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ABSTRACT Evidence has accrued to suggest that there are 2 distinct dimensions of narcissism, which are often labeled grandiose and vulner- able narcissism. Although individuals high on either of these dimensions interact with others in an antagonistic manner, they differ on other cen- tral constructs (e.g., Neuroticism, Extraversion). In the current study, we conducted an exploratory factor analysis of 3 prominent self-report mea- sures of narcissism (N 5 858) to examine the convergent and discriminant validity of the resultant factors. A 2-factor structure was found, which supported the notion that these scales include content consistent with 2 relatively distinct constructs: grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. We then compared the similarity of the nomological networks of these di- mensions in relation to indices of personality, interpersonal behavior, and psychopathology in a sample of undergraduates (n 5 238). Overall, the nomological networks of vulnerable and grandiose narcissism were un- related. The current results support the need for a more explicit parsing of the narcissism construct at the level of conceptualization and assessment.

Over the past three decades, there has been a growing interest in the study of narcissism and an increasing recognition of the existence of substantial heterogeneity within the construct. Multiples studies have documented the existence of two or more forms of narcissism, which are often referred to as grandiose versus vulnerable narcissism (Dick- inson & Pincus, 2003; Fossati et al., 2005; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Russ, Shedler, Bradley, & Westen, 2008; Wink, 1991). Grandiose nar- cissism primarily reﬂects traits related to grandiosity, aggression, and dominance, whereas vulnerable narcissism reﬂects a defensive and in- secure grandiosity that obscures feelings of inadequacy, incompetence,
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and negative affect. Individuals with traits of vulnerable narcissism have been described as being the ‘‘inhibited, shame-ridden, and hy- persensitive shy type, whose low tolerance for attention from others and hypervigilant readiness for criticism or failure makes him/her more socially passive’’ (Ronningstam, 2009, p. 113). Most experts agree that the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 4th Edition (DSM-IV; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) symptoms of nar- cissistic personality disorder (NPD) emphasizes the grandiose dimen- sion over the vulnerable dimension (e.g., Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008), although the corresponding descriptive text includes descriptions of both grandiosity and vulnerability associated with NPD.

Unfortunately, a review of the literature on narcissism makes it clear

that the distinction between these two dimensions has not been con-

sistently made in either the empirical or theoretical literature on nar-

cissism, which we believe has had ‘‘serious consequences for the ﬁeld as

a great deal of unreliability is introduced into our communications,

assessments, and conceptualizations’’ of narcissism (Miller, Widiger, &

Campbell, 2010). A recent empirical example of this problem can be

seen in the results of a study by Samuel and Widiger (2008), in which

they examined the correlations among ﬁve self-report measures of

narcissism and NPD, as well as each measure’s respective correlations

with a measure of the Five Factor Model (FFM) of personality, the

Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R; Costa & McCrae,

1992). Despite inﬂation due to shared method variance, the convergent

correlation among the ﬁve narcissism measures was only .45. The nar-

cissism measures also demonstrated divergent patterns of correlations

with the NEO PI-R. In fact, the authors noted that the measures only

shared a common negative relation with FFM Agreeableness. The

narcissism measures diverged in important ways, however, with regard

to their relations with Extraversion (rs ranged from .15 to .48) and

Neuroticism (rs ranged from .40 to .13).

Overall, we believe these ﬁndings may be indicative of the com-

mingling of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism that has occurred

both at the level of conceptualization and assessment of the narcis-

sism/NPD construct. If so, this represents a signiﬁcant barrier to the

development of a cohesive and valid theoretical and empirical liter-

ature on narcissism and NPD because the nomological networks of

these two forms of narcissism appear to be substantially different. In

fact, it is our contention that the primary feature shared by these two

forms of narcissism is a tendency to interact with others in an an-

tagonistic manner (e.g., manipulative, callous, noncooperative, an- gry). On many other central constructs, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism appear to be substantially different.

The goal of the present article is to assess the nomological net- works associated with grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. We use a range of criteria to assess the networks that can be broadly grouped into the domains of personality (e.g., FFM, self-esteem, entitlement), interpersonal behavior (e.g., attachment, social cognition, strangers’ rating of personality), and psychopathology (e.g., depression, anx- iety, personality disorders). Given the large number of external cri- teria used, we then compare these grandiose and vulnerable narcissism factors via the calculation of proﬁle ﬁt indices. This lat- ter approach is a procedure whereby the proﬁle of a construct, as assessed by its correlations with a wide range of markers, can be compared with the proﬁle generated by another construct. The re- sults of this study should provide a clear portrait of the similarities and distinctions between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism.

