



Pay it forward: Can perceived behavioral control to pass on scholarship aid be predicted by various narcissism?

Adiska Uswa Aisa,¹ Juneman Abraham,^{1*} Angela Dyah Ari Pramastyaningtyas¹

¹Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Bina Nusantara, Jakarta – Indonesia

Abstract: One way of making scholarships sustainable is to continue the “chain of kindness.” However, relatively few studies have examined the psychological predictors involved in making a scholarship recipient feel that “pay it forward” is under their control. This study aimed to determine the predictions of four types of narcissism on Perceived Behavioral Control (PBC) in continuing scholarship. The instruments used comprised psychological scales measuring PBC, which were constructed by the authors, and some types of narcissism, i.e. the Communal Narcissism Inventory (CNI), Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI), and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI). Data were obtained by convenience sampling from 212 Indonesian scholarship recipients and analyzed with multiple linear regression (predictive correlational design). The results showed that the regression model had statistical significance ($F(4, 211) = 15.452, p = .000, R^2 = 23\%$). A notable result was that communal narcissism predicted PBC in a positive direction. Narcissism often has negative connotations; however, the results contribute by showing that there is also a “bright side” of narcissism.

Keywords: narcissism; pay it forward; prosocial behavior; scholarship

Abstrak: Sebuah cara membuat beasiswa berkelanjutan adalah meneruskan “rantai kebaikan” itu, dengan memberikan beasiswa kepada orang lain. Sayangnya, belum banyak riset yang menelaah prediktor psikologis yang membuat seorang penerima beasiswa merasa bahwa “pay it forward” (PIF) berada di bawah kendalinya. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengetahui prediksi empat jenis narsisisme terhadap persepsi kendali perilaku dalam meneruskan beasiswa. Instrumen yang digunakan adalah skala psikologis yang mengukur Persepsi Kendali Perilaku (PKP)–yang dikonstruksi penulis, serta sejumlah jenis narsisisme–yakni *Communal Narcissism Inventory* (CNI), *Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory* (B-PNI), dan *Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16* (NPI). Data yang diperoleh dengan penyampelan konvenien dari 212 orang Indonesia penerima beasiswa yang dianalisis dengan regresi linear berganda (desain korelasional prediktif) menunjukkan model regresi memiliki signifikansi statistik ($F(4, 211) = 15,452, p = 0,000, R^2 = 23\%$). Salah satu hasil yang mengemuka adalah bahwa narsisisme komunal memprediksikan PKP untuk meneruskan beasiswa dalam arah positif. Narsisisme seringkali memiliki konotasi negatif; namun hasil penelitian ini berkontribusi dengan menunjukkan bahwa ada juga “sisi terang” dari narsisisme.

Kata Kunci: narsisisme; meneruskan kebaikan; perilaku menolong; beasiswa

*Corresponding Author: Juneman Abraham (juneman@binus.ac.id), Department of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Bina Nusantara, Jl. Kemanggis Ilir III/45, Jakarta 11480 – Indonesia.

Introduction

Providing beneficial aid or assistance to others can make life easier and worthwhile for some. Many studies have identified positive associations between prosocial behavior and individual wellbeing (Cui et al., 2021; Martela & Ryan, 2016). The aid provided can take various forms, from financial aid to simply sparing time for someone (Aknin et al., 2015).

Among the multitude of behaviors that benefit others (i.e., prosociality), *pay it forward* (PIF) exists as a form of prosocial behavior. The concept's origins lie in ancient Athens, specifically in the plot of the Greek drama *Dyskolos* (Pontefract, 2016). It was later popularized when American writer Catherine Ryan Hyde published the book "*Pay It Forward*" in 1999 (Hyde, 1999), which was subsequently adapted into a movie of the same title in 2000 (Leder, 2000).

Weick (as cited in Baker and Bulkley, 2014) concluded that in PIF, an individual's behavior in helping others is encouraged by positive influences. Assume that A helps B, who then feels grateful and returns (or passes on) the act of kindness to C. C is then inclined to help D, who will then help E, and so on. The positive influence that encourages these individuals is their gratitude toward the individual who previously helped them. Nowak and Roch (as cited in McCullough et al., 2008) concluded that gratitude motivates individuals to assist third parties for no particular reason. Thus, instead of helping the party that assisted at the outset, the individual prefers to help others who are in greater need.

In a study on gratitude, McCullough et al., (2008) found that the participants who felt grateful tended to reciprocate and assist those who had helped. However, they were also inclined to help strangers (i.e., people who had not helped them) in need of aid. It was thus concluded that gratitude not only elicits reciprocity but also

prompts the advancement of prosocial behavior, and in this sense, is termed PIF. PIF may develop despite the absence of interdependence between individuals who provide or receive help (Gray et al., 2014). While similar, however, PIF and altruistic behavior are not the same. Daimon and Atsumi (2018) posited PIF as a path of elevation to intrinsic altruism. As such, a "historical debt" in the area of mutual assistance encourages an individual to pay the debt more intrinsically.

As an example of a positive act, PIF can positively impact the emotions and wellbeing of both the giver and recipient. The positive emotions generated have been found to include positivity about humanity, a warm sensation in the chest, pleasantness, feelings of upliftment and inspiration, a desire to improve oneself, optimism, contentment with life, gratitude, jollity, and a desire to help others (McFarlane, 2016; Pressman et al., 2015; Schnall et al., 2010).

The Indonesian government provides several endowment programs to fund higher education in higher learning institutes both within the country and abroad. The main goal of scholarship programs is to promote the availability of future Indonesian leaders with quality education. It is expected that through the provision of grants, recipients will fuel innovation for the benefit of the country. Existing government scholarship programs are granted by, among others, the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) and the Higher Education General Directorate (DIKTI).

