PERSONALITY TRAITS AND NARCISSISM AS PREDICTORS OF PATHOLOGICAL SELFIE AMONG UNIVERSITY UNDERGRADUATES IN NIGERIA

¹Oyeleke, J.T., ²Oguntayo, R. & ³Popoola, O.A.

^{1,2,3}Department of Psychology, University of Ilorin, Ilorin, Nigeria

oyelekejohnson@gmail.com.

ABSTRACT

This study examined personality traits and narcissistic as predictors of pathological selfie among undergraduates of university of Ilorin. An ex post-facto design using survey method was adopted while three hundred respondents (110 males and 190 females), participated in the study. Their age ranged from 16 years to 35years. A questionnaire pack which included-the Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16); the Big Five Inventory (BFI); and Selfie Behaviour Scale (SBS) was utilized. The results of t-test revealed that gender do not significantly influence pathological selfies ($t=.763$; $df= 298$; $p>.05$). However, there was a significant difference in the participants type of phones on selfie pathology ($t(120)=-3.01$, $p<.05$); respondents with smart phones ($M=56.89$, $SD=10.25$) significantly reported higher scores on pathological selfies compare to respondents with non-smart phones ($M=53.23$, $SD=9.75$). Multiple regression result showed that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism and narcissism jointly predicted pathological selfies ($R=.49$; $R^2=.29$; $F(6, 293)=15.09$; $p<.01$). However, extraversion ($\beta =.20$; $t =2.91$; $p<.05$); agreeableness ($\beta= -.29$; $t =-4.03$; $p<.01$) conscientiousness ($\beta=.24$; $t=3.90$; $p<.01$); neuroticism ($\beta =.19$; $t=3.91$; $p<.05$) and narcissism ($\beta=.22$; $t=3.91$; $p<.05$) had independent significant prediction of pathological selfies. It is recommended that experts should pay attention to personality as a serious factor to be considered in alleviating selfie pathology and unhealthy smartphones usage among the consumers.

Key Words: Narcissism; Personality traits; Smart phones; Selfie pathology; undergraduates

Introduction

The world at large is concern about the alarming rate of phone syndrome among youth. Selfie addiction is a new pathology, often related to past bullying and low self-esteem. Behavioural scientists are beginning to consider the compulsion to take selfies as a serious mental health problem, although precise mechanism of selfie syndrome is not known but it is assumed to be due to imbalance between the excitatory and inhibitory neurotransmitters (Sai-Krishna, Sai-Krishna & Krishna, 2016). Selfie syndrome reflects a combination of the wide spectrum of varying degree of Neuro-psychiatric disorders. Some persons may have underlying stress disorder, self-obsessed and narcissistic generation, obsessive compulsive behaviour, anxiety, mania or even bipolar disorder but a new study suggests that it can even be linked to body dysmorphia. Taking Selfies could lead to narcissism, addiction, mental illness and even suicide. This syndrome is characterized by most of the time sticking on the social media network via face book, Twitter, Instagram, whatsapp, etc (Sai-Krishna, Sai-Krishna & Krishna, 2016). Individuals get easily distracted from their important official work with less productivity and poor performance in the work place, job dissatisfaction, unseen stress, peer pressure, unhealthy family relations, marital conflicts etc (Sai-Krishna, Sai-Krishna & Krishna, 2016). It may lead to

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

orthopaedics complications viz, computer related work injuries, cervical spondylitis, low back pain, fibromyalgia, chronic fatigue syndrome, carpal tunnel, tennis elbow, frozen shoulder etc due to prolonged use of the thumbs for typing, awkward posture of the body while using the phone or computer for social media and even catastrophic road traffic accidents while using phones during driving (WHO, 2017)

Recently, photo sharing has become a significant part of the online social activities and experience. Over half of social network users post self-portrait photographs of themselves (alone or with other people) and share them online through social media, this may be due to the increasing use of smartphones and the same cell phone as a means of taking picture and browsing through the net (Smith, 2013; Sorokowski et al., 2015; Weiser, 2015). In 2013, “selfie” was designated word of the year by Oxford English Dictionary. Selfie is refers to as “a photograph that one has taken of oneself, usually with a smartphone or webcam and shared via social media” (Oxford Dictionaries, 2015). More so, the term “Selfie” was first discussed by photographer Jim Krause in 2005, in the genre of dating. In 2010 Selfie had gained a wide popularity in social media. According to a study by Jillian McHugh on 3 April 2013, two thirds of women aged 16-35 make selfie order posting on facebook. The number of selfies shared online in 2014 was estimated to be around 880 billion (Zigterman, 2013) and each day smartphone users posted about 93 million number of pictures (Brandt, 2014). In November 2013, the word “selfie”, is declared as the “word of the year” by the Oxford English Dictionary. Art selfie is one that many people have practiced and perfected over the years, although the habit of publishing photos on social networks was born in 2000 with the creation of the first areas in social networks. Researcher has asserted that shooting oneself or ourselves is back in vogue and that it involves both teenagers and adult though very common at middle adulthood (Elvira, Orgesa, & Ortenca, 2017). The same study has shown that selfie as a reflection of low self-esteem and narcissism.