Review of the Nomological Nets of Grandiose and Vulnerable

Narcissism

Personality

From a general trait perspective, several studies have demonstrated that grandiose narcissism is positively related to Extraversion and negatively related to Agreeableness and Neuroticism from the FFM (e.g., Miller & Campbell, 2008; Paulhus & Williams, 2002). Alter- natively, vulnerable narcissism is primarily positively related to Neu- roticism and negatively related to Extraversion and Agreeableness (e.g., Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Miller, Dir, et al., 2010). From an FFM perspective, these two narcissism dimensions appear to share only a tendency to interact with others in a cold, hostile, and an- tagonistic manner. Even within this interpersonal domain, there is some evidence to suggest the traits associated with grandiose and vulnerable narcissism are not identical. For example, within the Agreeableness domain, Miller, Dir, et al. (2010) found that vulner- able narcissism manifested its largest correlation with the facet of trust (r 5 .42) and its smallest correlation with modesty (r 5 .13), whereas grandiose narcissism manifested its largest correlation with modesty (r 5 .62) and its smallest correlation with trust (r 5 .06). Although individuals high on either narcissism

dimension behave antagonistically, the motivation behind these be- haviors may be quite different (e.g., vulnerable narcissism: hostile attribution bias; grandiose narcissism: self-enhancement).

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism also manifest substantially different relations with self-esteem, with grandiose narcissism typically manifesting a small to moderate positive correlation and vulnerable narcissism manifesting a moderate negative correlation (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Pincus et al., 2009; Sedikides, Rudich, Gregg, Kumashiro, & Rusbult, 2004). The divergent relations between these forms of narcissism and self-esteem are indicative of fundamental differences in the nature of these constructs.

Interpersonal Behavior

Grandiose and vulnerable forms of narcissism are related differen- tially to a number of environmental factors thought to be important in the etiology of narcissism, such as child abuse and poor parenting practices. Although the empirical evidence is limited, research suggests that only vulnerable narcissism is signiﬁcantly related to reports of childhood abuse and problematic parenting (e.g., Miller, Dir, et al.,

2010; Otway & Vignoles, 2006). Given these potentially different child- hood experiences and personality traits, one would expect that these forms of narcissism would be differentially related to adult interper- sonal styles, which may develop due to a number of factors, including early attachment styles and temperamental differences.

Two adult attachment dimensions that are often described, in isolation and combination, are attachment avoidance (i.e., main- taining emotional distance from romantic partners and overempha- sizing autonomy and independence) and attachment anxiety (i.e., fear that romantic relationships will end or that one’s love is not fully reciprocated). These dimensions can also be combined such that in- dividuals who are high on both are described as having a fearful attachment style, those high on avoidance and low on anxiety are described as having a dismissive attachment style, and those high on anxiety and low on avoidance are described as having a preoccupied attachment style. Vulnerable narcissism appears to be related to an anxious or fearful attachment (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003; Otway & Vignoles, 2006), whereas grandiose narcissism seems related to either a secure or dismissive attachment style (e.g., Dickinson & Pincus,

2003; Miller et al., 2010).

Individuals high on either vulnerable or grandiose narcissism are also viewed differently by others with whom they interact. Wink (1991) found that spouses described individuals with high scores on either narcissism dimension as ‘‘bossy, intolerant, cruel, argumentative, dis- honest, opportunistic, conceited, arrogant, and demanding’’ (Wink,

1991, p. 595; i.e., antagonistic). Spouses of individuals high on grandiose narcissism, however, described them as being ‘‘aggressive, hardheaded, immodest, outspoken, assertive and determined’’ (Wink, p. 595; i.e., extraverted/dominant). Alternatively, spouses of individuals high on vul- nerable narcissism described them as ‘‘worrying, emotional, defensive, anxious, bitter, tense, and complaining’’ (Wink, p. 595; i.e., neurotic).

Psychopathology, Affect, and Treatment Implications

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism also manifest divergent rela- tions with indices of psychopathology, such as symptoms of anxiety, depression, and psychological distress. Grandiose narcissism is typ- ically either negatively related or unrelated to symptoms of distress (e.g., Sedikides et al., 2004), whereas vulnerable narcissism manifests signiﬁcant correlations with symptoms such as depression, anxiety, hostility, and paranoia (e.g., Miller, Dir, et al., 2010). The two also manifest divergent relations with other forms of personality pathol- ogy. Grandiose narcissism appears to be a stronger correlate of an- tisocial and histrionic personality disorders (PDs), whereas vulnerable narcissism appears to be a stronger correlate of avoid- ant and borderline PDs (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003; Miller, Dir, et al., 2010). It is noteworthy that Miller, Dir, and colleagues (2010) found that vulnerable narcissism created a personality proﬁle that was highly consistent (r 5 .94) with the trait proﬁle created by bor- derline personality disorder (BPD). In fact, these authors suggested that vulnerable narcissism may actually be a nearer neighbor of BPD than NPD, given the shared predispositions to negative emotions. Consistent with these ﬁndings, vulnerable narcissism, like BPD, is more strongly linked with nonsuicidal self-injury and suicide at- tempts (e.g., Pincus et al., 2009). In addition, these forms of narcis- sism are differentially associated with the utilization of psychiatric treatment such that grandiose narcissism is negatively associated with treatment utilization, whereas vulnerable narcissism is posi- tively associated with utilization (Pincus et al., 2009).