Not all members of society have equal opportunities to obtain government grants. At present, grant recipients receive governmental aid (which is seen as a measure of generosity); this in turn raises the question of whether those individuals will pass on the act of kindness to others (i.e., *pay it forward*/PIF). For instance, will they "transfer the scholarship" in the future to

people who are more in need of financial aid? While not all grant recipients have the capacity to do this, the question of whether they would transfer financial aid to others or not remains unanswered, and if so, what would be their primary motives?

As stated, PIF is a concept suggesting that recipients of kindness will “return” the received prosocial behavior by helping other people, rather than reciprocating directly toward the initial giver. The concept requires individuals to perfect acts of goodness and encourage recipients to continue the chain of kindness (Pressman et al., 2015). Baker and Bulkley (2014) discovered that individuals who have received a high level of assistance tend to be more likely to *pay it forward* to boost their reputation.

With PIF, recipients can reduce the negative implications of receiving help such as threats to their dignity and self-worth, e.g., guilt (Pressman et al., 2015). Thus, as an “antidote” to these threats, recipients of kindness are three times more likely to commit prosocial behavior than their usual behavioral repertoire. In fact, the chain of kindness points directly and spontaneously toward extending prosocial behavior. Recipients of kindness are motivated to believe that they are passing on such generosity because they wish to reciprocate the kindness that they have received. By passing it on, recipients may alter their status to become givers instead (Chancellor et al., 2018).

According to a report by Chancellor et al., (2018), givers and receivers of kindness will feel greater autonomy after engaging in prosocial behaviors. Givers may also feel more competent. However, the givers and receivers in that study did not report any increases in feelings of interconnection with other people. Hence, a giver’s prosociality does not lead to satisfaction in relationships. It does however create a higher sense of *self-efficacy* in interacting with their

surroundings (competence) and behaving in line with the values they possess (autonomy).

Bandura (1984) defined self-efficacy as an individual’s evaluation of the extent of their abilities to carry out a given task. Bandura’s self-efficacy shares similarities with Ajzen’s (2005) concept of *perceived behavioral control (PBC)*. Both concern individuals’ perceptions regarding the extent to which they are capable of or have control in carrying out a behavior (Ajzen, 2005). PBC is one factor that influences an individual’s intentions to adopt a behavior. However, Ajzen also asserted that PBC may have a direct effect on behavior. Individuals will not engage in behaviors when they lack the conviction to do so.

Fishbein and Ajzen (2010, p. 154), in *Predicting and Changing Behavior*, defined PBC as follows:

“Perceived behavioral control is defined as the extent to which people believe that they are capable of performing a given behavior, that they have control over its performance.”

PBC is therefore an individual’s perception regarding the extent to which they have control over certain behaviors. When behaviors are easy to carry out, individuals tend to pursue them. Contrarily, individuals tend to avoid behaviors that are difficult to perform.

Numerous studies have contended that PBC can predict an individual’s intention to exhibit behaviors. Fishbein and Ajzen (2010) categorized PBC into two components: 1) Control beliefs, which refer to the individual’s perceptions or beliefs as to how far they are capable or incapable of carrying out certain behaviors, and 2) Perceived power, which concerns the strength of control factors that may reinforce or impede the emergence of behaviors.

Prosocial behavior is not always performed in good faith. Daimon and Atsumi (2018) demonstrated the existence of structural (such as

social status, social class, education, income) and cultural (religious values, empathic values, socialization) factors that contribute to a person's prosocial behavior. That is, the helping behavior is not always authentically intrinsic. The social exchange theory emphasizes that prosocial activity, like PIF, is not always motivated by goodwill or pure intentions. Zhang and Epley (2009) termed this phenomenon "self-centered social exchange." They explained (Zhang & Epley, 2009, p. 796):

"This norm of reciprocity enables prosocial acts to flourish between otherwise disconnected groups or individuals, creating an environment in which people can expect that the costs they incur for the benefit of others will eventually be returned to them."

Another example of the lack of genuineness in PIF is when individuals possess narcissistic traits. Narcissism relates to an individual's self-admiration toward ideas of grandiosity, exhibitionism, and defensiveness in the face of criticism. Narcissists' interpersonal relationships tend to be characterized by exploitation, lack of empathy, and the fulfillment of rights (Raskin & Terry, 1988). It is a rich and multifaceted trait comprising attitudes toward oneself and others.

This study assumed that recipients of government grants (such as LPDP, etc.), who have received considerable aid from the state, are more likely to commit to PIF. However, the kindness chain they form may not be entirely based on sincerity; instead, there may be other precipitating factors behind their behavior, as previously mentioned (e.g., guilt, threats toward self-worth). However, in the context of this study, narcissism is the driving factor under investigation. It is necessary to understand the driving factors (i.e., narcissism) that motivate people to be emotional or rational (weighing the cost and benefits to the self) when helping and giving, as these may contribute to personal, societal, and even economic welfare.

Based on individuals' level of narcissism, we can observe their attitudes toward themselves and others, interpersonal orientations, and emotional reactions toward the environment or situations (Emmons, 1989). Through narcissism, we may also be able to identify the aspects that cause individuals to be assured of their perceived ability and control over certain behaviors. Moran (2016) asserted that individuals with high levels of narcissism consistently demonstrated prosociality based entirely on individualistic means that needed to be achieved.