Some studies have it that, personality traits do predict selfie posting behavior, considering the mediation of the four selfie motives. The two motives that are less related to any type of discomfort and that may, in a certain sense, be considered as healthy motivations—as they express a social motivation to share with others their own life—May be connected to self-evaluation or to the desire to appear for others to admire) (Roberta & Stefano, 2018). According to this finding, entertainment (i.e. the escape from boredom) and attention-seeking appear to mediate the link between the two personality traits considered and selfie-posting behavior. The relevant result is that, even if positively correlated between them, the model suggests two different (and almost contrary) modalities in the use of selfies of people high in self-esteem or narcissism (Roberta et al, 2018). People with high self-esteem do not engage in selfie posting behaviors with the aim of searching for the attention of others or escaping from boredom. Instead, these are the main motives by which narcissist people get involved, as concerns own selfies and importance attached to the likes received. In this sense, as suggested by Halpern et al. (2016), taking selfies for narcissist reasoning might be perceived as the opposite of taking selfies to feel authentic, which is more frequently a feature of individuals with high self-esteem (Warfield, 2014).

Across world, scholars agree that selfie posting symbolizes a relatively new but dominant means of online self-presentation (Qiu, Lu, Yang, Qu, & Zhu, 2015; Sung et al., 2016). The selfie distinguishes itself from other forms of self-promotion on social media. Users may indeed extend the self in a more complete way, showing in the portrait both physical characteristics and

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

personality traits (Lee & Sung, 2016). Specifically, selfies seem naturally to contain the highest number of elements of ostentation and self-propagation (Weiser, 2015). Some studies showed a relationship between online behaviors and different personality traits, founding that high extraversion, high openness to experience, high neuroticism and low conscientiousness predict more Social Network use (Ross et al., 2009; Ryan and Xenos, 2011; Eftekhar et al., 2014). Recently, studies started focusing also on the role of personality traits in selfie behaviors, employing the Five Factor Model as main personality theoretical framework, and found high extraversion and high neuroticism predicting more selfies (Qiu et al., 2015; Sorokowska et al., 2016). In the last 10 years, model of personality structure enlightened interesting results that helped in understanding phenomena beyond the Five Factor Model (Ashton et al., 2014). In fact, this model is based on the same lexical and cross cultural studies from which originated the Five Factor model, but it is composed of six dimensions instead of five (Ashton et al., 2006): Honesty/Humility, Emotionality, Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness to experience.

The most important change is related to the introduction of a sixth factor, named Honesty/Humility. People with high Honesty/Humility are inclined to be sincere, fair, and unassuming. Conversely, people with low scores have a strong sense of self-importance and are inclined to flatter others and break the rules in order to get what they want. A recent review by Ashton et al. (2014) shed light on how Honesty/Humility dimension better predicts different variables compared to the Five Factor Model. These findings are consistent using both self-report and observer report methods. Moreover, low Honesty/Humility appears to be a good predictor of antisocial, manipulative and unethical behaviors, and to be strongly related to the Dark Triad dimensions (Ashton et al., 2014). Other differences between the Five Factor Model and the model are related to Agreeableness and Emotionality factors (Ashton et al., 2004). In the HEXACO model, Emotionality describes a tendency to vulnerability, sentimentality and fearfulness vs. a tendency to fearlessness, detachment and toughness. A study explored personality traits and three different kinds of selfie (own selfies, selfies with partner and group selfies), controlling for age, gender and sexual orientation. It was found that personality traits did predicted selfies and online behaviors (DeHaan et al., 2013; Chong et al., 2015; Jang et al., 2015; Dhir et al., 2016; Sorokowski et al., 2016). The HEXACO Model (Lee and Ashton, 2004), and specifically the Honesty/Humility dimension can help in deeply understanding these online behaviors. In fact, since high Honesty/Humility was found to be related to being fair and cooperative with others (Hilbig and Zettler, 2009; Chirumbolo and Leone, 2010), it is possible that people with low Honesty/Humility could post more selfies as a strategy to seek admiration and to take advantage from others to reach own social goals at the expense of communality on social networks.

Furthermore, previous research has shown that selfies-posting behaviors are predicted by high level of narcissism (Barry et al., 2015; Fox and Rooney, 2015; Sorokowski et al., 2015; Weiser, 2015; Halpern et al., 2016). In these studies narcissism is described as a multiform construct characterized by exhibitionism, vanity, grandiosity, exploitativeness, entitlement and desire of authority, aspects that could be motivated by the need for self-esteem regulation (Morf and Rhodewalt, 2001). Weiser (2015) underlined how both adaptive and maladaptive facets of narcissism can predict selfies posting. In fact, previous studies found that narcissism is strongly and negatively correlated with Honesty/Humility traits, and positively and strongly correlated with Extraversion traits (Lee and Ashton, 2005; Bresin and Gordon, 2011; Jonason and

McCain, 2012). Thus, these findings could support the link between honesty-humility and selfies, suggesting the utility of the HEXACO model in understanding selfies-posting behaviors. While other dark triad traits were discovered to be good predictors of selfie behaviour. Dark Triad traits according to Paulhus and Williams (2002), concluded that Narcissism inclusive, are well predicted by lower Honesty/Humility (Lee et al., 2013) and, thus it is plausible expecting that posting selfies could be more frequent among people with lower levels of Honesty/Humility. Not only personality but other social factors had been found to correlate the selfies behaviour.