Current Study

To examine the convergent and discriminant validity of these fac- tors, we ﬁrst selected three prominent measures of grandiose narcis- sism (Narcissistic Personality Inventory [NPI]; Raskin & Terry,

1988), vulnerable narcissism (Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale

[HSNS]; Hendin & Cheek, 1997), or both (Pathological Narcissism

Inventory [PNI]; Pincus et al., 2009). These scales were then sub-

mitted to an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) to identify structur-

ally valid indicators of these narcissism dimensions. The factor

structure was explored in a large data set that combined data from

two samples (total N 5 858; Sample 1: n 5 620; Sample 2: n 5 238).

Two narcissism factors were extracted (grandiose and vulnerable)

and compared (in Sample 2) in relation to indices of personality,

interpersonal behavior, and psychopathology.

We expected that grandiose and vulnerable narcissism would

manifest largely divergent relations with these various constructs

in a manner that is consistent with the extant literature reviewed

earlier. For example, we expected vulnerable narcissism to be more

strongly related to indices of negative emotionality, psychological

distress, lower self-esteem, and poorer attachment styles. Con-

versely, we expected that the grandiose narcissism dimension would

demonstrate a pattern of correlations indicative of an outgoing, ag-

gressive, and dominant intra- and interpersonal style (e.g., positive

relations with self and stranger ratings of Extraversion, more self-

focused negotiation style, higher self-esteem). Consistent with pre-

vious research, we expected that the narcissism variants would

mainly share the use of cold, hostile, and selﬁsh interpersonal strat-

egies for relating to others but would diverge substantially in relation

to several personality constructs (e.g., Neuroticism, Extraversion,

self-esteem), interpersonal behavior (e.g., attachment and negotia-

tion styles, how strangers would rate the personality traits associated

with these dimensions [using Oltmanns, Friedman, Fiedler, & Turk-

heimer’s (2004) ‘‘thin slice’’ methodology]), and psychopathology

(e.g., depression, anxiety, negative affect, DSM-IV PDs).1

1. The thin slice methodology used here is derived from research by Oltmanns and colleagues (2004), in which strangers are asked to rate participants’ person- alities (FFM domains) and other characteristics (in this case, physical attractive- ness, likability, and narcissism) after brief exposures to the participant. In the current study, graduate students rated the participants on these variables after

Sample 1

METHOD

Participants and Procedure

Participants were 620 undergraduate men and women recruited from the research participant pool at a large southeastern university (60% women; mean age 5 19.20; SD 5 1.94; 78% Caucasian). Participants received re- search credit in exchange for their participation. Upon signing informed consent, participants completed a packet containing a variety of self-re- port questionnaires. Participants were debriefed at the completion of the study.

Sample 2

Participants were 238 undergraduate men and women recruited from the research participant pool from the same university (60% women; mean age 5 19.13; SD 5 1.26; 83% Caucasian). Participants received research credit in exchange for their participation. Upon signing informed consent, participants completed a packet containing a variety of self-report ques- tionnaires and laboratory tasks. At the end of the session, participants in- dividually completed a videotaped 60-second interview in which they were asked to respond to the following question: ‘‘What do you like doing?’’ Participants were debriefed at the completion of the study. Institutional Review Board approval was obtained for both studies.

Samples 1 and 2 Narcissism Measures

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI). The NPI (Raskin & Terry,

1988) is a 40-item self-report assessment of trait narcissism. The NPI total

score manifests good internal consistency and signiﬁcant correlations

with expert ratings of NPD (Miller & Campbell, 2008). In the current

study, we used 23 items that were divided into two factors (Leadership/

Authority [L/A] 5 9 items; Exhibitionism/Entitlement [E/E] 5 14 items)

on the basis of factor analyses by Corry, Merritt, Mrug, and Pamp (2008)

and Kubarych, Deary, and Austin (2004). We used these two NPI factors

(scored on the basis of these 23 items) as they evidence better replicability

than other factor structures based on the NPI (e.g., seven-factor structure;

see Corry et al., 2008, and Kubarych et al., 2004). See Table 1 for the

alphas for all narcissism scales.

watching 60-s videotaped clips of the participants answering, ‘‘What do you enjoy doing?’’

Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS). The HSNS (Hendin & Cheek,

1997) is a 10-item self-report measure that reﬂects hypersensitivity, vulner-

ability, and entitlement. Previous research suggests that the HSNS

manifests adequate internal consistency and is correlated with measures

of covert narcissism, Neuroticism, and disagreeableness (Hendin & Cheek,

1997).

Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI). The PNI (Pincus et al., 2009) is a 52-item self-report measure of traits related to vulnerable and grandiose narcissism. Four subscales are thought to be related to vulner- able narcissism: contingent self-esteem (PNI CSE), hiding the self (PNI HS), devaluing (PNI Dev), and entitlement rage (PNI ER). Three subscales are thought to be related to grandiose narcissism: self-sacriﬁcing self-en- hancement (PNI SSSE), grandiose fantasies (PNI GF), and exploitativeness (PNI E).

Sample 2 Personality Measures

Descriptive data are reported in Table 3.

Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO PI-R). The NEO PI-R (Costa & McCrae, 1992) is a 240-item self-report measure of the FFM. The higher order domains of the NEO PI-R include Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness, Agreeableness, and Conscientiousness; each of these domains is underlain by six more speciﬁc facets.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES). The RSES (Rosenberg, 1965) is a

10-item global measure of self-esteem in which the items are scored on a 1

(Disagree strongly) to4 (Agree strongly) scale.

Psychological Entitlement Scale (PES). The PES (Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004) is a nine-item self-report measure of the extent to which individuals believe that they deserve and are entitled to more than others. Items are scored on a 1 (strong disagreement) to 7 (strong agreement) scale.

Sample 2 Interpersonal Behavior Measures

Descriptive data are reported in Table 4.

Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised (ECR-R). The ECR-R (Fraley, Waller, & Brennan, 2000) is a 36-item self-report measure of two adult attachment styles: avoidance (18 items) and anxiety (18 items).

The ECR-R subscales manifest good internal consistency and structural validity, as well as convergent and divergent validity with expected con- structs (e.g., worry, avoidance of touch; Fairchild & Finney, 2006).

Social vignettes. Participants read 12 vignettes (Tremblay & Belchevski,

2004) describing a hypothetical interaction in which another person per-

forms a behavior that might be considered provocative to the participant

(e.g., ‘‘You are at a local dance club. While you are dancing a stranger

bumps into you very roughly.’’); four were ‘‘hostile’’ in nature, four were

‘‘ambiguous,’’ and four were ‘‘unintentional.’’ The participants were then

asked questions answered on a 1 (not at all likely) to 11 (extremely likely)

scale, which assessed the likelihood of (a) experiencing anger during the

interaction, (b) expressing anger toward the other individual in the in-

teraction, (c) being rude, (d) yelling or swearing, (e) threatening the other

person if the situation was not resolved, and (f ) using physical force if the

situation was not resolved. The answers for each of these six variables

were summed across the 12 vignettes.

Resource dilemma. This task, created by Sheldon and McGregor (2000), is based on the ‘‘tragedy of the commons’’ dilemma. Participants were required to believe they owned a timber company and were competing with three similar companies to harvest trees in the same national forest. Three dependent variables were created from this task: acquisitiveness (how much the participant hoped to proﬁt more than the other compa- nies), apprehensiveness (the degree to which the participant expected the other companies to try to maximize their own proﬁts), and harvest bids (how may hectares the participant would ‘‘bid’’ to cut down each year across a 4-year period; each company could bid to harvest 0 to 10 hectares per year). The dilemma in this situation is that if all four companies put their own proﬁt motives ﬁrst and harvest too much, the forest will be deforested, leaving no available resources for all four companies. Partic- ipants were told that the forest regenerates at a rate of 10% each year. Following Sheldon and McGregor, participants are told: ‘‘It may be to the four companies’ collective advantage to make smaller bids. However, another danger is that a company will not do as well because it cuts less than the other three companies. Thus, it may be to each company’s in- dividual advantage to make larger bids’’ (p. 393). Acquisitiveness and apprehensiveness were each measured with one question. The harvest bids variable was measured with ﬁve questions (one bid per year).