Narcissists have difficulty empathizing (Hepper et al., 2014). Their lack of empathy may be the cause of their socially risky behavior or failures in interpersonal relationships. In terms of the subject matter of this study, this leads to the question: Do narcissistic individuals tend to offer financial aid to others (i.e., to donate or be genuinely charitable)? One study suggested that individuals with high narcissism scores commit prosocial behavior without considering the altruistic motives to volunteer. The reality is that they prefer to help others when there is an audience for their "heroic" deeds (Konrath et al., 2016).

Based on observations of the current situation where our world is filled with social media users, narcissism is chosen as the causative factor of PBC that affects PIF. Social media serves as the "fuel and food" for narcissism, as revealed by the Newport Institute (2021, para. 8):

"Because social media, particularly Facebook and Instagram, focus on sharing (and sometimes oversharing) one's own image and opinions, young adults who use these platforms frequently are prone to narcissism."

The statement has been supported in various empirical studies (e.g., Andreassen et al., 2017; Boursier et al., 2020). When many people are vulnerable to developing narcissistic traits, we must anticipate the effects of narcissism in terms

of whether it will always negatively impact the world or whether it could provide some benefit. A mass fall in prosociality has a negative impact on the world, making it less friendly, at least in terms of social information processing (Laible et al., 2014). The question is, therefore, with the increasing use of social media—and thus many people’s increasing vulnerability to becoming narcissistic—is there any indication that these narcissistic people will make positive contributions? Zhong et al. (2022) recently identified that the rivalry dimension of narcissism among company employees meant that “employees who are more narcissistic tend *not* to ‘pay it forward’ when they receive help from their peers at work because received help fails to increase their prosocial motivation” (p. 135). The present study casts doubt on Zhong et al., (2022) because they paid little consideration to the two facts that 1) Based on the *dialogical self* perspective, a narcissist can ask for and be willing to accept help from others (Dimaggio et al., 2007); and 2) Helping others (including on the basis of reciprocation) can be a strategic instrument or means for narcissists to increase their self-esteem as well as a sense of obtaining something bigger (Konrath et al., 2016).

The concept of narcissism has been supported since the early works on psychoanalysis, when Freud (as cited in Sandler et al. (1991) divided it into two perspectives: normal narcissism and pathological narcissism. He concluded that pathological narcissism emerges during the states of adulthood, whereas normal narcissism occurs during early development or childhood.

Individuals with normal narcissism have positive relationships with affective components on wellbeing and self-esteem (Žemojtel-Piotrowska et al., 2016), self-absorption, and superiority (Kauten & Barry, 2016). Such individuals also need to maintain or enhance their self-esteem. Individuals with pathological narcissism, meanwhile, have positive relationships

with high levels of neuroticism (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019), contingent self-esteem, exploitativeness, and entitlement. Such individuals worry that people will notice their weaknesses (Pincus et al., 2009). Normal and pathological narcissists coexist in the general population. Both are capable of living normal lives, including having jobs and earning decent incomes. Both normal and pathological narcissists also have the potential to help other people.

Normal narcissists believe that they have a high sense of personal control over their personal efforts, other people’s behavior, and the world around them (Brown, 2017). Narcissistic individuals are determined to attain what they desire in life and will influence or even exploit others to do so. In contrast, pathological narcissists feel that they have no control over their lives (Brown, 2017; Hart et al., 2018). Instead, they are convinced that they are incapable of controlling their lives and focus more on avoiding negative judgments as opposed to seeking positive evaluations.

Based on its orientation, narcissism is categorized into two types: communal narcissism and agentic narcissism. Many studies have concluded that communal narcissism pertains to individual functioning in social relations while agentic narcissism relates to individual functioning in tasks or goal achievement (Wojciszke & Abele, 2008). Both types of narcissists tend to seek means that may advance their status, success, and attention. This is motivated by a desire to enhance their pride and self-worth without having to develop meaningful social relationships (Konrath & Tian, 2018). Cai et al. (2012) concluded that individuals who live in urban areas have higher narcissism levels compared to those living in suburban or rural areas. This may reflect differences in a person’s individualist and collectivist values. Individualism focuses on the self (agentic),

whereas collectivism focuses on the group (communal) (Foster et al., 2003).

When linked to our cultural context, we are currently living in a narcissistic culture (Zdanow, 2011). Developments in information and communications technology have made it easier for us to display our superiority compared to others. With the advent of social networking sites, individuals can share their daily activities with others through photos, videos, comments, etc. Goffman (as cited in Kim et al., 2016) stated that individuals develop and utilize social performance as a tool with which to manage people's impressions of themselves. Social networking sites have thus become an ideal vehicle through which narcissists construct and establish their personal image (Morf & Rhodewalt, as cited in Kim et al., 2016). Aside from information and technological advancement, an individual's residential area may also affect their level of narcissism. It is common for narcissists to focus on boosting their self-image and develop motives for self-enhancement (McCain et al., 2016). Narcissistic individuals will tend not to use privacy controls in their social networks to facilitate self-promotion in a positive manner (Utz & Krämer, 2009).

The phenomenon of narcissism is intertwined with an individual's PBC. In this study's framework, agentic and communal narcissism factors are presumed to play a role in predicting the PBC of PIF, as is normal and pathological narcissism, which may be associated with a grant recipient's PBC to *pay forward* financial aid. Due to this, the authors aim to identify and test hypotheses concerning the roles of the mentioned various types of narcissism in predicting scholarship recipients' PBC to *pay forward* financial assistance.

Methods

This study applied a predictive correlational design. The criterion or dependent variable in this

study was perceived behavioral control (PBC) to *pay forward* financial aid in the form of scholarships to others. Whereas the predictor or independent variables were the different types of narcissism, comprising Normal communal narcissism (NCN), Pathological communal narcissism (PCN), Normal agentic narcissism (NAN), and Pathological agentic narcissism (PAN). The data were analyzed with multiple linear regression.