Studies on selfies found age and gender differences, showing that adolescents are more likely than young adults to post selfies on social network websites, and that girls usually share more selfies than boys (Jang et al., 2015; Dhir et al., 2016; Sorokowski et al., 2016). Conversely there is a lack in literature about sexual orientation differences in selfies. However, studies on online behaviors showed that sexual orientation seems to predict differences in the use of social networks: The Internet is commonly used by not heterosexual young people to find friends and romantic partners, in order to compensate the perceived difficulty of establishing offline contact with LGBT peers (DeHaan et al., 2013; Chong et al., 2015; Morelli et al., 2016). In line with literature on online behaviors and personality traits (Ryan and Xenos, 2011; Sorokowska et al., 2016), and with studies on the relationship between selfies and narcissism (Barry et al., 2015; Fox and Rooney, 2015) that emerged being related to Honesty/Humility dimension of HEXACO model (Lee and Ashton, 2005), we hypothesized that low Honesty/Humility and high Extraversion could be related to all kinds of selfie-posting behaviors investigated. It is plausible that people with low Honesty/Humility could share more selfies in order to affirm their inflated beliefs about their positive self-view and extraverted people could share their selfies in order to improve their relationships and popularity. Moreover, it is expected that Conscientiousness would be negatively related to posting all kinds of selfies because people who are high in Conscientiousness are less involved in online behaviors and in the use of the Internet (Dhir et al., 2016), probably because they are engaged in offline activities and they considered Internet only a distraction from their tasks (Ross et al., 2009). A study detected that high Emotionality could predict more selfie-posting behaviors because people high on this dimension may consider social networks as a safer place to express self-aspects compared to the off-line reality (Forest and Wood, 2012; Seidman, 2013), probably due to the association between Emotionality and social anxiety (Ashton et al., 2006). This study aimed at investigating the influence of personality traits and narcissism as predictors of selfie behaviour among undergraduates of university of Ilorin.

Research Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses were postulated in the course of this research:

- i. Individual female respondents will significantly score highest on pathological selfies than male respondents.
- ii. Respondents with smart phones will report significantly higher pathological selfies than those with other type of phones
- iii. Extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness and narcissism will significantly, jointly and independently influence of pathological selfie behaviour among undergraduates.

Methods

Design

This study adopted an ex-post-facto design using survey method. This is because the variables in the research are cannot be manipulated. The independent variables are personality traits and narcissistic behaviour. The dependent variable is pathological selfie behaviour which was intervally and continuously measured with a scale on individual students. However, the study used the quantitative data collection techniques to achieve its objectives in the target region for the study.

Setting

This study was conducted in university of Ilorin located at capital city of Kwara State and it only involved only undergraduate students (16years and above) of university of Ilorin alone. This setting is most suitable for this type of study because the dwellers are endowed with multiple smartphones users who may portray the quality of this research interests.

Participants

The participants were randomly selected purposively during questionnaires administration. A total sample size of about 300 respondents (which involved 110(36.7%) and 190(61.3%) females) sampled among the target population. The age range is within adolescents to late adulthood thus; 42.7% of the respondent were 16-20 years of age while 57.3% were 21-40 years of age. Participants that as at the time of this research work used smart phone are 29.7% of the respondent while those using smart phones while 70.3% were using other type of phones. shows that 80.0% had phones that are internet compliance while 20.0% were using phones that are not internet compliance. The ethnicity of the subjects could not be determined absolutely however it could probably be Yorubas majorly but the institution accommodates all tribes and races in Nigeria and Worldwide respectively.

Sampling Procedure

The sampling technique employed is purposive sampling technique which involves the selection of participants in such a way that it would follow the purpose of the study strictly by considering only the adults (including males and females) who are students of university of Ilorin.

This study involved respondents who are students of university of Ilorin and students of kwara state polytechnic who give their informed consent.

Instruments

Three instruments were used in the study, namely: The Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 was developed ((Ames, Paul, & Anderson, 2006), the “Big Five” Inventory was designed by Gerlitz & Schupp (2005) and The Selfie Behaviour Scale was developed by Balakrishnan & Griffiths (2017).

The Narcissistic Personality Inventory-16 (NPI-16)

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

The NPI-16 measures narcissistic personality. The scale response ranges from Disagree strongly=1, Disagree=2, not really sure=3, agree=4 and Agree strongly=5. The NPI-16 shown an internal consistency of 0.72. A test re-test was conducted five times and revealed a reliability of 0.85. To validate the NPI-16, it was compared to the original NPI 40-item measure, where similarities were found in correlations of 0.71 between the 16 items and the remaining 24 items (Ames et al., 2006). The NPI-16 shown an internal consistency of 0.72 while the full 40-item scale shown a variance of 0.84. A test re-test was conducted five times and revealed a reliability of 0.85. NPI-16, it was validated compared to the original 40-item measure, where similarities were found in correlations of 0.71 between the 16 items and the remaining 24 items (Ames et al., 2006). The Cronbach Alpha recorded for the current study was .78. Items are directly scored and a score above 47 indicate higher narcissism behaviour. The statements that are coded to be related to narcissism are added up to get a total score.