Thin slices. Following the protocol described by Oltmanns and col- leagues (2004), each participant was individually videotaped for 60 s while answering the following question: ‘‘What do you enjoy doing?’’ Each

video clip was then rated by, on average, 11 raters who were doctoral students in a clinical psychology program. The graduate students rated the following constructs (using one item per construct) on a 1 to 5 Likert- type scale: Neuroticism, Extraversion, Openness to Experience, Agree- ableness, Conscientiousness, physical attractiveness, likability, and nar- cissism. Descriptions for the ﬁve personality domains were consistent with FFM deﬁnitions (e.g., Costa & McCrae, 1992). For physical attrac- tiveness, no descriptors were given. For likability, raters were asked,

‘‘How likable do you ﬁnd this individual (would you want to get to know

him/her better)?’’ For narcissism, raters were given the following descrip-

tors to go along with the ‘‘narcissistic’’ label: self-centered, grandiose, and

overly conﬁdent. Interrater reliability was calculated using intraclass cor-

relations, which ranged from .77 (likability) to .92 (physical attractive-

ness), with a median of .86. Composites were created for subsequent

analyses by taking the mean of all available ratings.

Sample 2 Psychopathology and Affect Measures

Descriptive data are reported in Table 5.

Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). The BSI (Derogatis & Melisaratos, 1983) is a 53-item measure of psychological symptoms experienced during the past week that includes speciﬁc symptom scales and a global severity index (GSI).

Positive and Negative Affect Schedule-Expanded Form (PANAS-X). The PANAS-X (Watson & Clark, 1994) is a 60-item self-report measure of affect. In the current study, we report on the factors of positive affect (10 items) and negative affect (10 items).

Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Personality Disorders-Person- ality Questionnaire (SCID-II/PQ). The SCID-II P/Q (First, Gibbon, Spitzer, Williams, & Benjamin, 1997) is a 119-item self-report question- naire designed to assess the DSM-IV PDs.

RESULTS

Bivariate Correlations Among Self-Report Narcissism Scales

Because of the number of signiﬁcance tests conducted, a p-value equal to or less than .001 was used for all analyses. The 10 self-report narcissism scales evinced correlations with one another ranging from

Bivariate Correlations Among the 10 Narcissism Scales

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | a | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 9 | 10 |
| NPI L/A | .92 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| NPI E/E | .92 | .50n | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PNI CSE | .94 | .16n | .07 | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PNI E | .83 | .41n | .32n | .02 | — |  |  |  |  |  |
| PNI SSSE | .74 | .13n | .14n | .28n | .30n | — |  |  |  |  |
| PNI HS | .80 | .07 | .05 | .39n | .18n | .21n | — |  |  |  |
| PNI GF | .91 | .25n | .22n | .29n | .26n | .38n | .26n | — |  |  |
| PNI Dev | .82 | .01 | .07n | .47n | .12 | .21n | .39n | .23n | — |  |
| PNI ER | .89 | .13n | .28n | .55n | .28n | .26n | .32n | .36n | .56n — |  |

HSNS .71 .04 .11 .57n .09 .16n .32n .30n .46n .55n —

Note. N 5 858. NPI L/A 5 Narcissistic Personality Inventory Leadership/Authority; NPI E/E 5 Exhibitionism/Entitlement; PNI CSE 5 Pathological Narcissism Inventory Contingent Self-Esteem; PNI E 5 Exploitativeness; PNI SSSE 5 Self-Serving Self- Enhancement; PNI HS 5 Hiding the Self; PNI GF 5 Grandiose Fantasies; PNI Dev5Devaluing; PNI ER 5 Entitlement Rage; HSNS5Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale. np .001.

.16 (NPI Leadership/Authority—PNI Contingent Self-Esteem) to

.57 (PNI Contingent Self-Esteem—Hypersensitive Narcissism

Scale), with a median of .26 (see Table 1).

Factor Structure of the Self-Report Narcissism Measures

To determine the factor structure of the narcissism scales, we con- ducted an EFA using all available data (N 5 858; principal axis fac- toring with an oblimin rotation) of the two scale-level scores from the NPI (L/A and E/E), seven subscales from the PNI (PNI CSE, PNI E, PNI SSSE, PNI HS, PNI GF, PNI Dev, and PNI ER), and the HSNS. The EFA resulted in two eigenvalues with values of 1.0 or greater and a scree plot suggestive of two factors The ﬁrst ﬁve eigen- values were as follows: 3.385, 1.917, .995, .794, and .658; the ﬁrst two factors explained 53.02% of the variance. We next employed both the Parallel Analysis (PA) method of Horn (1965) and the Minimum Average Partial (MAP) method of Velicer (1976) to identify the op- timal number of factors. The PA method suggested that up to four

factors could be extracted, whereas the MAP method suggested that only two factors be extracted.2

The two-factor solution is presented in Table 2. Factor 1 com-

prised many of the scales typically associated with vulnerable

narcissism: PNI Contingent Self-Esteem, PNI Hiding the Self,

PNI Devaluing, PNI Entitlement Rage, and the Hypersensitive

Narcissism Scale; we titled this factor ‘‘vulnerable narcissism.’’