The participants in this study comprised individuals who had received or were currently receiving scholarships from the Indonesian government, giving a total of 212 samples (89 males, 123 females). The participants were recruited through purposive sampling, and those who volunteered to participate provided informed consent.

In terms of education level, the majority of the participants held a master's degree, comprising 106 people (50%), followed by 53 people (25%) who held a bachelor's degree, 37 people (17.5%) with high school or vocational qualifications, and 16 people (7.5%) with a doctorate degree. The participants had received or were receiving a bachelor's, master's, or doctorate scholarship. A total of 72 people (34%) received a bachelor's grant, 74 people (34.9%) a master's grant, and 66 people (31.1%) received a doctorate grant.

A large proportion of the participants were from Jakarta (the capital city of Indonesia), totaling 67 people (31.6%), 18 (8.5%) were from Bandung (the capital city of West Java), 18 (8.5%) from Tangerang, 17 (8%) from Depok, and 16 (7.5%) from Yogyakarta. Regarding their profession, most of the participants were lecturers, totaling 74 people (34.9%), followed by 57 (26.9%) who were university students. Private sector employees comprised 35 people (16.5%), 26 (12.3%) were civil servants, 13 (6.1%) were self-employed, 4 (1.9%) were researchers, and the remaining 3 (1.4%) were unemployed. Most of the participants (89 people or 42%) earned an income between

IDR 1,000,001 and 5,000,000; 52 people (24.5%) earned between IDR 5,000,001 and 10,000,000; 24 people (11.3%) between IDR 10,000,001 and 15,000,000; 14 people (6.6%) earned more than IDR 15,000,000, and 2 people (0.9%) earned less than IDR 1,000,000. The remaining 31 samples (14.6%) did not disclose their monthly income.

The participants were given a questionnaire in Indonesian, consisting of a number of scales (PBC, NCN, PCN, NAN, PAN). The questionnaire had the following introduction:

“Education is an important issue in our lives; this means that every person has the right to receive and thrive in education. Surely this is something that the government must attend to so as to advance education in Indonesia. To achieve this goal, one of the government’s efforts is to provide scholarship programs, such as through the Endowment Fund Administration Board (LPDP), and the Higher Education General Directorate (DIKTI Bidik Misi, BPP-DN, BPP-LN, PKPI, PPA, etc.)

“These grant programs are aimed at funding education for prospective university students who are economically limited but have good academic potential. Unfortunately, the government’s disbursement of funds for these programs is limited, so not all members of society who qualify can be accepted into these scholarship programs. Due to this, additional education funding is needed for less fortunate members of society. Imagine if you were a government scholarship recipient, would you intend to pass on education funding to those who are less fortunate than you are?”

The PBC concept was developed based on Fishbein and Ajzen’s theory (1975). The PBC scale (CITC/corrected item-total correlations range = .497 – .674, Alpha = .875) was constructed through an elicitation phase involving 15 government scholarship recipients. During this phase, questionnaires with open-ended questions were distributed to subjects who represented the population. The participants were given two questions on the factors that support or hinder them in passing on financial aid. For each

dimension of Control Beliefs and Perceived Power, 6 supporting factors and 18 impeding factors were obtained, totaling 24 items. Example items were “My knowledge of individuals who have potential in education encourages me to pass on financial aid” (supporting factor); “Not having sufficient funds discourages me from passing on financial aid” (impeding factor); “Having a strong will motivates me to pass on financial aid” (supporting factor); “The inconsistency of my job prevents me from passing on financial aid” (impeding factor). Six potential response scores ranged from *Strongly Disagree* (scored 1) to *Strongly Agree* (scored 6). The impeding factors were unfavorable items, so the response scores were reversed.

NCN (CITC range = .466 – .672, Alpha = .896) was measured using the Communal Narcissism Inventory developed by Gebauer et al. (2012) comprising 16 items. Eight of these items relate to the present time, seven items relate to the future, and one item is conditional (may refer to the present or future (Žemojtel-Piotrowska et al., 2016). The instructions for this scale are given as follows (Gebauer et al., 2012, p. 878):

“People have all kinds of private thoughts about themselves. From person to person, these self-thoughts can vary quite a lot in content. We are interested in the sort of self-thoughts you possess. Below you will find a list of self-thoughts you may have. For each self-thought, please indicate whether you have this or a similar thought.”

Example items included “I am going to bring peace and justice to the world”; “I am the most caring person in my social surrounding”; “I am an amazing listener”; “I have a very positive influence on others”; and “I am extraordinarily trustworthy.” The response options ranged from *Strongly Disagree* (scored 1) to *Strongly Agree* (scored 6).

PCN (CITC range = .343 – .633, Alpha = .841) was measured according to the Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory (B-PNI) developed by (Schoenleber et al., 2015) with the following

dimensions: entitlement rage, grandiose fantasy, exploitativeness, and self-sacrificing self-enhancement (16 items in total). Example items comprised “I get annoyed by people who are not interested in what I say or do”; “I often fantasize about accomplishing things that are probably beyond my means”; “I can read people like a book”; and “I like to have friends who rely on me because it makes me feel important.” The response options ranged from 0 (“Not at all like me”) to 5 (“Very much like me”).