The “Big Five” Inventory (BFI-15)

The BFI-15 Scale consists of 15 items to assess personality traits; this is adapted from the BFI-15 of Gerlitz & Schupp (2005). It was introduced in a subsample of the SHP in 2014. The BFI-15 on a subsample of the SHP was introduced to test the psychometric properties of this scale, before introducing this scale to the entire SHP sample. In total, 241 participants of the SHP in 2014 wave 16, aged 18 to 65 (Table 2), answered the BFI-15. The German version of the BFI-15 was taken and adapted from the GSOEP, and the French and Italian versions were translated from the German version. As for the BFI-10, we adapted the BFI-15 to an 11-point scale ranging from 0 (*completely disagree*) to 10 (*completely agree*). The second analyses are based on this SHP subsample from wave 16 in 2014 composed of 241 individuals. The 15 items short version personality inventory measures five (5) dimension of personality which is openness to experience, conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness and neuroticism. The test retest correlations reported for the BFI-15 scales are thus: extraversion .83, agreeableness .68, conscientiousness .77, and neuroticism .74, openness to experience .72, the test reliability for the big five is .75 convergent validity with the NEO-PI-R domains average of .63 for the TiPi and .67 for the BFI-15. The first us sample (us-1) consisted of 726 students (68% female, mean age 21 years) at a large public university whereas the second (us-2) consist of 726 students at a private university (56% female, mean age 18). The first German sample (G-1) consists of 457 students (56% female mean age 25), and the second. The reliability were reported thus; extraversion traits =.79, agreeableness=.69, conscientiousness=.70, neuroticism=.76, and openness to experience =.65. Cronbach Alpha recorded for the current study was .72. Each of the items are based on a five (5) point scale which ranges from disagree strongly to agree strongly. Some of the items are reverse when scoring; they are items 1,2,3,4,5 and 7, extraversion was assessed with items 1R, 6 (R denotes reverse section) agreeableness: 2,7R. Conscientiousness: 3R, 8. Openness to experience 5R, 10 and neuroticism:4R, 9.

The Selfie Behaviour Scale

The Selfie Behaviour Scale assess pathological selfie. It contains a-six components of selfies: environmental enhancement, social competition, attention seeking, mood modification, self-confidence, and social conformity. The MANOVA results confirmed that the six factors significantly differed across selfitis intensity level (i.e., borderline, acute, and chronic) in total as well as within the groups. The Scheffe's test identified that most of the high significant

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

differences within-factor came from borderline and chronic intensity categories. This also validates that there is an appreciative deviation between the lowest and highest ranges of intensity categories. Selfitis is a new construct in which selfie addiction and/or compulsion are measured. The psychometrics of the scale are: Environmental Enhancement: this is related to feeling good, self-expression, memories, and trophies. Here, the environment is enjoyable, and the taking of selfies helps create better memories. The mean score of environmental enhancement was 3.76 (out of 5) among those with chronic selfies, the Cronbach alpha reliability recorded for this dimension was 0.80. Social Competition: this is an important component for those with a gaming compulsion. In case of selfitis, the social competition factor was observed to have a high mean score of 4.2 (out of 5) in the chronic selfitis category with Cronbach alpha reliability of 0.84. Attention Seeking: Social media is a well-known way to gain such attention (Lee and Ma, 2012) and selfie-taking behavior is often accompanied by posting on social media outlets and is indicative of a narcissistic action. The highest mean score of attention seeking was 4.0 (out of 5) in the chronic selfitis category, the Cronbach alpha reliability recorded for this dimension was 0.81. Mood Modification: refers to mood modification as a subjective experience to a particular activity that typically makes the person feel better in some way. The highest mean score of mood modification was 3.89 (out of 5) in the borderline category (i.e., it was less of a factor in acute and chronic selfitis). The Cronbach alpha reliability recorded for this dimension was 0.820. Self-Confidence: Previous literature has noted that low self-confidence can lead to excessive behavior and addiction. The Cronbach alpha reliability recorded for this dimension was 0.78. Subjective Conformity: The highest mean value of subjective conformity was 3.57 (out of 5), which was the lowest among the six factors (and highest in the acute selfitis category). Subjective conformity is an individual's obligation to follow social conformity, which is subjective to different reference groups. The Cronbach alpha reliability recorded for this dimension was 0.80.. Cronbach Alpha recorded for the current study was .68. Responses are rated on a 5-point Likert scale: (5=strongly agree; 4=Agree; 3= Neither Agree or Disagree; 2=Disagree; 1=Strongly Disagree). Scores are summed. The higher the score, the greater the likelihood of selfitis Items 1, 7, 13, and 19 relate to environmental enhancement Items 2, 8, 14 and 20 relate to social competition Items 3, 9, and 15 relate to attention seeking Items 4, 10, and 16 relate to mood modification Items 5, 11, and 17 relate to self-confidence Items 6, 12, and 18 relate to subjective conformity.