This factor also comprised signiﬁcant loadings from scales thought

to represent grandiose narcissism as assessed by the PNI (i.e.,

Self-Serving Self-Enhancement and Grandiose Fantasies). Factor 2

comprised many of the scales associated with grandiose nar-

cissism, including NPI Leadership/Authority, NPI Exhibitionism/

Entitlement, and PNI Exploitativeness, as well as secondary loadings

from PNI Grandiose Fantasies and PNI Entitlement Rage. We

titled this factor ‘‘grandiose narcissism.’’ The factors manifested

an interrelation of .22. The factor scores generated from the EFA

were saved and used as the vulnerable and grandiose narcissism

scores when examined in relation to the criterion variables from

Sample 2.

FFM correlates of individual narcissism scales. Before proceeding to an examination of the convergences and divergences of the two nar- cissism factors, we explored further the nature of the 10 individual narcissism scales via an examination of their correlations with the FFM domains in Sample 2 (see Table 2). We did this to understand why certain narcissism scales loaded on the vulnerable rather than

2. A three-factor solution resulted in the following factor loadings: Factor 1: PNI ER (.78), PNI CSE (.76), HSNS (.72), PNI Dev (.66), PNI HS (.47), PNI GF (.39, secondary loading); Factor 2: NPI L/A (.78), NPI E/E (.66), PNI E (.49); Factor 3: PNI SSSE (.61), PNI GF (.56), PNI E (.48, secondary loading), PNI HS (.43, secondary loading), PNI ER (.43, secondary loading), PNI CSE (.38, secondary loading), PNI Dev (.35, secondary loading). The ﬁrst factors in both the two- and three-factor solution (i.e., vulnerable narcissism) were signiﬁcantly correlated; r 5 .99. The same was true for the second factors in both solutions (i.e., grandiose narcissism); r 5 .95. The third factor in a three-factor solution manifested signiﬁ- cant correlations with both the vulnerable factor (r 5 .73) and grandiose factor (r 5 .60) used in the current analyses. From an FFM perspective, this third factor was signiﬁcantly positively related to Neuroticism (r 5 .30) and Openness (r 5 .26) and negatively correlated with Agreeableness (r 5 –.28). The fourth factor in a four-factor solution manifested no primary factor loading.

Exploratory Factor Analysis of Narcissism Scales and Relations

Between Individual Narcissism Scales and the FFM

1 (Vulnerable)

2

(Grandiose) 3 (N) 4 (E) 5 (O) 6 (A) 7 (C)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| NPI L/A | .03 | .78 | .26n | .45n | .01 | .46n | .13 |
| NPI E/E | .15 | .60 | .15 | .49n | .17 | .41n | .06 |
| PNI CSE | .77 | .02 | .67n | .17 | .04 | .00 | .15 |
| PNI E | .22 | .58 | .09 | .23n | .22 | .49n | .01 |
| PNI SSSE | .37 | .32 | .22 | .26n | .26n | .03 | .15 |
| PNI HS | .51 | .07 | .30n | .20 | .07 | .23n | .04 |
| PNI GF | .45 | .41 | .19 | .12 | .29n | .15 | .05 |
| PNI Dev | .67 | .13 | .51n | .23n | .03 | .15 | .11 |
| PNI ER | .76 | .37 | .44n | .07 | .07 | .38n | .20 |
| HSNS  Correlations | .69 | .11 | .58n | .24n | .07 | .27n | .13 |
| Factor 2 | .23 | — |  |  |  |  |  |

Note. N (EFA) 5 858. Correlations between narcissism scales and FFM domains (N 5 238, Sample 2). Factor loadings .35 are boldfaced. NPI L/A 5 Narcissistic Personality Inventory Leadership/Authority; NPI E/E 5 Exhibitionism/Entitle- ment; PNI CSE 5 Pathological Narcissism Inventory Contingent Self-Esteem; PNI E 5 Exploitativeness; PNI SSSE 5 Self-Serving Self-Enhancement; PNI HS 5 Hiding the Self; PNI GF 5 Grandiose Fantasies; PNI Dev 5 Devaluing; PNI ER 5 Entitlement Rage; HSNS 5 Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; N 5 Neu- roticism; E 5 Extraversion; O 5 Openness; A 5 Agreeableness; C 5 Conscientious- ness. \*p .001.

grandiose factor. Both PNI Self-Serving Self-Enhancement and Grandiose Fantasies manifested null correlations with FFM Agree- ableness (which includes facets such as modesty) and null to small correlations with FFM Extraversion (which includes facets such as assertiveness); these are the primary FFM domains thought to com- pose grandiose narcissism (Lynam & Widiger, 2001; Paulhus, 2001). The other scales that loaded strongly on the grandiose narcissism factor included signiﬁcant correlations with both Agreeableness (negative) and Extraversion (positive). In addition, both PNI scales manifested signiﬁcant positive correlations with FFM Neuroticism, which is similar to the other scales that compose the vulnerable fac- tor (but unlike the scales that compose the grandiose narcissism fac- tor).