NAN (CITC range = .301 – .478, Alpha = .694) was measured using the Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI) developed by Ames et al. (2006), with 16 items in total. The main concept of this instrument is self-promotion and self-centeredness. The participants were required to select one of two statements that best illustrated narcissism (scored 1) and non-narcissism (scored 0) for each item. For instance, they had a choice of two statements that described them best: “I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so” or “When people compliment me, I sometimes get embarrassed”; “I am apt to show off if I get the chance” or “I try not to be a show off”; “I can make anybody believe anything I want them to” or “People sometimes believe what I tell them.”

PAN (CITC range = .468 – .723, Alpha = .869) was measured with the Brief-Pathological Narcissism Inventory (Schoenleber et al., 2015), but with different dimensions to PCN. The dimensions were: hiding the self, devaluing, and contingent self-esteem, with a total of 12 items. Sample items here included “I can’t stand relying on other people because it makes me feel weak”; “Sometimes I avoid people because I’m concerned, they won’t acknowledge what I do for them”; and “It’s hard to feel good about myself unless I know other people admire me.” Answers ranged from 0 (“Not at all like me”) to 5 (“Very much like me”).

The results of the item validity testing (corrected item-total correlation criteria/CITC >

.25) and scale reliability testing (Cronbach’s Alpha > .60) indicated valid items and reliable scales. However, several items were excluded, i.e., 14 items for PBC (final 10 items), 1 item for NCN (final 15 items), 4 items for PCN (final 13 items), 2 items for PAN (final 10 items), and 8 items for NAN (final 7 items).

Results

The results (Table 1) show that a regression model was able to predict the recipient participants’ PBC to pass on financial aid (PBC) ($F(4, 211) = 15.452, p = .000, R^2 = 23\%$).

In detail, NCN was significantly able to predict PBC in a positive direction ($\beta = .127, p < .05$). PCN was unable to predict PBC ($\beta = -.127, p > .05$). NAN was unable to predict PBC ($\beta = .075, p > .05$). PAN was significantly able to predict PBC in a negative direction ($\beta = -.355, p < .05$).

Discussion

The researcher assumed that normal communal narcissism (NCN), pathological communal narcissism (PCN), normal agentic narcissism (NAN), and pathological agentic narcissism (PAN) (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019) play a role in predicting perceived behavioral control (PBC) in passing on scholarships to people other than their benefactor (also termed pay it forward/PIF). Each type of narcissism has a role in predicting the probability of recipient’s inclination to pass on the financial aid.

Normal communal narcissism (NCN) is an individual’s tendency to fulfill their needs in self-accentuation (i.e., being under the spotlight) within their surroundings through mutually beneficial interactions. Three dimensions illustrate NCN: 1) helpfulness (feeling capable of changing the world, feeling capable of solving other people’s problems), 2) trustworthiness (feeling trustworthy, feeling trusted by others), and

Table 1

Multiple Linear Regression Analysis in Predicting Perceived Behavioral Control to Pass on Financial Aid (Scholarship), or Pay it Forward (N=212)

Predictor	<i>B</i>	<i>SE B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>Tolerance</i>	<i>VIF</i>
NCN	.113	.056	.127	2.038	.043	.955	1.047
PCN	-.140	.097	.127	2.038	.043	.955	1.047
PAN	-.439	.103	-.355	-4.260	.000	.537	1.864
NAN	.339	.315	.075	1.075	.284	.768	1.302

Note: NCN (normal communal narcissism), PCN (pathological communal narcissism), PAN (pathological agentic narcissism), NAN (normal agentic narcissism)

3) interpersonal warmth (feeling as though they have a positive influence on other people's lives, feeling superior to others) (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019). NCN focuses on an individual's relationship with their surroundings. Individuals with high NCN scores tend to draw attention to themselves in the environment through mutually beneficial interactions. They do this by emphasizing their presence through warmth or hospitality, trustworthiness, and helpfulness. When applying this concept to our study, these three aspects are exhibited when the scholarship recipients consider their status is under threat. Moreover, they tend to pass on financial aid to feel they are being useful to others. The behavior of passing on financial assistance is supported by an individual's belief that they are capable of solving social problems.

As predicted, NCN was found to positively predict PBC to PIF or pass on scholarship aid. Luo et al. (2014) stated that individuals with NCN tend to describe themselves as individuals who are capable of bringing harmony or advantages to other people. Individuals with NCN also need to emphasize themselves through kindness. They are prepared to do anything to demonstrate that they can resolve social issues (Barry et al., 2017). Delic

et al. (as cited in Kauten and Barry, 2016) identified a relationship between normal narcissism and social intelligence. They also found that socially intelligent individuals are likely to exhibit prosocial behavior, primarily when they are highly aware of social cues, in an effort to secure positive judgment from their surroundings. Individuals with NCN describe themselves as warm and friendly, or as highly socially intelligent, to emphasize their positive personal traits toward their surroundings (Barry et al., 2017). Such individuals might believe that positive evaluations from the environment encourage them to pass on financial aid such as a scholarship (i.e., "pay it forward"). A person's perception as to how far they are capable of passing on financial aid may also lead them to feel able to solve social problems.

Pathological communal narcissism (PCN) is an individual's tendency to self-protect by displaying a persona of usefulness to avoid negative evaluations from their surroundings. Four dimensions illustrate PCN: 1) entitlement rage (i.e., being bothered by people's lack of attention toward their distinctions, desires must be obtained), 2) grandiose fantasy (fantasizing about achieving success, fantasizing over their efforts or actions), 3) exploitativeness (manipulating others,

able to “read” others), and 4) self-sacrificing self-enhancement (feeling important, feeling sacrificial for others) (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019).