Procedure

Before handing the questionnaire to each participant, a simple introductory discussion was conducted stating partial intent of the research so as to gain the participant's cooperation and sincerity. Also, participants inform consent were sought and those who agreed to participate were asked to sign the inform consent form attached with the questionnaire; the questionnaires were then, administered. The use of non-probability purposive sampling procedure was adopted, using the purposive sampling procedure. The participants were approached in the hospitals where they have come to donate blood. It took the researcher several weeks to administer the questionnaire and collect it back.

Statistical Analysis

Data was analyzed using (statistical packages for the social sciences) SPSS 21.0. Descriptive statistics such as frequency, mean, Standard Deviation and variance were performed to describe the subject's information. Pearson product moment correlation was used to analyze hypothesis one regression and t-test were used to analyse the hypothesis.

Result

The study employed descriptive and inferential statistical tests in analyzing the stated hypotheses. The descriptive tests showed the distribution of participants according to sociodemographic characteristics of the population while the inferential statistics showed results for hypotheses testing.

Table 1: Distribution of respondent based on age

Age	Frequency	Percent
12-20year	128	42.7
21-40years	190	57.3
Total	300	100

Table 1 shows that 42.7% of the respondent were 16-20 years of age while 57.3% were 21-40 years of age.

Table 2: Distribution of respondent based on sex

Gender	Frequency	Percent
Male	110	36.07
Female	190	36.3
Total	300	100

Table 2 shows that 36.7% of the respondent were male while 61.3% were female.

Table 3: Distribution of respondent based on level

Level	Frequency	Percent
100	62	20.7
200	92	30.7
300	65	21.6
400	81	27.0
Total	300	100

Table 3 shows that 20.7% of the respondent were in 100 level, 30.7% were in 200 level, 21.6% were in 300 level while 27.0% were in 400 level

Table 4: Distribution of respondent based on types of phone

Types of handset	Frequency	Percent
Smart phone	89	29.7
No	211	70.3
Total	300	100

Table 4 shows that 29.7% of the respondent were using smart phones while 70.3% were using other type of phones.

Table 5: Distribution of respondent based on phone internet compliance

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	240	80.0
No	60	20.0
Total	300	100

Table 4.5 shows that 80.0% had phones that are internet compliance while 20.0% were using phones that are not internet compliance.

Table 6: Distribution of respondent based on frequent usage of social media

Usage of social media	Frequency	Percent
All the time	183	61.0
sometimes	88	29.3
Once or twice weekly	29	9.7
Total	300	100.0

Table 6 shows that 61.0% uses social media all the time; 29.3% uses social media sometimes while 9.7% uses social media once or twice weekly.

Table 7: Distribution of respondent based on taking of selfies

Response	Frequency	Percent
Yes	241	80.3
No	59	19.7
Total	300	100

Table 7 shows that 80.3% take selfies regularly while 19.7% do not take selfies regularly.

The first hypothesis stated that female respondents will significantly score highest on pathological selfies than male respondents. The hypothesis was analyzed with t-test for independent samples and the result is presented on table 4.8

Table 8, Summary Table of Independent Sample t-test Showing the Gender Difference on Pathological Selfies

	Gender	N	$\bar{X}$	SD	Df	T	P
Pathological selfies	Male	110	54.91	9.81	298	.763	>.05
	Female	190	53.97	10.13			

Table 8 shows that gender do not significantly influence pathological selfies ($t = .763$; $df = 298$; $p > .05$). This means that male respondent ($X = 54.91$; $SD = 9.81$) reported higher pathological selfies compared to female respondent ($X = 53.97$; $SD = 10.13$) who reported low pathological selfies.

The second hypothesis stated that respondents with smart phones will report significantly higher pathological selfies than those with other type of phones. This hypothesis was tested using the t-test for independence and the result presented in Table 4.9.

Table 9: t-test summary table showing difference between respondents with smart phones and other type of phones on pathological selfies

	Type of phone	N	$\bar{X}$	Std	df	T	P
Pathological selfies	Smart phone	89	56.89	10.25	298	-2.93	<0.05
	Other phones	211	53.23	9.75			

The result from table 9 shows that respondents with smart phones ($M=56.89$, $S.D= 10.25$) significantly reported higher scores on pathological selfies compare to respondents with other type of phones ($M=53.23$, $S.D =9.75$). Respondents with smart phones significantly reported higher pathological selfies ($t(120) = -3.01$, $p<.05$) than those with other type of phones spent shorter years. This implies that type of phones significantly influences pathological selfies. The hypothesis is thus accepted.

The third hypothesis stated that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism and narcissistic personality traits will significantly, jointly and independently predict pathological selfies. The hypothesis was tested with multiple regression and the result is presented in Table 10.

