

We held the live recruiting event on campus a few days later. After arriving at a classroom and signing a consent form, we asked students to write their first name on a nametag and photographed them wearing it. These steps facilitated the evaluations that took place after the event.

Next, we read a set of instructions to them while they followed along. These instructions informed participants that they would participate in a simulated recruiting event that would take place in an adjoining classroom. During the event they were free to determine how to spend their

---

5 We received IRB approval for both the collection of this narcissism measure in the on-line survey and for the live recruiting event that followed. Participants agreed to a consent form at both stages of the experiment.
time as they mingled with the other attendees of the session and two former employees of public accounting firms (hereafter, we will refer to these former employees as “recruiters”). We told them that the event would last approximately 30 minutes, but that they could feel free to leave the event whenever they preferred. We also told the students that after the event, the two recruiters would formally evaluate them based on the impression the students made on them during the event. We informed participants that those receiving an evaluation in the top ten percent of all attendees would receive an additional $100.

After reading the instructions, we walked the students to the event room. The event room contained food, drink, and one recruiter of each gender. The two recruiters had an average of three years of experience at Big Four accounting firms, and both reached supervisory positions. Moreover, both had extensive experience in the hiring process and representing their firms at on-campus group mingling and networking events.

Student attendees were free to mingle in an open space with these two recruiters and their fellow students for as long as they desired. Students spent an average of 41 minutes in the event room. After the students left the event room, they completed a post-experimental questionnaire. The questionnaire measures participants’ impressions of the event as well as the following personality measures: (1) the Ten-Item personality Inventory for the “Big Five” personality traits (Gosling, Rentfrow, and Swann 2003), and (2) the Hurtt (2010) measure of trait professional skepticism. After completing the questionnaire, we paid students their $25 participation fee and dismissed them.

After the session, the recruiters evaluated each student based on the extent that s/he would be a good hire for a public accounting firm. Specifically, for each student participant, the recruiters discussed together to make a single evaluation in response to the following question:
“To what extent do you believe the participant would be a good hire for a public accounting or other professional service firm, based on the impression the participant made on you during today’s session?” The recruiters’ responses were measured on an 11-point Likert scale with endpoints of 0 – “Not a good hire at all” and 10 – “An exceptionally good hire”. For each session, we also asked the recruiters to rank order the students from the session from best (receiving a rank of 1) to worst (receiving a rank equal to the number of students attending the session). For students receiving an evaluation in the top ten percent, we contacted them after the session to pick up their $100 bonus.

IV. RESULTS

Table 1 contains descriptive statistics by gender for the evaluations and ranking provided by recruiters. Recall, the higher the evaluation scores, the more hirable the recruiters deemed the student. Moreover, the lower the ranking, the more hirable the recruiters deemed the student. The narcissism scores are the average of the sixteen items collected on the NPI-16 survey (see Appendix 1).

Test of Hypotheses

Our two hypotheses investigate the relation between student’s narcissism levels and evaluations received during group recruiting events. Our first hypothesis predicts that more narcissistic male students receive better evaluations than other male students. Our second hypothesis, stated in null form, explores whether evaluations of female students depend on their level of narcissism.

To facilitate a test of our hypotheses, we split our sample into those receiving a ranking in the top half of each session (Good Evaluation) and those who did not (Bad Evaluation). To test our hypotheses, we compare narcissism scores across the good and bad evaluation
Panel A of Table 2 provides descriptive statistics for narcissism scores across our gender and evaluation subsamples. Figure 1 presents average narcissism scores graphically across these four subsamples.

Panel B of Table 2 reports the results of an ANOVA with narcissism scores as the dependent variable and gender and evaluation subsample as the independent variables. We observe a significant Gender × Evaluation interaction (F1, 47 = 3.85; two-tailed p = 0.056). To formally test our hypotheses, Panel C of Table 2 reports simple effects of ranking (good versus bad) across our male and female samples. Consistent with H1, we find that males receiving a good evaluation tend to be more narcissistic (F1, 47 = 3.25; one-tailed p = 0.04). While the pattern of means suggest that females receiving a good evaluation tended to be less narcissistic, the comparison is not statistically significant at conventional levels (F1, 47 = 1.25; two-tailed p = 0.27).