PCN focuses on the self-protection in which an individual engages to avoid negative judgment from their surroundings. They tend to do this in various ways, such as exploiting, showing anger, and excessively explaining and sacrificing themselves to prevent negative evaluations. It is therefore assumed that a scholarship recipient will be more likely to help when they believe that passing on financial assistance will support them in gaining positive evaluations. They may even be inclined to sacrifice their personal possessions to pass on such financial aid.

However, contrary to predictions, pathological communal narcissism (PCN) was found to be unable to predict PBC to PIF or pass on scholarship aid. Kauten and Barry (2016) supported this finding, asserting that PCN is unrelated to prosocial behavior indicators. This means that a scholarship recipient’s PCN levels are not associated with passing on financial aid. This contradicts findings by Zeigler-Hill et al. (2008), who contended that individuals with PCN need to boost their self-worth through other people’s approval or positive evaluation, and prosocial behavior (such as passing on financial aid) is considered to augment their self-worth. By helping others, they can present themselves as pleasant while also receiving positive appraisal from others.

However, Beattie et al. (2017) stated that individuals with high levels of narcissism tend to appraise their abilities through personal beliefs on factors that are not based on their real abilities. As such, individuals with PCN tend to project themselves excessively, so that their view of themselves differs from other people’s thoughts on them (Ogrodniczuk, 2013). This excessive self-projection therefore leads them to appraise their abilities based on expectations rather than

actuality. While individuals with PCN do expect or tend to sacrifice themselves to help others (Pincus et al., 2009), it is key that a recipient who is willing to pass on financial aid has sufficient funds. Thus, although PCN individuals are convinced that they are capable of fulfilling narcissistic needs, a lack of funds can hinder them from believing that they can pass on financial aid.

Normal agentic narcissism (NAN) is an individual’s tendency to emphasize positive personal functioning to boost their self-worth. Four dimensions describe NAN: 1) self-ascribed authority (feels seen as an authority or has authority over others), 2) self-absorption (desire to be the center of attention, has control over situations), 3) entitlement (respected by others, manipulates others), and 4) superiority (brags about themselves, feels superior to others) (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019). NAN focuses on enhancing self-worth by emphasizing positive personal functioning. Individuals with high NAN levels are convinced that they are more capable than others. PBC was hypothesized as being able to predict NAN. Individuals with high levels of NAN tend to hold greater beliefs about their abilities to achieve goals. Narcissistic individuals are viewed as more motivated by rewards than agentic experiences (Brookes, 2015). For example, such individuals will be motivated by activities or behaviors that may increase their status and power (Konrath & Tian, 2018).

Contrary to predictions, however, NAN was unable to predict PBC to PIF or pass on scholarship aid. Luo et al. (2014) stated that individuals with NAN present themselves as being superior to other people. When observed in the context of *paying forward* financial aid, individuals with NAN may view such aid as a way to fulfill other people’s needs as opposed to their own. Individuals with NAN are presumed to commit prosocial acts when the potential exists to gain personal benefits (Konrath et al., 2016). This can

be related to a scholarship recipient's perception of the extent of their level of control to gain personal advantage from passing on financial aid. The same study also found that individuals with this type of narcissism preferred to be involved in prosocial acts that are noticed by others. They tend not to be involved in anonymous voluntary activities. The present study does not specifically define whether the act of *paying forward* financial aid is anonymous or not. This was assumed to account for the shift in individuals' beliefs as to the extent of their control to enhance their self-worth by passing on financial aid.

Pathological agentic narcissism (PAN) involves an individual's excessive self-projection to enhance their dignity and self-worth, provoked by a sense of fear that their flaws will be noticed. Three dimensions describe PAN: 1) hiding the self (fear of displaying personal shortcomings, not wanting to be seen as reliant on others), 2) devaluing (concern about disappointing others, concern that their needs do not accord with others), and 3) contingent self-esteem (concern about not being liked by others, feeling comfortable when others do like them) (Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019). PAN centers on an individual's fear that their weaknesses will be noticed, so they project themselves excessively. Theoretically, they will tend to do whatever it takes to attain or maintain a superior self-image compared to other people. Hence, in the context of this study, if a scholarship recipient believes that passing on financial aid will make them superior, they will be more likely to do it.

As predicted, PAN was able to predict PBC to PIF or pass on scholarship aid; however, the direction was negative. It is theoretically elaborated that individuals with PAN tend to do whatever it takes to gain or maintain a superior personification. They tend to be manipulative, lack empathy, and demonstrate aggression when their expectations are not met (Pincus et al., 2009).

Italiano (2017) predicted that individuals with PAN would only help people with higher statuses than their own. This is aimed at enhancing their own social status, which in turn will boost their self-worth. In this study, the grant recipients were expected to believe that they are capable of *paying forward* financial aid to those in greater need. Unlike Italiano's study, the subjects in this study were individuals with lower statuses than the recipients of government scholarships. It is concluded that this may have impeded the individuals' belief in controlling behavior, thus producing the result that PAN plays a negative role in PBC to pass on financial aid.

When governments aspire for grant recipients to *pay forward* financial aid (i.e., to establish societal harmony and economic welfare), it is suggested that they consider granting such scholarships to individuals with PAN tendencies. This is because the greater an individual's PAN level, the lower their belief that they can pass on financial aid. However, this notion warrants further study based on more rigorous study designs, e.g., experimental.

This research has implications for the way society treats narcissists; as such, it is necessary to acknowledge and leverage the fact that narcissists have the potential to engage in prosocial behavior in the field of education.

Conclusion

This study concludes that narcissism plays a role in predicting PIF in the context of continuing scholarship assistance, with both positive (by normal communal narcissism/NCN) and negative (pathological agentic narcissism/PAN) predictions. It is also concluded that clinical psychology (which discusses pathological matters) and positive psychology (which discusses behavior with a positive character, for example, communal harmony) can be discussed together, in line with

the scope of the *Psikhumaniora: Jurnal Penelitian Psikologi*.

