COMPLEXITY AVOIDANCE, NARCISSISM AND EXPERIENTIAL LEARNING

J. Duane Hoover
Texas Tech University
duane.hoover@ttu.edu

ABSTRACT

The Millennial Generation, born between the years 1977 and 2000, is the student group that experiential and simulation practitioners must work with now and for the next several years as well. Some of the characteristics of Millennials indicate that they have a preference for complexity avoidance coupled with increasing levels of narcissism. This combination manifests as a preference for simplicity and economy in data/information processing as opposed to the requisite willingness to address systemic complexity. The characteristics of these trends, driven by a combination of technology and culture, are interwoven to identify potential hindrances to successful implementation of meaningful simulation and experiential learning processes.

INTRODUCTION

The "three-legged stool" of ABSEL scholarship involves the three components of the simulation or exercise, the instructor/facilitator, and, of course, the learning targets of the whole process--- the students. ABSEL has done an exemplary job when it comes to focusing on the design aspects of simulations and experiential learning exercises. Considerable work has also been done in the areas of instructor technique and simulation and experiential exercise delivery. However, relatively speaking, less focus has been given to student characteristics. "Though we at ABSEL have focused much on innovative delivery techniques, perhaps what we need is more incorporation of student views into the design and development of methods that conform to the way that modern students learn" (Gentry and McGinnis, 2009, p. 46). In this paper, the focus is on aspects of narcissism and complexity avoidance, identified as characteristics of the Millennial generation, as hindrances to effective execution of the learning processes vital to simulation and experiential learning.

Anderson and Lawton (2009) have examined the relationship between goal orientation and simulation performance in terms of attitude change and perceived learning. This paper asserts that a student's characteristics of narcissism and complexity avoidance play a substantial role in not only how students perceive learning, but also their willingness to engage in attitude changes as a function of personalized learning experiences. In addition, a student's perceived need to engage in meaningful learning is challenged by the fact that students today have at their disposal more technology, more information, and more ways to gather and integrate information than ever before. My assertion is that the value of information is perceived, at least to some extent, as a function of the effort required for its attainment. Habits of "shallow surfing" of the internet (for example, rarely going past page one of a Google search), lead to a lack of appreciation of information obtained. Over time this has the potential to yield a pattern of intellectual incuriosity.

Complexity avoidance comes into play when the question of simulation/exercise simplicity versus complexity is addressed. Cannon, Freisen, Lawrence & Feinstein (2009), as well as many other ABSEL scholars, have looked at the simplicity question, differentiating between the states of complexity resulting from too much information (information overload) and complexity resulting from too little (uncertainty). This paper will assert that Millenials are more comfortable in states of relative uncertainty and simplicity in the absence of information because of their inherent avoidance of complexity. As such, there is a danger that Millenials may be predisposed to lower the definition of what we, as simulation and experiential learning educators, would consider as adequate to implement adequate learning standards. This is problematical if one agrees with the assertion (Cannon, 1995) that a game has to have a level of complexity requisite to be sufficiently realistic and therefore capable of producing sophisticated managerial learning. "The complexity of a simulation game is expressed in the amount of information processing required to make effective decisions (Cannon et al, 2009, p. 245)."

NARCISSISM

Graduates of our business schools, now entering the workforce, have been labeled as the Millennial Generation, born between the years 1977 and 2000. Considerable evidence exists that one of the characteristics of these so-called Millennials is a propensity for narcissism (Bergman, Westerman & Daly, 2010; Westerman, Bergman, Bergman & Daly, 2010). Twenge and Campbell (2008) list the following as observed characteristics of Millennials as opposed to previous generations: 1) higher self-esteem, 2) narcissism, 3) anxiety, 4) depression, 5) lower need for social approval, 6) more external locus of control orienta-

tion, and, 7) more agentic traits such as assertiveness, especially for women.