To further investigate the implications of narcissism levels on group recruiting event evaluations, we compare female narcissism levels across the approximately 20 percent receiving one of the highest two evaluations (i.e., a 9 or 10) from our recruiters and those two did not. We find that females with a top twenty percent evaluation had significantly lower narcissism levels than those with a below twenty percent evaluation (0.18 high evaluation versus 0.33 low evaluation; F1,29 = 5.01; two-tail p = 0.03). This results suggests that female students exhibiting more narcissistic tendencies could face a social cost in the form of lower evaluations following a group recruiting event.

**Additional Analyses**

While more narcissistic males receive a better evaluation and more narcissistic females receive a lower evaluation in group recruiting events, male and female students ultimately
receive similar rankings on average ($F_{1,49}=0.58$; two-tailed $p = 0.45$). As such, we investigate whether a specific personality trait tends to lead to higher evaluations for female candidates. Specifically, social role theory suggests that female students who exhibit more communal concerns would receive higher evaluations. To investigate this possibility, we examine whether more favorable evaluations tend to go to more agreeable females, where agreeableness is one of the Big Five personality traits reflecting a tendency to be compassionate and cooperative towards others (see Appendix 2).

Panel A of Table 3 provides descriptive statistics for agreeableness scores across our gender and evaluation subsamples. Panel B of Table 2 reports the results of an ANOVA with agreeableness scores as the dependent variable and gender and evaluation as the independent valuations. Panel C of Table 3 reports simple effects test, which suggests that females receiving a better evaluation tend to be higher in agreeableness than females receiving a worse evaluation ($F_{1,41} = 3.05$, two-tailed $p$-value = 0.08). We did not observe a similar effect across our male subsamples ($p>0.50$).

Given the challenges of navigating a group recruiting event, it is somewhat surprising that less narcissistic (more agreeable) female students can attract the attention of recruiters. In reading through open-ended post-experimental questionnaire responses describing participants’ strategies for navigating group-based recruiting events, approximately 25 percent of the females receiving a good evaluation stated that they attempt to get all students involved in the conversation with the recruiters. We did not observe any other female or male student reporting a similar strategy. Thus, it appears that individuals with more communal tendencies do find ways to signal their type to recruiters.
Collectively, our results suggest that more narcissistic males and more communal females tend to receive higher evaluations following group recruiting events. While this result is consistent with social role theory, it runs counter to prior research suggesting that females exhibiting the agentic behaviors often associated with narcissists do not receive lower evaluations during one-on-one interviews. In the next section, we explore the generalizability of our findings beyond our simulated recruiting events.

**V. SUPPLEMENTAL EXPERIMENT AND RESULTS**

To investigate the generalizability of our results beyond our simulated recruiting event, we designed a paper-based experiment to elicit students’ impressions as to how they generally perform in group recruiting events hosted by public accounting firms. Moreover, we elicit these impressions about two different types of events. As discussed in section 2, Big Four firms host not only mix-and-mingle events of the type modeled in our simulated recruiting events, but also events with more formal activities.

While we believe that the results we observe from our simulated recruiting event would generalize across both types of events, our objective is to explore whether the propensity of narcissistic males and less narcissistic females to excel relative to others depends on this important choice variable faced by Big Four firms when organizing on-campus group recruiting events. On the one hand, the separation among these students could be larger for events with formal activities. The presence of a set of activities could more clearly communicate to students what behaviors are socially acceptable in networking events. For example, the presence of contests or other competitions could signal to students that being competitive is acceptable. Research suggests that many individuals feel more comfortable and more willing to be themselves in events in which acceptable behaviors are more clearly defined (Snyder and
Gangestad 1982; Ames et al. 2006). If so, more narcissistic individuals could more strongly reveal their type, which would make their personalities more salient to recruiters leading to stronger separation among the types. On the other hand, the separation among these students could be larger for mix-and-mingle events. Events with less structure are presumably more difficult to navigate, which could allow narcissists to take advantage of their natural abilities to work the crowd, which could make their personality types more salient to recruiters. We explore these possibilities in the paper-based experiment described next.