Table 10: Summary of Multiple Regressions showing the Influence of extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism

Variable	R	R ²	F	p	β	t	p
Extraversion					.20	2.91	>.05
Agreeableness					-.29	- 4.03	>.01
Conscientiousness					.24	3.90	<.01
Openness	.49	.29	15.09	<.01	.03	.57	>.05
Neuroticism					.19	3.33	<.05
Narcissistic					.22	3.91	<.01

The results in table 4.10 showed that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism and narcissistic jointly predicted pathological ($R = .49$; $R^2 = .29$; $F(6, 293) = 15.09$; $p<.01$). This implies that extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, openness, neuroticism and narcissistic jointly accounted for 29% variance in pathological selfies while the remaining 71% could be attributed to other variables not considered in this study. However, the analysis of the independent predictions indicated that extraversion ($\beta = .20$; $t=2.91$; $p<.05$); agreeableness ($\beta = -.29$; $t=-4.03$; $p<.01$); conscientiousness ($\beta = .24$; $t=3.90$; $p<.01$); neuroticism ($\beta = .19$; $t=3.91$; $p<.05$) and narcissistic ($\beta = .22$; $t=3.91$; $p<.05$) predicted significant independent influence on pathological selfies. Therefore, stated hypothesis is supported by the results obtained and accepted in this study

Discussion

This section is concerned with the discussion of the findings highlighted in the chapter four and the results of the hypotheses tested. Findings from the study tend to support what many other similar researchers have found. Results from the study showed that gender of participants did significantly influence pathological selfies, the results show that males are more active in taking selfies compare to female counterparts. These findings are similar to the result of poll conducted by Telegraph Magazine (January 12, 2015), it found that a quarter of men polled share selfies to make current or previous partners jealous, and one in ten did it to make themselves more desirable

to potential partners. In comparison, half that number of women take selfies to make ex or partners jealous (just 13 per cent), and only one in 15 (seven per cent) take pictures to make themselves more desirable to potential partners. The main reason women take selfies is to share what they're doing with friends (35 per cent) and to record memories (26 per cent). Indeed, scholars have shown that men tend to portray themselves on selfies according to stereotypical standards of masculinity (e.g. power) and women instead portray themselves as "affiliative" (Biolcati & Passini, 2018). That is, through online activities, women try to communicate and extend their social network and to seek social satisfaction (Dhir et al., 2016; Joiner et al., 2012). The differences in overall selfie posting frequencies could also be explained by the fact that the men in this sample may have higher scores on narcissism as compared to women. In this sense, it is reasonable that individuals with high levels of narcissism use selfies as a usual means to manage impressions (Sung et al., 2016).

Second hypothesis which states that owning smartphone influence selfies behaviour was confirmed. Though, no previous research was found relating to this result, it is observed that one who has smartphones combine with situational factors (i.e., technological, social, and experiential factors) play a key role in influencing the development of pathological selfies. Individual as social beings are susceptible to do what they observe others doing, especially at the sight of the cue objects (Smartphone) (Frey & Gerry, 2006).

The third hypothesis that personality traits (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness to experience and narcissism will jointly influence selfies among participants was confirmed; this is in line with some previous studies that showed that there was a relationship between online behaviors and different personality traits, founding that high extraversion, high openness to experience, high neuroticism and low conscientiousness predict more Social Network use (Ross et al., 2009; Ryan and Xenos, 2011; Eftekhari et al., 2014). Recently, studies started focusing also on the role of personality traits on selfie behaviors, employing the Five Factor Model as main personality theoretical framework, and found high extraversion and high neuroticism predicting more selfies (Qiu et al., 2015; Sorokowska et al., 2016; Lee and Ashton, 2004; Ashton and Lee, 2007; Ashton et al., 2014). Added to that, some studies on the relationship between selfies and narcissism found a significant relationship and narcissism as predictor of pathological selfies (Barry et al., 2015; Fox and Rooney, 2015; Sorokowski et al., 2015; Weiser, 2015). This implies that narcissism, neuroticism and Extraversion are related to all kinds of pathological selfie behaviours investigated.

Conclusion

This research provides an overview of current research on influence of personality traits and narcissistic on pathological selfies. Most evident is that these research literature bases have been growing, often in parallel ways with the results of this study. The research concludes that personality as a whole does influence pathological selfies among individual undergraduates. Also, narcissism predicts the level of pathological selfies among individual participants. Having smartphones also have significant influence on pathological selfies and the demographic variables especially sex did not have a significant influence on pathological selfies in this study. The result implies that, personality of individual students may determine the level of his/her pathological selfies. It was also discovered that, students are narcissistic have tendencies for pathological

2019; *Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2*

selfies. Therefore, government should bring up a programme that will aid awareness of pathological selfies and, counseling centers to educate people on how to manage their personality patterns that foil unhealthy phone usage in our society.

Recommendations

In order to achieve a balance and healthy lifestyles, there is need to pay attention to means of fostering mechanisms that alleviate unhealthy smartphones usage. On the basis of the findings reached in this study, the following measures are suggested in order to reduce the phenomenon of pathological selfies challenge globally and in Nigerian particularly:

- i. There should be public enlightenment through the mass media on the side effects of pathological selfies and how it affects the wellbeing of the victims in matter of concentration, positioning of necking and other social and physiological implication of phone addiction lifestyles.
- ii. Psychologists should be ready to build some kind of behavioural therapy or counseling that will find-tune the affected individuals top normalcy considering personality related modules that will help to rescue the public from new pathological construct.

