**MEASURES IN DETAIL**

***Covert Narcissism***

We used the Chinese version of the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS) to assess covert narcissism (Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Wang, 2008). The HSNS is a unidimensional scale consisting of 10 items. It uses a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*very uncharacteristic* or *untrue*, *strongly disagree*) to 5 (*very characteristic* or *true*, *strongly agree*). Higher scores suggest higher levels of covert narcissism. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) suggested a unidimensional model for HSNS; however, the factor loading for item 5(*“I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people’s troubles”*) was low (factor loading = .149). This item’s meaning might be confusing to Chinese because it has more than one interpretation. For example, one interpretation is: “I am tired to worry about others, so I want to control my mind not to be so weak,” or “I feel free that I don’t care about others’ troubles.” Because of multiple interpretations, we did not use this item in the final data analysis. The results of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for the HSNS without item 5 showed a moderate model fit, as follows: *χ2* = 61.23 (*df* = 25), RMSEA = .068 (90% C.I.= 046, .089), CFI = .892, TLI = .845, SRMR = .050. Hendin and Cheek (1997) determined that the HSNS has a range of internal consistency (*α*) from .62 to .75. The Chinese version of the HSNS (Wang, 2008) has a previously reported *α* of .73. The *α* in this study was .69.

***Shame-Focused Coping Strategies***

We measured shame-focused coping strategies using the Compass of Shame Scale (CoSS; Elison et al., 2006a). The CoSS is a self-reported scale with 48 items based on a theory of shame-focused coping strategies proposed by Nathanson (1992). Four factors follow each of 12 shame-inducing situations. The factors represent reactions characteristic of each of the poles: attack self (AS), withdrawal (WD), attack other (AO), and avoidance (AV). Each item’s score ranged on a scale from 1 (never) to 5 (almost always). An example of a shame-inducing situation is: “When I feel rejected by someone.” The possible answers to this situation included “I soothe myself with distractions (AV),” “I repeatedly think about my imperfections (AS),” “I withdraw from the situation (WD),” or “I get angry with them (AO).” Elison et al. (2006a) reported an internal consistency for the four factors from .74 to .91.

Before our study, we secured permission to translate the CoSS into Chinese and to use it in our study (Elison et al., 2006b). With the help of two Chinese-American colleagues in our field, we produced a translation and back translation of this version. EFA suggested a four-factor model, similar to the model proposed by Elison et al. (2006b). However, we deleted six items in our study (AV1, AV12, WD1, WD5, WD12, and AO5) because of low factor loadings or substantial loadings on two or more factors. AV consists of AV3-AV6, AV8-AV11, and WD8, with a range of factor loadings from .226 to .789; AS consists of AS1-AS12 and WD10, with a range of factor loadings from .656 to .974; WD consists of WD2-WD4, WD6-WD7, WD9, and WD11, with a range of factor loadings from .520 to .803; AO consists of AO1–AO12, AV2, and AV7, with a range of factor loadings from .465 to .614. CFA results confirmed this factor structure with a fine model fit as follows: *χ*2 = 1632.47 (*df* = 810), RMSEA = .057 (90% C.I. = .053, .061), CFI = .854, TLI = .845, SRMR = .066. The internal consistency values of the four factors in this study ranged from .78 to .94.

***Depressive Symptoms***

We assessed depressive symptoms using the Symptom Check List-90-Revision (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1994; Wang, 1984). The SCL-90-R is a 90-item self-report symptom inventory designed to assess patterns of psychological symptoms. The depression symptom scale in this study included 13 items. The items were rated on a 5-point Likert-type scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 5 (*very much*). EFA showed that all 13 items loaded significantly and suggested a unidimensional model. CFA demonstrated an acceptable model fit as follows: *χ2* = 330.67 (*df* = 63), RMSEA = .116 (90% C.I. =.104, .128), CFI = .905, TLI = .882, SRMR = .052. The internal consistency value in this study was .94.