**Supplemental Experiment**

We designed a paper-based experiment to elicit students’ impressions as to how they generally perform in group recruiting events hosted by public accounting firms. Eighty-five students with prior experience attending group recruiting events completed the experiment in a classroom setting. These participants read descriptions of two group-based recruiting events hosted by a Big Four public accounting firm, where one event is a mix-and-mingle event and the other has more formal activities planned. Each event description indicated that a Big Four Accounting Firm had invited them and their classmates to attend a recruiting event at a local restaurant one evening, and that appetizers and beverages would be provided throughout the duration of the event.

We described the event without formal activities similarly to the structure of our simulated recruiting event as follows:

_A Big Four Accounting Firm invited you and your classmates to attend a recruiting event at a local restaurant from 7:30-9:00pm one evening next week. During the event, you will freely determine how to spend your time as you mingle with employees of the Firm and your classmates. Firm employees will formally evaluate you and the other attendees after the event. Only the event attendees that impress firm employees will be invited to attend future recruiting events._

---

6 Twelve students reported having no prior experience attending group-recruiting events. Because these students would likely not yet have a good sense for how they would perform at these events, we eliminated them from our sample. That said, including them would not change the inferences we make in this section.
Appetizers and beverages will be provided for your enjoyment throughout the duration of the event. Business casual attire is appropriate.

We described the event with more formal activities as follows:

A Big Four Accounting Firm invited you and your classmates to attend a recruiting event at a local restaurant from 7:30-9:00pm one evening next week. During the event, your time will be spent completing a series of predetermined activities with employees of the Firm and your classmates. Firm employees will formally evaluate you and the other attendees after the event. Only the event attendees that impress firm employees will be invited to attend future recruiting events. Appetizers and beverages will be provided for your enjoyment throughout the duration of the event. Business casual attire is appropriate.

After reading about these two events, presented in counterbalanced order, students responded to several questions about each event including: “How favorable of an impression could you make on the firm attending the event?” Their responses were captured on a seven-point Likert scale with endpoints of 1 – “Not at all favorable” and 7 – “Very favorable”. As in our live event, students also completed personality variables including the NPI-16 narcissism measure (Ames et al. 2006), the Ten-Item Personality Inventory to measure their “Big Five” personality traits (Gosling et al. 2003), and the Hurtt (2010) measure of trait professional skepticism.

Results

We again test our two hypotheses by investigating whether those higher in narcissism believe that they make more favorable impressions following a group recruiting event. Our first hypothesis suggests that more narcissistic males would believe that they make a better impression on recruiters than less narcissistic males. Our second hypothesis examines whether the impressions females perceive they make on recruiters depends on their level of narcissism. To facilitate a test of our hypotheses, we perform a median split on participants’ narcissism scores. We then estimate an ANOVA with these narcissism subsamples and gender as the
independent variables and the perceived favorable impressions that participants make during each of the two events as the dependent variable.

**Group Recruiting Event with Activities**

Table 4 summarizes results for the group recruiting event with activities. Panel A of Table 4 provides descriptive statistics for perceived favorable impressions across our gender and narcissism subsamples. Panel B of Table 4 reports the results of an ANOVA with perceived favorable impressions as the dependent variable and gender and narcissism subsamples as the independent variables. We observe a significant Gender \times Narcissism Subsample interaction (F\(_{1, 81}\) = 3.84; two-tailed p = 0.05). To formally test our hypotheses, Panel C of Table 4 reports simple effects of narcissism (low versus high) across our male and female samples. Consistent with H1, we find that more narcissistic males believe that they will make a more favorable impression during the group recruiting event with activities than less narcissistic males (F\(_{1, 81}\) = 7.23; one-tailed p = 0.02). However, we detect no significant effect of narcissism on perceived favorable impressions across for females (p > 0.50).