Twenge has been the leading scholar in this area, and has written a popular book on the subject as well (Twenge & Campbell, 2009) entitled *The Narcissism Epidemic*. Included in the book are a number of interviews with managers who lament the characteristics of the new generation of employees now entering their companies. Among other things, these mangers cite stories of employees wanting to do less work for more pay, demanding more work flexibility, wanting more work/life balance, and asking for more praise and positive feedback on a regular basis. Perhaps the anchor study in this regard is a 2008 cross-temporal meta-analysis of narcissism with a sample size of 16,475 (Twenge, Konrath, Foster, Campbell & Bushman, 2008). This study found that narcissism levels have risen steadily over several generations from 1979 to 2006, as measured by the 40-item forced-choice Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Raskin & Hall, 1979). Twenge and her colleagues also found increases in other traits that could be labeled as more individualistic, including assertiveness, a sense of agency, self-esteem and extraversion.

When it comes to a particular focus on college students, similar results of increasing levels of narcissism have been observed (Bergman, et al, 2010, Twenge & Foster, 2008). Westerman and colleagues (2010) found that Millennial students from an AACSB accredited business school (n = 536) had not only higher levels of narcissism then college students in the past, but also higher narcissism scores then students who were psychology majors at the same institution. These results led Westerman et al to ask the question "Are Business Schools Creating Narcissistic Employees?" A recent *Newsweek* story entitled "Generation Me" (Kelly, 2009) stated "… we've created a generation of hot-house flowers puffed with a disproportionate sense of self-worth." Westerman et al (2010) also cite Hassett (2009) who wrote a piece entitled "Harvard Narcissists with MBAs Killed Wall Street". Citing a number of studies that indicate problems with narcissism in organizational settings and with narcissists as managers, Westerman et al (2010, p. 3) conclude that "A rising tide of narcissism would present significant problems for organizations, their productivity and long-term viability."

So what is narcissism? Bergman et al (2010, p. 119) state, "The term narcissistic is used to describe activities, behaviors or experiences that serve to maintain or enhance a grandiose, yet vulnerable self…those high in narcissism display a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, self-focus, and self-importance (Carson, Butcher & Coleman, 1988; Millon, 1996)." Narcissists rely on external social sources for information, but they are simultaneously hyper-sensitive to information that supports their inflated self-image or makes them feel good about themselves, while also reacting harshly to and being highly resistant to information that disconfirms their perceptions of grandiosity. In a learning environment, this tendency manifests as resistance to leaning processes that require an enhanced sense of self, followed by the realization of a possible need for individual change. The narcissist's attitude is that "I am more than just okay, and for _____ to say otherwise is just wrong."

Narcissism is the opposite of humility. Narcissism is characterized by vanity, materialism, self-promotion, and poor social behavior. Narcissists tend to disregard others feelings, and lack the capacity for empathy and seeing things as other people see them. Narcissism is not good for society or for the individual. It is not a confident attitude or a healthy feeling of self-worth; rather, it is arrogance, conceit, vanity, grandiosity, and self-centeredness. A narcissist will become aggressive when challenged or criticized and have a general tendency to externalize blame.

Narcissists are especially harmful at work. In the workplace, narcissists are not team players. Instead, they are prone to act as self-serving individuals seemingly needing to succeed at all costs. Narcissists are not popular bosses nor are they successful as CEOs. In one study (Chatterjee and Hambrick, 2007) it was found that the more narcissistic the CEO was the more volatile was the company's performance. Additional aspects of narcissism will be presented throughout the paper as examples that are more specific are described. Finally, it should be noted that the use of the term "narcissism" in this paper refers to a subclinical personality trait, and not a clinical personality disorder as defined by the American Psychiatric Association.

OTHER COMPLEXITY AVOIDANCE AND NARCISSISM CHARACTERISTICS.