Reference

- Ames, D.R., Paul, R., & Anderson, C.P. (2006). The NPI-16 as a short measure of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, (40)440–450
- Ashton M. C., Lee K. (2007). Empirical, theoretical, and practical advantages of the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 11, 150–166.
- Ashton M. C., Lee K. (2009). The HEXACO-60: a short measure of the major dimensions of personality. *J. Pers. Assess.* 91, 340–345. 10.1080/00223890902935878 [[PubMed](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]
- Ashton, M. C., Lee K., & De-Vries R. E. (2014). The HEXACO Honesty-Humility, agreeableness, and emotionality factors: a review of research and theory. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 18, 139–152. 10.1177/1088868314523838 [[PubMed](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]
- Ashton, M. C., Lee K., de Vries R. E., Perugini M., Gnisci A., & Sergi I. (2006). The HEXACO model of personality structure and indigenous lexical personality dimensions in Italian, Dutch, and English. *J. Res. Pers.* 40, 851–875. 10.1016/j.jrp.2005.06.003 [[Cross Ref](#)]
- Ashton, M. C., Lee K., Perugini M., Szarota P., De Vries R. E., Di Blas L., et al. . (2004). A six-factor structure of personality-descriptive adjectives: solutions from psycholexical studies in seven languages. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 86, 356–366. 10.1037/0022-3514.86.2.356 [[PubMed](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]

Barry, C. T., Doucette H., Loflin D. C., Rivera-Hudson N., Herrington L. L. (2015). “Let Me

Take a Selfie”: associations between self-photography, narcissism, and self esteem. *Psychol. Pop. Media Cult.* 10.1037/ppm0000089 Available online at: <http://psycnet.apa.org/psycarticles/2015-28942-001> [Cross Ref]

Bresin, K., Gordon K. H. (2011). Characterizing pathological narcissism in terms of the

HEXACO model of personality. *J. Psychopathol. Behav. Assess.* 33, 228–235. 10.1007/s10862-010-9210-9 [Cross Ref]

Butt, S., Phillips J. G. (2008). Personality and self reported mobile phone use. *Comput. Human*

Behav. 24, 346–360. 10.1016/j.chb.2007.01.019 [Cross Ref]

Chirumbolo, A., Leone L. (2010). Personality and politics: The role of the HEXACO model of

personality in predicting ideology and voting. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 49, 43–48. 10.1016/j.paid.2010.03.004 [Cross Ref]

Chong, E. S., Zhang Y., Mak W. W., Pang I. H. (2015). Social media as social capital of LGB

individuals in Hong Kong: its relations with group membership, stigma, and mental well-being. *Am. J. Community Psychol.* 55, 228–238. 10.1007/s10464-014-9699-2 [PubMed] [Cross Ref]

DeHaan, S., Kuper L. E., Magee J. C., Bigelow L., Mustanski B. S. (2013). The interplay

between online and offline explorations of identity, relationships, and sex: a mixed-methods study with LGBT youth. *J. Sex Res.* 50, 421–434. 10.1080/00224499.2012.661489 [PubMed] [Cross Ref]

Dhir, A., Pallesen S., Torsheim T., Andreassen C. S. (2016). Do age and gender differences exist

in selfie-related behaviours? *Comput. Human Behav.* 63, 549–555. 10.1016/j.chb.2016.05.053 [Cross Ref]

Eftekhari, A., Fullwood C., Morris N. (2014). Capturing personality from Facebook photos and

photo-related activities: how much exposure do you need? *Comput. Human Behav.* 37, 162–170. 10.1016/j.chb.2014.04.048 [Cross Ref]

Elvira, M., Orgesa, M., Ortenca, K. (2017). Selfie-Mania Influence on Adolescent Self-Esteem.

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

Paper Presented In 1-St International Scientific Conference on Professional Sciences in ,
Interdisciplinary Journal Of Research And Development; Vol (Iv), 2. “Alexander Moisiu”
University, Durrës, Albania.

Frey, S. H. and Gerry, V. E. (2006). Modulation of Neural Activity during Observational

Learning of Actions and Their Sequential Orders. *Journal of Neuroscience*, Vol. 26,
December 20, pp. 13194-13201.

Forest, A. L., Wood J. V. (2012). When social networking is not working: individuals with low

self-esteem recognize but do not reap the benefits of self-disclosure on
Facebook. *Psychol. Sci.* 23, 295–302. 10.1177/0956797611429709 [[PubMed](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]

Fox, J., Rooney M. C. (2015). The Dark Triad and trait self-objectification as predictors of men's

use and self-presentation behaviors on social networking sites. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 76,
161–165. 10.1016/j.paid.2014.12.017 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Goldberg, D. P., & Hillier, V.F. (1979), A scaled version of the General Health Questionnaire.
Psychological Medicine, 9, 139-145.