To further investigate this latter result, we compare personality characteristics of the fifteen percent of the females who believe that they would make the most favorable impression on recruiters during the event (responding with either a 6 or 7) with those believing that they would make a less favorable impression. We observe weak evidence that those believing that they would make a favorable impression on recruiters would be lower in narcissism than other females (means 0.19 for more favorable impression versus 0.28 for less favorable impression; F\(_{1,52}\) = 1.77; one-tailed p-value = 0.09). Moreover, similar to results from our live group recruiting event, female students who believe that they would make the most favorable
impression are higher in agreeableness than those believing that they would make a less favorable impression (means 5.90 versus 4.50; F_{1,52} = 11.16; p < 0.01).

Collectively, these results are generally consistent with those we observe for the live recruiting event. More narcissistic males believe that they will make a more favorable impression during a group recruiting event with activities relative to less narcissistic males. More communal females believe that they will make a more favorable impression than less communal females during these events.

**Group Recruiting Event with Mingling Only**

Table 5 summarizes results for the group recruiting event with mingling only. Panel A of Table 5 provides descriptive statistics for perceived favorable impressions across our gender and narcissism subsamples. Panel B of Table 5 reports the results of an ANOVA with perceived favorable impressions as the dependent variable and gender and narcissism subsamples as the independent valuations. Overall, we do not observe a pattern of results consistent with either the evaluation from our simulated recruiting event or participants’ responses to the group-recruiting event with predetermined activities.

The different pattern of results across these two cells are primarily driven by the perceived impressions of the less narcissistic males and the more narcissistic females, the groups that receive lower evaluations during our simulated event and report making a worse impression in the event with activities. First, comparing perceived impressions for the two events across our four cells, the only difference we observe is that less narcissistic males believe that they will make a more favorable impression in the mingling event relative to the event with formal activities (two-tailed p = 0.03). Moreover, we compare personality characteristics of the 34 percent of females who believe that they would make the most favorable impression on recruiters
during the mingling event (responding with either a 6 or 7) with those believing that they would make a less favorable impression. We find that those believing that they would make the most favorable impression on recruiters during this event are actually higher in narcissism than other females (means 0.34 for more favorable impression versus 0.22 for less favorable impression; \( F_{1,51} = 5.77; \) two-tailed p-value = 0.02). Future analyses will attempt to contribute to a better understanding for why these groups believe that they make better impressions in group mingling events, when our simulated event suggests otherwise. That said, given that we observe results consistent with social role theory in the event with structured activities, the results across these events suggest that the separation among student groups that we observe in the simulated recruiting event would likely be even stronger in the presence of more formal activities.

**Additional Supplemental Analyses**

Finally, our theoretical development suggests that more narcissistic individuals could help promote the values and goals of public accounting firms. As one test of this theory, we examine the association between our measure of narcissism and a measure of trait professional skepticism. Hurtt (2010) describes professional skepticism as a multidimensional, stable individual characteristic. The six dimensions of her measure include (1) a questioning mind, (2) suspension of judgment, (3) search for knowledge, (4) interpersonal understanding, (5) self-esteem, and (6) self-determination. As discussed earlier, prior research suggests that narcissists tend to possess traits that could promote many of these dimensions including the questioning of others’ motives, high self-esteem, highly determined, and good interpersonally (Ryckman, Thornton, and Butler 1994; Ross et al. 2003; Ames et al. 2006; Jones and Paulhus 2010; Wang 2017). Consistent with our theoretical development, we find that narcissism and trait professional skepticism are positively correlated across our two samples (\( r = 0.26; p < 0.01 \)).
V. CONCLUSION