***Self-Compassion***

The Self-Compassion Scale (SCS; Neff, 2003) is a self-report scale consisting of 26 items measuring six components: self-kindness, self-judgment, common humanity, isolation, mindfulness, and over-identification. Our study employed the Chinese SCS validated by Gong et al. (2014), consisting of a 12-item scale and three components: self-kindness (SK), common humanity (CH), and mindfulness (MF). Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*almost never*) to 5 (*almost always*). The scale’s internal consistency total for the three factors in Gong et al.’s study was .77, with a range of .56 to .74. In our study, EFA yielded a three-factor model for the SCS, with all 12 items exhibiting substantial loadings. Our model was consistent with Gong et al.’s study, except that item 4 loaded significantly on CH instead of SK. Considering the consistency of the item content suggested by Gong et al., we decided to use Gong et al.’s model without alteration. CFA also showed that Gong et al.’s model in our sample had a moderate model fit as follows: *χ2* = 183.108 (*df* =50), RMSEA = .093 (90% C.I. =.079, .108), CFI = .911, TLI = .880, SRMR = .098. The scale’s internal consistency total was .69, and the three factors were as follows: CH: .77, MF: .87, SK: .54.

CoSS CFA RESULTS

MODEL FIT INFORMATION

Number of Free Parameters 135

Loglikelihood

H0 Value -17500.092

H1 Value -16683.859

Information Criteria

Akaike (AIC) 35270.184

Bayesian (BIC) 35777.209

Sample-Size Adjusted BIC 35349.023

(n\* = (n + 2) / 24)

Chi-Square Test of Model Fit

Value 1632.465

Degrees of Freedom 810

P-Value 0.0000

RMSEA (Root Mean Square Error Of Approximation)

Estimate 0.057

90 Percent C.I. 0.053 0.061

Probability RMSEA <= .05 0.003

CFI/TLI

CFI 0.854

TLI 0.845

Chi-Square Test of Model Fit for the Baseline Model

Value 6494.350

Degrees of Freedom 861

P-Value 0.0000

SRMR (Standardized Root Mean Square Residual)

Value 0.066

MODEL RESULTS

Two-Tailed

Estimate S.E. Est./S.E. P-Value

AV BY

AV3 0.226 0.062 3.646 0.000

AV4 0.622 0.064 9.716 0.000

AV5 0.549 0.066 8.277 0.000

AV6 0.637 0.073 8.776 0.000

AV8 0.734 0.067 10.944 0.000

AV9 0.761 0.059 12.827 0.000

AV10 0.479 0.074 6.509 0.000

AV11 0.789 0.063 12.444 0.000

WD8 0.595 0.063 9.448 0.000

AS BY

AS1 0.763 0.057 13.384 0.000

AS2 0.656 0.056 11.792 0.000

AS3 0.894 0.057 15.668 0.000

AS4 0.882 0.058 15.182 0.000

AS5 0.789 0.063 12.549 0.000

AS6 0.766 0.054 14.227 0.000

AS7 0.865 0.058 14.918 0.000

AS8 0.974 0.055 17.841 0.000

AS9 0.891 0.060 14.860 0.000

AS10 0.873 0.055 15.872 0.000

AS11 0.843 0.057 14.740 0.000

AS12 0.810 0.060 13.518 0.000

WD10 0.765 0.059 13.068 0.000

WD BY

WD2 0.520 0.063 8.218 0.000

WD3 0.783 0.055 14.281 0.000

WD4 0.770 0.061 12.719 0.000

WD6 0.741 0.061 12.155 0.000

WD7 0.803 0.059 13.657 0.000

WD9 0.689 0.062 11.138 0.000

WD11 0.798 0.062 12.832 0.000

AO BY

AO1 0.512 0.049 10.362 0.000

AO2 0.614 0.057 10.780 0.000

AO3 0.578 0.051 11.314 0.000

AO4 0.465 0.042 11.068 0.000

AO6 0.537 0.052 10.313 0.000

AO7 0.475 0.062 7.708 0.000

AO8 0.589 0.051 11.472 0.000

AO9 0.586 0.051 11.375 0.000

AO10 0.472 0.052 9.099 0.000

AO11 0.548 0.065 8.391 0.000

AO12 0.501 0.049 10.218 0.000

AV2 0.503 0.051 9.764 0.000

AV7 0.504 0.058 8.689 0.000

AS WITH

AV 0.521 0.051 10.182 0.000

WD WITH

AV 0.695 0.044 15.878 0.000

AS 0.797 0.029 27.743 0.000

AO WITH

AV 0.404 0.060 6.737 0.000

AS 0.568 0.045 12.558 0.000

WD 0.644 0.044 14.557 0.000

WD10 WITH

AS10 0.273 0.042 6.464 0.000

AV8 WITH

AV5 0.313 0.063 4.944 0.000

AS11 WITH

AV11 0.238 0.047 5.023 0.000