How Information Is Processed. All humans are subject to selective screening of data and of potential filtering of information. In particular, the human tendency is to filter out that which is disconfirming to current point of view and/or disconfirming to their self-image. This is the basic rationale for all forms of cognitive dissonance reduction (Festinger, 1957). In the effort to instill educationally relevant information in students, every instructor has undoubtedly uttered the following phrase at some point in a class, simulation or experiential exercise. --- "You need to hear this, really!"

The importance of getting educationally relevant information in place is a challenge that all instructors face. An inability to accomplish this goal will produce inevitable educational failure, because, by default, decisions are then being made by students based on incorrect, faulty, or incomplete information. Note that tendencies for complexity avoidance, to the extent they exist in the class or in the individual student, will automatically function to reduce the amount of information produced. By reducing the amount of extant information being examined, the power of the status quo increases proportionately. Therefore, complexity avoidance yields an inherent conservatism that makes classroom innovation and individual student change/ learning less probable.

The other question at hand is how this challenge manifests in the realm of narcissism. The peculiar dynamics of narcissism come into play here. Narcissism's hunger for grandiosity can only be fed from external sources. Therefore, the narcissist must rely on social sources for information supportive of inflated self-importance. However, at the same time, narcissists suffer from a lack of empathy and a generalized lack of a capacity to see things as others see them. The combination of these two factors yields a set of dynamics wherein narcissists have a harder time hearing feedback from others while they simultaneously need the feedback that confirms their grandiosity. The conclusion on this point is that while all people tend to engage in processes of selective screening and filtering, narcissists are hyper-functional in this regard. Therefore, narcissists are particularly challenged when it comes to both generating and utilizing information directed towards learning and individual change. As such, narcissists, as students, offer a uniquely viral form of resistance to simulation and experiential learning processes as they function to both minimize and distort valid information to serve their own purposes.

The Decision to Learn. How might narcissists and collective narcissists handle the decision to learn? Narcissists have fragile self-concepts (Bergman, et al, 2010). As such, they are hyper-sensitive to feedback that may disconfirm or threaten that fragile self-concept. This can lead to feelings of anger or embarrassment that can produce aggressive and/or anti-social behavior directed against the source of that perceived threat (Stucke & Sporer, 2002). Narcissists can perceive threats as coming from instructors as well as fellow students. As such, narcissists may be too potentially volatile to function successfully in environments characterized by innovative or non-traditional learning.

Nor do these traits apply only to individualized learning. They may also manifest in groups or teams utilized in simulation and experiential learning. Given their tendency to externalize failure, narcissists may be a ticking time bomb in group efforts where the collaboration is fueled by a large number of alternatives under consideration and where information is exchanged freely and openly. Furthermore, the narcissists' tendency to a sense of self-entitlement (Beck, et al, 1990) may attune them to only adopting, and perhaps also only considering, those choices that support their self-perceived status in the system. As a result, narcissists may not only become disengaged in a non-traditional classroom, they may also become a source of active resistance or even aggression.

THE CONCEPTS OF ENGAGEMENT AND DEVELOPMENTAL READINESS

Learner Engagement. The literature of learning/ individual change as a function of engagement has several characteristics in common with the concepts already discussed in this paper. For example, many authors describe engagement as being multidimensional and multifaceted. Fredricks, Blumenfeld and Paris (2004) include behavioral engagement, emotional engagement and cognitive engagement in their description of engagement. Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) list engagement dimensions as encompassing behavioral engagement, cognitive engagement and motivational engagement. "In fact, some scholars suggest that the term engagement should be reserved specifically where multiple components are present" (Fredricks, et al 2004, p. 60).

Regardless of the particular criteria used to define engagement, most engagement scholars focus on the general internal characteristics of a learning person, especially an adult learner, making an individual decision to invest in focused efforts towards individual change and learning. As Sharan and Tan (2008, p. 42) state:

> "Engagement is the student's psychological investment in an effort directed toward learning, understanding, and mastering the knowledge, skills or crafts that the academic work is intended to promote. Our only reservation about that definition is the absence of sufficient reference to the motivational-affective aspects of engagement."