To facilitate on-campus recruiting, public accounting firms often rely on group events where a large number of students interact with firm employees. We conduct a simulated recruiting event with former public accounting firm employees as evaluators to test theory about how narcissists perform during on-campus group recruiting events. Consistent with social role theory, we find that the success narcissists enjoy during group recruiting events depends on their gender. While more narcissistic male students receive higher evaluations than other male students, more narcissistic female students receive lower evaluations than other female students during these events. We report some similar findings from a paper-based experiment where students read scenarios about on-campus group recruiting events and self-report the extent they can make favorable impressions on recruiters. We further discuss theory and report some evidence suggesting that more narcissistic employees can help facilitate important objectives of public accounting firms. Collectively, our results contribute to a better understanding of survey and field evidence suggesting that entry-level male and female public accounting firm employees have different personalities which could ultimately influence their career trajectories within the firm.
APPENDIX 1
NPI-16 Narcissism Measure

Read each pair of statements below and place an “X” by the one that comes closest to describing your feelings and beliefs about yourself. You may feel that neither statement describes you well, but pick the one that comes closest. Please complete all pairs.

1. ___ I really like to be the center of attention
   ___ It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention

2. ___ I am no better or no worse than most people
   ___ I think I am a special person

3. ___ Everybody likes to hear my stories
   ___ Sometimes I tell good stories

4. ___ I usually get the respect that I deserve
   ___ I insist upon getting the respect that is due me

5. ___ I don't mind following orders
   ___ I like having authority over people

6. ___ I am going to be a great person
   ___ I hope I am going to be successful

7. ___ People sometimes believe what I tell them
   ___ I can make anybody believe anything I want them to

8. ___ I expect a great deal from other people
   ___ I like to do things for other people

9. ___ I like to be the center of attention
   ___ I prefer to blend in with the crowd

10. ___ I am much like everybody else
    ___ I am an extraordinary person

11. ___ I always know what I am doing
    ___ Sometimes I am not sure of what I am doing

12. ___ I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people
    ___ I find it easy to manipulate people

13. ___ Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me
    ___ People always seem to recognize my authority

14. ___ I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so
    ___ When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed

15. ___ I try not to be a show off
    ___ I am apt to show off if I get the chance

16. ___ I am more capable than other people
    ___ There is a lot that I can learn from other people

a Participants receive a score of “1” for each bold item selected and a “0” for the other item. We average scores across all measures to obtain our narcissism score.
APPENDIX 2
Big Five Personality Scale

Here are a number of personality traits that may or may not apply to you. Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement. You should rate the extent to which the pair of traits applies to you, even if one characteristic applies more strongly than the other.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disagree strongly</th>
<th>Disagree moderately</th>
<th>Disagree a little</th>
<th>Neither agree nor disagree</th>
<th>Agree a little</th>
<th>Agree moderately</th>
<th>Agree strongly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I see myself as:

1. _____ Extraverted, enthusiastic.
2. _____ Critical, quarrelsome.
3. _____ Dependable, self-disciplined.
4. _____ Anxious, easily upset.
5. _____ Open to new experiences, complex.
6. _____ Reserved, quiet.
7. _____ Sympathetic, warm.
8. _____ Disorganized, careless.
9. _____ Calm, emotionally stable.
10. _____ Conventional, uncreative.

---

*a Items 1 and 6 (reverse coded) measure extraversion. Items 7 and 2 (reverse coded) measure agreeableness. Items 3 and 8 (reverse coded) measure conscientiousness. Items 9 and 4 (reverse coded) measure emotional stability. Items 5 and 10 (reverse coded) measure openness to experience. The participant’s measure of each trait is calculated as the average of his/her responses to these items.
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FIGURE 1
Narcissism for Students Receiving High and Low Rankings by Gender
**TABLE 1**
**Descriptive Statistics from Live Event**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Male Students</strong></th>
<th></th>
<th><strong>Female Students</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 20</td>
<td>n = 31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evaluation</strong>(^a)</td>
<td>6.60 (2.74)</td>
<td>6.00  (2.77)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ranking</strong>(^b)</td>
<td>8.75 (5.49)</td>
<td>9.06 (4.65)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Narcissism</strong>(^c)</td>
<td>0.38 (0.19)</td>
<td>0.30  (0.15)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreeableness</strong>(^d)</td>
<td>5.31 (1.00)</td>
<td>5.09 (1.17)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Recruiters together rated each student on the extent they would be a good hire for a public accounting or other professional service firm on an 11-point Likert scale with endpoints of 0 – “Not a good hire at all” and 10 – “An exceptionally good hire”.