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Basic Personality

Next, we examined the trait proﬁles generated by the two narcissism factors with the FFM domains and facets, as well as measures of self- esteem and psychological entitlement. In order to quantify the overall similarity of the trait proﬁles generated by the two narcissism factors, we correlated the two columns of data found in Table 3. The pattern of personality correlates for vulnerable narcissism was uncorrelated with the correlates for grandiose narcissism; r 5 .10, ns.

In addition to examining the bivariate relations between the narcis-

sism factors and these basic personality dimensions, we also tested

whether the correlates were signiﬁcantly different from one another (i.e.,

test of dependent rs; see Cohen & Cohen, 1983, pp. 56–57). For the sake

of space, we review here only the FFM domain-level ﬁndings and the

ﬁndings for self-esteem and entitlement. As can be seen in Table 3, vul-

nerable narcissism was signiﬁcantly positively related to Neuroticism,

whereas grandiose narcissism manifested a nonsigniﬁcant negative rela-

tion with this domain; the correlations were signiﬁcantly different from

one another (t 5 13.33, p .001). Conversely, grandiose narcissism was

signiﬁcantly positively related to Extraversion, whereas vulnerable nar-

cissism was nonsigniﬁcantly negatively related to this domain; these

correlations were signiﬁcantly different from one another (t 5 9.32,

p .001). Both vulnerable and grandiose narcissism factors were sig-

niﬁcantly negatively related to Agreeableness, although the correlation

was signiﬁcantly stronger for grandiose narcissism than for vulnerable

narcissism (t 5 4.83, p .001). Neither narcissism factor was signiﬁ-

cantly related to Openness to Experience or Conscientiousness. The

narcissism scores manifested divergent relations with self-esteem such

that vulnerable narcissism manifested a moderate to strong negative

correlation, whereas grandiose narcissism manifested a signiﬁcant small

to moderate positive relation; these correlations were signiﬁcantly differ-

ent from one another (t 5 10.71, p .001). Both narcissism scores man-

ifested small to moderate positive correlations with psychological

entitlement that were not signiﬁcantly different from one another.

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Markers of Interpersonal

Behavior

Adult attachment. First, we examined the correlations between the narcissism factors and two adult attachment styles: anxiety and avoid-

Correlations Between Narcissism Factors and the Personality Traits

M SD a Vulnerable Grandiose

Warmth 3.98 .54 .75 .17 .08

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Neuroticism | 2.90 | .48 | .91 | .65na | .13b |
| Anxiety | 3.14 | .70 | .78 | .47na | .21b |
| Angry hostility | 2.69 | .64 | .74 | .48n | .27n |
| Depression | 2.79 | .74 | .82 | .60na | .18b |
| Self-consciousness | 3.01 | .66 | .73 | .53na | .35nb |
| Impulsiveness 3.20 .58 .65 .34n .18 | | | | | |
| Vulnerability | 2.59 | .58 | .72 | .44na | .26nb |
| Extraversion | 3.58 | .41 | .89 | .18a | .46nb |

Gregariousness 3.60 .63 .73 .09a .29nb

Assertiveness 3.17 .65 .77 .22a .63nb

Activity 3.25 .50 .56 .10a .35nb

Excitement seeking 3.67 .60 .64 .01a .43nb

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Positive emotions | 3.79 | .57 | .70 | .20a | .13b |
| Openness | 3.48 | .44 | .89 | .04 | .13 |
| Fantasy | 3.55 | .66 | .76 | .08 | .09 |
| Aesthetics | 3.42 | .82 | .83 | .06 | .01 |
| Feelings | 3.78 | .55 | .70 | .22 | .15 |
| Actions | 2.92 | .50 | .56 | .19a | .12b |
| Ideas | 3.58 | .71 | .80 | .02 | .23n |
| Values | 3.62 | .56 | .64 | .03 | .01 |
| Agreeableness | 3.44 | .44 | .91 | .24na | .57nb |
| Trust | 3.36 | .72 | .85 | .41n | .25n |
| Straightforwardness | 3.33 | .68 | .76 | .14a | .56nb |