This last concept, the motivational-affective components of engagement, has us once again looking at a learning/change-focused concept through the lens of narcissism. To put this in some perspective, let us look at the concept of the adult learner, or what some scholars call andragogical learning (Forrest & Peterson, 2006). One of the assumptive elements of adult learning is that the person targeted for change is, in fact, an adult. As such, he or she would be assumed to be acting in a mature fashion, to utilize reason and logic, and to act as a personally responsible participant in the learning/change process. This is in contrast to the parent---child aspects of pedagogy, a system wherein the teacher/change agent takes almost sole responsibility for the system design and execution. However, narcissists with an External orientation, tend to skate around confrontations wherein they must assume personal responsibility. Instead, they prefer to externalize the blame--- placing it on others, on bad luck, or on circumstances beyond their control.

Realizing individual change and personalized learning is based on reaching new levels of attainment of self-knowledge and self-reflection. This process is described by many adult education authorities as transformative learning (see Cranton, 1994 and Mezirow, 1991 and 2000 for examples). Mezirow (1991) also provides the very descriptive phrase of "emancipatory learning" to describe this outcome. Mezirow describes emancipatory knowledge as that "gained through critical self reflection, as distinct from the knowledge gained from the technical interest in the objective world" (Mezirow, 1991, p. 88).

It must be pointed out that "critical self-reflection" is almost impossible for the narcissist. Moreover, if it is not impossible, it is at least highly improbable. This is because narcissists almost automatically and emphatically reject

information that is not supportive of their inflated and grandiose self-image. This leads to the logical conclusion that it is very difficult for the narcissist to function successfully as an adult learner. This means that simulation and experiential learning practitioners may be left with the default condition of having to utilize parent/child pedagogical techniques with narcissists. Furthermore, these pedagogical applications have to be more or less forced upon narcissists because they have an inherent lack of intellectual curiosity when it comes to reality-based feedback relative to their performance, standing, level of importance, etc.

Nor does the lack of critical self-reflection stop at perceived performance. It also manifests in the realm of persuasion of others as well. In a clever set of studies reported in a paper entitled "Are Two Narcissists Better than One?" Goncalo, Flynn and Kim (2010) designed a study wherein blind coders found no differences in the creative performance of individuals with both low and high narcissism test scores. Not surprisingly, narcissists believed that they were more creative and that their work product was superior. More interestingly, they were also able to persuade others of the superiority of their work, not because their work was actually better, but because persons who were targeted with their pitch found that they delivered the pitch with more enthusiasm. Just as high levels of self-confidence and self-efficacy can lead to a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy of a healthier life, enhanced effectiveness and more success (Bandura, 1997), so can narcissism yield similar self-fulfilling outcomes. However, the problem with self-fulfilling outcomes that are a product of narcissistic enthusiasm is that they are inevitably fragile. Propped up with bravado and reinforced by bluster and brashness, they are a tapestry of fabrications and exaggerations that will unfailingly fade in the light of close examination. One of the sadder aspects of the narcissism syndrome occurs when the life of the narcissist becomes a life-long and sometimes even desperate struggle to preserve an unrealistic, grandiose image.

Developmental Readiness. The Center for Creative Leadership has suggested that there is an important dimension needed for leadership development. This is the willingness of individuals to not only engage in learning by participating in developmental initiatives, but also to seek out such initiatives (Chappelow, 2004; Ting & Hart, 2004). Shebaya (2010) combines these two dimensions in a construct that she labels as Developmental Readiness. Shebaya contends than a lack of developmental readiness, such as might be found in a narcissistic population, is sufficient to block any meaningful attempts to engage in leadership development.

Shebaya (2010) portrays developmental readiness as a meta-competency consisting of the dimensions of self-awareness, self-motivation, and self-regulation. Narcissists may have few problems in self-motivation, and they are usually disciplined enough in their self-focused behaviors to function within the realm of self-regulation. Nevertheless, narcissists find meaningful levels of self-awareness to be a significant stumbling block. Avolio and Hannah (2008) also identify the concept of self-clarity as a meta-cognitive component of developmental readiness.