The authors fully acknowledge the limitations of this study, which may restrict the analysis and discussion of its findings. *First*, it was difficult to recruit participants that were an ideal match for the study's characteristics. The authors sought assistance from several government institutions that manage scholarship programs but received no positive response regarding this study. The authors then requested assistance in distributing questionnaires from various social media accounts for alumni or current university student groups specifically for scholarship recipients. *Second*, other relevant variables should have been assessed when aiming to reveal how acts of kindness may improve mental and social

wellbeing; as such, the type of *paying it forward* could have been broken down into more contextual factors (e.g., formal or informal, spontaneous or scheduled) or differences in demographic characteristics (e.g., age, gender, occupational field) as they may reveal more clues as to which may yield stronger social bonds or have greater impacts on levels of wellbeing.

Acknowledgment

This study was funded by the Research and Technology Transfer Office, Bina Nusantara University as a part of Bina Nusantara University's International Research Grant entitled "Urban Well-Being: Measurement and Conceptualization" with contract number: No. 017/VR.RTT/III/2021 and contract date: 22 March 2021.[]

References

- Ajzen, I. (2005). *Attitudes, personality and behavior* (2nd ed.). Open University Press - McGraw Hill Education.
- Aknin, L. B., Broesch, T., Hamlin, J. K., & Van de Vondervoort, J. W. (2015). Prosocial behavior leads to happiness in a small-scale rural society. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *144*(4), 788–795. <https://doi.org/10.1037/xge0000082>
- Ames, D. R., Rose, P., & Anderson, C. P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *40*(4), 440–450. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2005.03.002>
- Andreassen, C. S., Pallesen, S., & Griffiths, M. D. (2017). The relationship between addictive use of social media, narcissism, and self-esteem: Findings from a large national survey. *Addictive Behaviors*, *64*, 287–293. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2016.03.006>
- Baker, W. E., & Bulkley, N. (2014). Paying it forward vs. rewarding reputation: Mechanisms of generalized reciprocity. *Organization Science*, *25*(5), 1493–1510. <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.2014.0920>
- Bandura, A. (1984). Recycling misconceptions of perceived self-efficacy. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, *8*(3), 231–255. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01172995>
- Barry, C. T., Lui, J. H. L., Lee-Rowland, L. M., & Moran, E. V. (2017). Adolescent communal narcissism and peer perceptions. *Journal of Personality*, *85*(6), 782–792. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12287>
- Beattie, S., Dempsey, C., Roberts, R., Woodman, T., & Cooke, A. (2017). The moderating role of narcissism on the reciprocal relationship between self-efficacy and performance. *Sport, Exercise, and Performance Psychology*, *6*(2), 199–214. <https://doi.org/10.1037/spy0000092>
- Boursier, V., Gioia, F., & Griffiths, M. D. (2020). Selfie-engagement on social media: Pathological narcissism, positive expectation, and body objectification – Which is more influential? *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, *11*, 100263. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100263>

- Brookes, J. (2015). The effect of overt and covert narcissism on self-esteem and self-efficacy beyond self-esteem. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 85, 172–175. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.013>
- Brown, A. A. (2017). *Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in relationships: A perceived control perspective*. [Unpublished master thesis]. The Ohio State University, United States.
- Cai, H., Kwan, V. S. Y., & Sedikides, C. (2012). A sociocultural approach to narcissism: The case of Modern China. *European Journal of Personality*, 26(5), 529–535. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.852>
- Chancellor, J., Margolis, S., Jacobs Bao, K., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2018). Everyday prosociality in the workplace: The reinforcing benefits of giving, getting, and glimpsing. *Emotion*, 18(4), 507–517. <https://doi.org/10.1037/emo0000321>
- Cui, X., Li, B., He, R., Zhang, S., & Lei, L. (2021). The effects of prosocial spending on subjective well-being and its mechanism. *Advances in Psychological Science*, 29(7), 1279–1290. <https://doi.org/10.3724/SP.J.1042.2021.01279>
- Daimon, H., & Atsumi, T. (2018). “Pay it forward” and altruistic responses to disasters in Japan: Latent class analysis of support following the 2011 Tohoku earthquake. *Voluntas: International Journal of Voluntary and Nonprofit Organizations*, 29(1), 119–132. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11266-017-9880-y>
- Dimaggio, G., Fiore, D., Salvatore, G., & Carcione, A. (2007). Dialogical relationship patterns in narcissistic personalities: Session analysis and treatment implications. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 20(1), 23–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530600992741>
- Emmons, R. A. (1989). Exploring the relations between motives and traits: The case of narcissism. In *Personality Psychology* (pp. 32–44). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4684-0634-4_3
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, attitude, intention, and behavior: An introduction to theory and research*. Addison-Wesley.
- Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (2011). *Predicting and changing behavior: The reasoned action approach*. Psychology Press. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203838020>
- Foster, J. D., Keith Campbell, W., & Twenge, J. M. (2003). Individual differences in narcissism: Inflated self-views across the lifespan and around the world. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 37(6), 469–486. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(03\)00026-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00026-6)
- Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103(5), 854–878. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029629>
- Gray, K., Ward, A. F., & Norton, M. I. (2014). Paying it forward: Generalized reciprocity and the limits of generosity. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 143(1), 247–254. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0031047>
- Hart, W., Richardson, K., & Tortoriello, G. K. (2018). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissists disagree about whether others’ vulnerable narcissism is relatable and tolerable. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 134, 143–148. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.06.016>
- Hepper, E. G., Hart, C. M., & Sedikides, C. (2014). Moving narcissus. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 40(9), 1079–1091. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167214535812>
- Hyde, C. R. (1999). *Pay it forward*. Simon & Schuster.
- Italiano, A. (2017). *What’s in it for me? Why narcissists help others*. [Unpublished doctoral dissertation]. The Ohio State University, United States.