Gosling, S. D., Augustine A. A., Vazire S., Holtzman N., Gaddis S. (2011). Manifestations of

personality in online social networks: self-reported Facebook-related behaviors and
observable profile information. *Cyberpsychol. Behav. Soc. Netw.* 14, 483–488.
10.1089/cyber.2010.0087 [[PMC free article](#)] [[PubMed](#)] [[Cross Ref](#)]

Haferkamp, N., Eimler, S. C., Papadakis, A., & Kruck, J. V. (2012). Men Are from

Mars, Women Are from Venus? Examining Gender Differences in Self
Presentation on Social Networking Sites. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior &
Social Networking*, 15(2), 91-98. doi:10.1089/cyber.2011.0151

Halpern, D., Valenzuela S., Katz J. E. (2016). “Selfie-ists” or “Narci-selfiers”? a cross-lagged

panel analysis of selfie taking and narcissism. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 97, 98–101.
10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.019 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Hilbig, B. E., & Zettler I. (2009). Pillars of cooperation: honesty–humility, social value

orientations, and economic behavior. *J. Res. Pers.* 43, 516–519.
10.1016/j.jrp.2009.01.003 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Hughes, D. J., Rowe M., Batey M., & Lee A. (2012). A tale of two sites: twitter vs. facebook and

2019; *Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2*
the personality predictors of social media usage. *Comput. Human Behav.* 28, 561–569.
10.1016/j.chb.2011.11.001 [[Cross Ref](#)]

and money: prediction from the Dark Triad and Honesty–Humility. *Eur. J. Pers.* 27, 169–
184. 10.1002/per.1860 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Jang, J. Y., Han K., Shih P. C., Lee D. (2015). Generation like: comparative

characteristics in Instagram, in *Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on
Human Factors in Computing Systems* (State College, PA: University of Pennsylvania,
ACM;), 4039–4042.

Jonason, P. K., McCain J. (2012). Using the HEXACO model to test the validity of the dirty

dozen measure of the dark triad. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 53, 935–938.
10.1016/j.paid.2012.07.010 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Kinsey, A. C. (1948). *Sexual Behavior in the Human Female*. Philadelphia PA: W. B. Saunders.

Lee K., & Ashton M. C. (2004). Psychometric properties of the HEXACO personality

inventory. *Multivariate Behav. Res.* 39, 329–358. 10.1207/s15327906mbr3902_8.

Lee, K., & Ashton M. C. (2005). Psychopathy, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in the five-

factor model and the HEXACO model of personality structure. *Pers. Individ. Diff.* 38,
1571–1582.

Lee K., Ashton M. C., Wiltshire J., Bourdage J. S., Visser B. A., Gallucci A. (2013). *Sex, Power.*

LHJ

Morelli, M., Bianchi D., Baiocco R., Pezzuti L., & Chirumbolo A. (2016). Sexting,

psychological distress and dating violence among adolescents and young
adults. *Psicothema* 28, 137–142. 10.7334/psicothema2015.193

Morf, C. C., Rhodewalt F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: a dynamic self-

regulatory processing model. *Psychol. Inq.* 12, 177–196. 10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1

Oxford Online Dictionaries (2015). Selfie. Available online

at: <http://www.oxforddictionaries.com/definition/english/selfie>

Paulhus D. L., Williams K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: narcissism,

2019; *Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2*
 machiavellianism, and psychopathy. *J. Res. Pers.* 36, 556–563. 10.1016/S0092-
 6566(02)00505-6

Qiu, L., Lu J., Yang S., Qu W., Zhu T. (2015). What does your selfie say about you?. *Comput.*

Human Behav. 52, 443–449. 10.1016/j.chb.2015.06.032 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Ross, C., Orr E. S., Sisic M., Arseneault J. M., Simmering M. G., Orr R. R. (2009). Personality
 and motivations associated with Facebook use. *Comput. Human Behav.* 25, 578–586.

Roberta, B., & Stefano, P. (2018). Narcissism and self-esteem: Different motivations for selfie
 posting behaviors. *Cogent Psychology*, (5): 143-147
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23311908.2018.1437012>

Sai-Krishna, G., & Krishna, T. (2016). Selfie Syndrome: A Disease of New Era. *Res*
Pharm Health Sci.; 2(2):118-12

Ryan, T., & Xen, O. (2011). The Big Five, shyness, narcissism, loneliness, and Facebook
 usage. *Comput. Human Behav.* 27, 1658–1664. 10.1016/j.chb.2011.02.004 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Seidman, G. (2013). Self-presentation and belonging on Facebook: How personality influences
 social media use and motivations. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 54, 402–407.
 10.1016/j.paid.2012.10.009 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Sorokowska, A., Oleszkiewicz A., Frackowiak T., Pisanski K., Chmiel A., Sorokowski P.
 (2016). Selfies and personality: who posts self-portrait photographs? *Pers. Individ.*
Dif. 90, 119–123. 10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.037 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Sorokowski P., Sorokowska A., Oleszkiewicz A., Frackowiak T., Huk A., Pisanski K.
 (2015). Selfie posting behaviors are associated with narcissism among men. *Pers.*
Individ. Dif. 85, 123–127. 10.1016/j.paid.2015.05.004 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Sung, Y., Lee J. A., Kim E., Choi S. M. (2016). Why we post selfies: understanding motivations
 for posting pictures of oneself. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 97, 260–265.
 10.1016/j.paid.2016.03.032 [[Cross Ref](#)]

Swickert, R. J., Hittner J. B., Harris J. L., & Herring J. A. (2002). Relationships among Internet
 use, personality, and social support. *Computer and Human Behav.* 18, 437–451.

2019; Special Publication of Nigerian Psychological Association Volume 2

Weiser, E. B. (2015). Me: narcissism and its facets as predictors of selfie-posting frequency. *Pers. Individ. Dif.* 86, 477–481.