Focusing on the benefits of engagement has led to a number of interesting and varied studies. For example, Linnenbrink and Pintrich (2003) examined the positive role that self-efficacy plays in student engagement. Relative to behavioral skill development, Blumenfeld, Kempler, and Krajcik (2006, p. 476) conclude engagement has iterative properties, and that "mastering a … skill can lead to greater feelings of competence and greater perceived value of the endeavor, and result in higher (subsequent) levels of engagement." This is true, however, only if the processes of the engagement are coming from the perspective of personally responsible adult learning. A belief in self-efficacy is healthy only if that self-efficacy belief is encased in an enveloping envelope of reality-based information.

Whole-person based learner engagement (Hoover, 2007) is activated to the extent that an individual's psychological needs for relatedness, autonomy, and competence are met (Fredricks, et al, 2004: 80-82). These are difficult roles for the narcissist to execute. Their lack of empathy, lack of ability to see things as others see them, and general disregard for the feelings of others--- all function to make relatedness a tenuous outcome. Narcissists may do well in the area of autonomy, but that autonomy can easily devolve into a state of intellectual, emotional and behavioral isolation. Finally, narcissism thrives in an environment of perceived competence, even if that sense of personally perceived competence is not necessarily based in reality or put in a meaningful context. Furthermore, when reality finally does impinge upon the narcissist, he or she may pay a large personal price. Living in a world of perceived and recognized incompetence is hard for the narcissist to bear. Nor does the price to be paid for narcissism stop there. Companies and the stakeholders of companies managed by narcissistic CEOs also pay a substantial price (Chatterjee & Hambrick, 2007). It is reasonable to assume that the same would hold for classrooms engaged in simulation and experiential learning exercises.

ONE POSSIBLE SOLUTION: BEHAVIORAL IMMERSION

Giambatista and Hoover (2009) have suggested that "behavioral immersion" may be one of the ways that this challenge could be addressed. Significant levels of behavioral immersion produce increased levels of both direct and vicarious experiential learning. For starters, the more intense the level of the experience, the outcomes and the context of the learning are more individualized. The mental attitude that "this is about me" aligns quite well with a narcissistic point of view since the context of the learning is about self.

Secondly, the mechanisms of "whole person experiential learning" come into play here (Hoover, 2007). In cognitive learning processes the clues to the "next step" can of-

ten be laid out plainly and systematically. Such step-by-step processes have an inherent appeal to a person addicted to complexity avoidance. However, whole person experiential learning (Hoover, 2007) is more systemic than it is systematic. Whole person experiential learning often involves not only complex behavioral skills (Hoover, 1974; Hoover et al, 2010) but also an emotional commitment to the learning process (Argyris, 1970). Compared to cognitive learning clues, whole person experiential learning behavioral/ skill clues are less readily discerned in a complex learning environment. Behavioral immersion, by time compressing the learning experience, makes behavioral/skill clues more readily identifiable, and less subject to complexity avoidance filtering. In other words, behavioral immersion simplifies the learning process by automatically making it harder for Millenials to filter out some of the complexity elements that Millenials are wont to avoid.

CONCLUSION

Many obstacles can block the path to the successful implementation of simulations and experiential learning exercises. One possible learning inhibitor can be found in the characteristics of the modern day student. Narcissism is on the rise in the general population. Millennials in general and business school students in particular are demonstrating very high levels of narcissism not only in the classroom environment, but also in the workforce as newly hired employees. Narcissists create problems in the classroom, including offering a particular challenge to efforts directed towards innovative applications of simulation and experiential learning.