\(^b\) Recruiters rated each participant in the session from the best hire (a ranking of “1”) to worst hire for a public accounting or other professional service firm.

\(^c\) NPI-16 narcissism score (see Appendix 1).

\(^d\) Measured using the short Big Five Personality Measure (see Appendix 2).
TABLE 2
Narcissism by Gender and Evaluation in Simulated Event

Panel A: Means (Standard Deviations) for Narcissism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bad Evaluation</th>
<th>Good Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0.32 (0.15)</td>
<td>0.26 (0.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=18</td>
<td>n=13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.30 (0.24)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=8</td>
<td>n=12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender × Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.107</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel C: Simple Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect of Evaluation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>within Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.030</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>within Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Based on recruiter ratings, where good evaluation is in the top 50 percentile and bad ratings are below the 50 percentile within each of our three live recruiting event sessions.

<sup>b</sup> Reported p-values are two-tailed unless testing a one-tailed prediction, as signified by bold face.
### TABLE 3
Agreeableness by Gender and Evaluation in Simulated Eventa

**Panel A: Means (Standard Deviations) for Agreeableness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Bad Evaluation</th>
<th>Good Evaluation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>4.71 (1.18)</td>
<td>5.50 (1.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=12</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>5.38 (1.25)</td>
<td>5.25 (0.83)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n=8</td>
<td></td>
<td>n=10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel B: Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-valueb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.435</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.113</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender × Evaluation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.105</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1.182</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel C: Simple Effects**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-valueb</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Evaluation within Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.597</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect of Evaluation within Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&gt;.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

a Based on recruiter ratings, where good evaluation is in the top 50 percentile and bad ratings are below the 50 percentile within each of our three live recruiting event sessions.

b Reported p-values are two-tailed unless testing a one-tailed prediction, as signified by bold face.
| Panel A: Means (Standard Deviations) for Perceived Impression in Structured Event |
|---------------------------------|------------------|------------------|
|                                 | Low Narcissism    | High Narcissism  |
| Female                          | 4.73 (1.15)       | 4.62 (0.97)      |
|                                 | n=33              | n=21             |
| Male                            | 4.09 (1.64)       | 5.10 (1.29)      |
|                                 | n=11              | n=20             |

**Panel B: Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>&gt;.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.709</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender × Narcissism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.705</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>1.484</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Panel C: Simple Effects**

- Effect of Narcissism within Female: 1 0.150 0.10 >.50
- Effect of Narcissism within Male: 1 7.226 4.87 .02

<sup>a</sup> Participants responded to the following “How favorable of an impression could you make on the firm attending on the event (with predetermined activities)?” on a seven-point Likert scale with “1” being “Not at all favorable” and 7 being “Very favorable”.

<sup>b</sup> Median split of narcissism measure (see Appendix 1).

<sup>c</sup> Reported p-values are two-tailed unless testing a one-tailed prediction, as signified by bold face.
TABLE 5  
Perceived Impression\(^a\) in Mingling Recruiting Event by Gender and Narcissism\(^b\)

Panel A: Means (Standard Deviations) for Perceived Impression in Unstructured Event

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Narcissism</th>
<th>High Narcissism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n=33</td>
<td>n=20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>4.64 (1.27)</td>
<td>5.00 (1.34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.46 (1.21)</td>
<td>5.25 (1.48)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Panel B: Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MSE</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.158</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Narcissism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.114</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>&gt;.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender × Narcissism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.459</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>1.776</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Participants responded to the following “How favorable of an impression could you make on the firm attending on the (mingling) event?” on a seven-point Likert scale with “1” being “Not at all favorable” and 7 being “Very favorable”.

\(^b\) Median split of narcissism measure (see Appendix 1).

\(^c\) Reported p-values are two-tailed unless testing a one-tailed prediction, as signified by bold face.