- Kauten, R. L., & Barry, C. T. (2016). Adolescent narcissism and its association with different indices of prosocial behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality, 60*, 36–45. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.11.004>
- Kim, E., Lee, J.-A., Sung, Y., & Choi, S. M. (2016). Predicting selfie-posting behavior on social networking sites: An extension of theory of planned behavior. *Computers in Human Behavior, 62*, 116–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.03.078>
- Konrath, S., Ho, M.-H., & Zarins, S. (2016). The strategic helper: Narcissism and prosocial motives and behaviors. *Current Psychology, 35*(2), 182–194. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9417-3>
- Konrath, S., & Tian, Y. (2018). Narcissism and prosocial behavior. In *Handbook of trait narcissism* (pp. 371–378). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92171-6_40
- Laible, D., McGinley, M., Carlo, G., Augustine, M., & Murphy, T. (2014). Does engaging in prosocial behavior make children see the world through rose-colored glasses? *Developmental Psychology, 50*(3), 872–880. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033905>
- Leder, M. (2000). *Pay it forward (film)*. Bel-Air Entertainment, Tapestry Films.
- Luo, Y. L. L., Cai, H., Sedikides, C., & Song, H. (2014). Distinguishing communal narcissism from agentic narcissism: A behavior genetics analysis on the agency–communion model of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality, 49*, 52–58. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2014.01.001>
- Martela, F., & Ryan, R. M. (2016). Prosocial behavior increases well-being and vitality even without contact with the beneficiary: Causal and behavioral evidence. *Motivation and Emotion, 40*(3), 351–357. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11031-016-9552-z>
- McCain, J. L., Borg, Z. G., Rothenberg, A. H., Churillo, K. M., Weiler, P., & Campbell, W. K. (2016). Personality and selfies: Narcissism and the dark triad. *Computers in Human Behavior, 64*, 126–133. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2016.06.050>
- McCullough, M. E., Kimeldorf, M. B., & Cohen, A. D. (2008). An adaptation for altruism. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17*(4), 281–285. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8721.2008.00590.x>
- McFarlane, J. (2016). *Why I pay it forward: Motivations and basic psychological needs of young adult peer educators*. [Unpublished master thesis]. Stellenbosch University, South Africa.
- Moran, E. V. (2016). *The relation of adolescent narcissism and prosocial behavior with cooperative and competitive attitudes*. [Unpublished master thesis]. University of Southern Mississippi, United States.
- Newport Institute. (2021). *Social media narcissism in young adults*. <https://www.newportinstitute.com/resources/mental-health/social-media-narcissism/>
- Ogrodniczuk, J. S. (2013). *Understanding and treating pathological narcissism*. American Psychological Association.
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 21*(3), 365–379. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016530>
- Pontefract, D. (2016). *Flat army: Creating a connected and engaged organization*. Elevate Publishing.
- Pressman, S. D., Kraft, T. L., & Cross, M. P. (2015). It's good to do good and receive good: The impact of a 'pay it forward' style kindness intervention on giver and receiver well-being. *The Journal of Positive Psychology, 10*(4), 293–302. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2014.965269>
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(5), 890–902. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890>

- Rogoza, R., & Fatfouta, R. (2019). Normal and pathological communal narcissism in relation to personality traits and values. *Personality and Individual Differences, 140*, 76–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.039>
- Sandler, J., Person, E. S., & Fonagy, P. (2012). *Freud's "On narcissism: an introduction."* Karnac Books.
- Schnall, S., Roper, J., & Fessler, D. M. T. (2010). Elevation leads to altruistic behavior. *Psychological Science, 21*(3), 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09567976093598>
- Schoenleber, M., Roche, M. J., Wetzel, E., Pincus, A. L., & Roberts, B. W. (2015). Development of a brief version of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 27*(4), 1520–1526. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000158>
- Utz, S., & Krämer, N. (2009). The privacy paradox on social network sites revisited: The role of individual characteristics and group norms. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 3*(2). <https://cyberpsychology.eu/article/view/4223>
- Wojciszke, B., & Abele, A. E. (2008). The primacy of communion over agency and its reversals in evaluations. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(7), 1139–1147. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.549>
- Zdanow, C. (2011). *Investigating the relationship between the social phenomenon of facebook and narcissistic socio-cultural tendencies.* [Unpublished master thesis]. Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa.
- Zeigler-Hill, V., Clark, C. B., & Pickard, J. D. (2008). Narcissistic subtypes and contingent self-esteem: Do all narcissists base their self-esteem on the same domains? *Journal of Personality, 76*(4), 753–774. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00503.x>
- Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Czarna, A. Z., Piotrowski, J., Baran, T., & Maltby, J. (2016). Structural validity of the Communal Narcissism Inventory (CNI): The bifactor model. *Personality and Individual Differences, 90*, 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.036>
- Zhang, Y., & Epley, N. (2009). Self-centered social exchange: Differential use of costs versus benefits in prosocial reciprocity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 97*(5), 796–810. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016233>
- Zhong, M., Gao, Z., & Song, L. J. (2022). Pay it forward or keep it for myself? How narcissism shapes daily prosocial motivation and behavior after receiving help. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 135*, 103721. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103721>

This page has been intentionally left blank.