The emergence of narcissistic Millennials in the classroom and in the work place is not something that is simply going to go away. It is a phenomenon, as well as a set of potential challenges, that is here to stay--- one that ABSEL members will have to address. Millennials present a peculiar and almost self-contradictory set of characteristics. They are simultaneously more demanding of autonomy and individual discretion, while at the same time, less able to function without the need for supervision and control. This presents a unique problem for simulation and experiential learning practitioners. We are compelled by our desire for successful adult learning to use more and more participatory and andragogically driven techniques. At the same time, we see them flounder in a narcissistic user population that demands such an approach but cannot process it as mature, responsible agents of productive of learning and individual change.

REFERENCES

Anderson, P.H. & Lawton, L. (2009). "The relationship between goal orientation and simulation performance with attitude change and perceived learning". *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, Volume 36, 75-82, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Argyris, C. (1970). ***Intervention theory and method: A behavioral science view***. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.

Avolio, B.J. & Hannah, S.T. (2008). Leader development readiness. ***Industrial and Organizational Psychology***, 2: 284-287.

Bandura, A. (1997). ***Self-efficacy: The exercise of control***. New York: W.H. Freeman.

Beck, A. T., Freeman, A. & Associates. (1990). ***Cognitive therapy of personality disorders***. New York: Guilford Press.

Bergman, J.Z., Westerman, J.W. & Daly, J.P. (2010). Narcissism in management education. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education***, 9 (1): 118-131.

Blumenfeld, P.C., Kempler, T.M. & Krajcik, J.S. (2006). Motivation and cognitive engagement in learning environments. In R.K. Sawyer, (Ed.), ***The Cambridge handbook of learning sciences***. (pp. 475-488).

Cannon, Hugh M. (1995). Dealing with the complexity paradox in business simulation games. *Developments in Business Simulations and Experiential Exercises*, Volume 22, 96-102. (Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library, available from http://ABSEL.org).

Cannon, H.M., Freisen, D.P., Lawrence, S.J. & Feinstein, A.H. (2009). "The simplicity paradox: Another look at complexity in design of simulations and experiential exercises". *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, Volume 36, 244-250, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http:// ABSEL.org]

Carson, R.C., Butcher, J.N. & Coleman, J.C. (1988). ***Abnormal psychology and modern life*** (8th edition) Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Chappelow, C.T. (2004). 360-degree feedback. In C.D. McCauly & E. Van Velsor (Eds.) ***The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development***, 2nd edition: 58-84. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chatterjee, A. & Hambrick, D.C. (2007). It's all about me: narcissistic CEOs and their effects on company strategy and performance. ***Administrative Science Quarterly***, 52: 351-386.

Chatterjee, A. & Hambrick, D.C. (2010). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk-taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. ***Academy of Management Meeting***, Montreal, Canada.

Cranton, P. (1994). ***Understanding and promoting transformative learning***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

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

Fredericks, J.A., Blumenfeld, A.H. & Paris, A.H. (2004). Student engagement: Potential of the concept, state of the evidence. ***Review of Educational Research***, 74 (59)

Forrest, S.P. & Peterson, T.O. (2006). It's called andragogy. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education,*** 5 (1); 113-122.

Gentry, J.W. and McGinnis, L.P. (2008). "Thoughts on how to motivate students experientially". *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, Volume 35, 73-77, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Gentry, J.W. and McGinnis, L.P. (2009). "Movement toward increased student roles in the design of experiential exercises". *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, Volume 36, 44-47, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Giambatista, R.G. & Hoover, J.D. (2010). An empirical test of 'behavioral immersion' in experiential learning. *Developments in Simulation and Experiential Learning,* Vol. 36, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Goncalo, J.A., Flynn, F.J. & Kim, S.H. (2010). Are two narcissists better than one? The link between narcissism, perceived creativity, and creative performance. ***Academy of Management Meeting***, Montreal, Canada.

Hassett, K.(2009). Harvard narcissists with MBAs killed Wall Street. Bloomberg.com, February 17th.

Hoover, J. D. (1974) "Experiential learning: Conceptualization and definition" in James Kenderdine and Bernard Keys (Eds.) *Simulations, Games and Experiential Learning: On the Road to a New Frontier*, ABSEL Proceedings, Vol. 1

Hoover, J. D. & Whitehead, C. (1976) "An Experiential-cognitive methodology in the first course in management: Some preliminary results" in Bernard Sord (Ed.) *Computer Simulation and Learning Theory*, ABSEL Proceedings, Vol. 3

Hoover, J. D. (2007) "How "whole" is whole person learning? An examination of spirituality in experiential learning," *Developments in Simulation and Experiential Learning,* Vol. 34, 324-330, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http:// ABSEL.org]

Hoover, J.D. & Giambatista, R.G. (2009). Why have we neglected vicarious experiential learning? *Developments in Simulation and Experiential Learning,* Vol. 36, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Hoover, J.D., Giambatista, R.G., Sorenson, R.L. & Bommer, W.G. (2010). Assessing the effectiveness of whole person learning pedagogy in skill acquisition. ***Academy of Management Learning and Education***, 9 (2).

Kelly, R. (2009). Generation me. ***Newsweek Magazine***, April 27th.

Linnenbrink, E.A. & Pintrich, P.R. (2003). The role of self-efficacy beliefs in student engagement and learning in the classroom. ***Reading and Writing Quarterly***, 19 (2): 119-137.

Mezirow, J. (1991). ***Transformative dimensions of adult learning***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Mezirow, J. & Associates. (2000). ***Learning as transformation***. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishing.

Millon, T. (1996). ***Disorders of personality. DSM-IV and beyond*** (2nd edition). New York: Wiley- Interscience.

Raskin, R. & Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. ***Psychological Reports***, 45.

Robak, R., Chiffriller, S., & Zappone, M. (2007). College students'motivations for money and subjective well-being. ***Psychological Reports,*** 100(1): 147–156.

Sharan, S. & Tan, I.G.C. (2008). ***Organizing schools for productive learning***. Springer Publications.

Shebaya, M. (2010). Leadership development: How can developmental readiness explain and influence outcomes? ***Academy of Management Meeting***, Montreal, Canada.

Stucke, T.S. & Sporer, S.L. (2002). When a grandiose self-image is threatened: Narcissism and self-concept clarity as predictors of negative emotions and aggression following ego threat. ***Journal of Personality***. 81: 133-145.

Teach, R. & Murff, E.J.T. (2009). "Learning inhibitors in business simulation and games". *Developments in Business Simulation and Experiential Learning*, Volume 36, 191-196, Reprinted in the Bernie Keys Library [Available from http://ABSEL.org]

Ting, S. & Hart, E.W. (2004). Formal coaching. In C.D. McCauly & E. Van Velsor (Eds.) ***The Center for Creative Leadership handbook of leadership development***, 2nd edition: 116-150. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Twenge, J.M. & Campbell, S.M. (2008). Generational differences in psychological traits and their impact on the workforce. ***Journal of Managerial Psychology***, 23 (8); 862-877.

Twenge, J.M. & Campbell, S.M. (2009). ***The narcissism epidemic: Living in the age of entitlement.*** New York: Free Press.

Twenge, J.M. & Foster, J.D. (2008). Mapping the scale of the narcissism epidemic: Increases in narcissism 2002-2007 within ethnic groups. ***Journal of Research in Psychology***, 42: 1619-1622.

Twenge, J. M., Konrath, S., Foster, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Bushman, B.J. (2008). Egos inflating over time: A crosstemporal meta-analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory.***Journal of Personality,*** 76(4): 875–901.

Twenge, J.M. (2009). Status and gender: The paradox of progress in an age of narcissism. ***Sex Roles***, 61: 338-340.

Westerman, J.W., Bergman, J.Z., Bergman, S.M. & Daly, J.P. (2010). Are business schools creating narcissistic employees? An empirical examination of narcissism in millennial students and its implications. ***Academy of Management Meeting***, Montreal, Canada.