Altruism 3.95 .54 .77 .13 .18

Compliance 3.10 .65 .74 .16a .53nb

Modesty 3.33 .59 .73 .07a .58nb

Tendermindedness 3.55 .51 .56 .06a .34nb

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Conscientiousness | 3.32 | .45 | .91 | .16 | .05 |
| Competence | 3.60 | .50 | .63 | .15a | .19b |
| Order | 3.11 | .65 | .69 | .01 | .07 |
| Dutifulness | 3.57 | .55 | .65 | .08 | .02 |
| Achievement striving | 3.35 | .58 | .74 | .11a | .23nb |
| Self-discipline | 3.21 | .65 | .79 | .29na | .06b |
| Deliberation | 3.07 | .64 | .79 | .08 | .25n |
| Self-esteem | 31.14 | 4.9 | .89 | .46na | .25nb |
| Entitlement | 35.56 | 9.80 | .86 | .24n | .30n |

Note. \*p .001. Correlations within each row with different superscripts are sig- niﬁcantly different at p .001 (test of dependent rs; Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

Correlations Between Narcissism Factors and Interpersonal Relations

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | M | SD | a | Vulnerable | Grandiose |
| Attachment Styles |  |  |  |  |  |
| Anxiety | 66.88 | 23.74 | .93 | .52na | .11b |
| Avoidance | 54.98 | 18.90 | .93 | .27na | .01b |
| Social Cognition |  |  |  |  |  |
| Experience anger | 49.17 | 12.60 | .87 | .43n | .28n |
| Express anger | 43.20 | 13.73 | .87 | .29n | .45n |
| Be rude | 38.23 | 14.47 | .88 | .27n | .44n |
| Yell | 26.66 | 13.30 | .88 | .16 | .37n |
| Threaten | 20.87 | 11.14 | .89 | .10 | .33n |
| Use physical aggression  Negotiation | 17.80 | 8.96 | .87 | .01 | .23n |
| Acquisitiveness | 5.28 | 1.56 |  | .06 | .28n |
| Apprehensiveness | 4.69 | 1.88 |  | .15 | .02 |
| Harvest bids  Thin Slices Ratings | 35.87 | 10.10 | .84 | .02 | .23n |
| Neuroticism | 2.81 | .56 |  | .16a | .25nb |
| Extraversion | 3.34 | .71 |  | .18a | .34nb |
| Openness | 3.19 | .58 |  | .07 | .10 |
| Agreeableness | 3.57 | .42 |  | .00 | .10 |
| Conscientiousness | 3.39 | .56 |  | .11 | .13 |
| Attractiveness | 3.09 | .71 |  | .04 | .15 |
| Likability | 3.12 | .48 |  | .08 | .15 |

Narcissism 2.44 .56 .03 a .32nb

Note. Correlations within each row with different superscripts are signiﬁcantly different at p .001 (test of dependent rs; Cohen & Cohen, 1983).

np .001.

ance (see Table 4). Vulnerable narcissism was signiﬁcantly positively correlated with both the anxiety and avoidance attachment styles, whereas grandiose narcissism manifested nonsigniﬁcant correlations with both dimensions. These correlations were signiﬁcantly different across the narcissism dimensions (ts 3.57, p .001).

Social cognition. Across vignettes assessing negative social interac- tions of an ambiguous, neutral, and overtly intentional nature, vul- nerable narcissism was signiﬁcantly positively correlated with experiencing and expressing anger, as well as being rude toward

the protagonist of the vignettes (see Table 4). Grandiose narcissism was also signiﬁcantly positively related to experiencing and express- ing anger, as well as being rude, yelling, threatening, and being willing to use physical aggression to resolve the situation. The correlations manifested by the grandiose and vulnerable narcissism factors, however, were not statistically signiﬁcantly different for any of the social cognition variables.

Negotiation. Next, we examined the correlations between the narcis- sism factors and three negotiation/decision-making variables from a

‘‘tragedy of the commons’’–related laboratory task. Vulnerable narcis-

sism was unrelated to the three negotiation variables, whereas grandiose

narcissism was signiﬁcantly positively correlated with two of the three

variables: acquisitiveness and harvest bids. From the start, individuals

higher on grandiose narcissism were more oriented toward making a

larger proﬁt and made larger ‘‘bids’’ to obtain this proﬁt. The correla-

tions for the two narcissism dimensions and the negotiation scales were

not statistically signiﬁcantly diﬀerent from one another.

Thin slice ratings of personality, attractiveness, likability, and narcis- sism. We examined the relations between the narcissism dimen- sions and the ﬁve ‘‘thin slice’’ ratings of personality based on the FFM, as well as ratings of physical attractiveness, likability, and narcissism (see Table 4). The vulnerable narcissism factor manifested null results with all eight thin slice ratings. Conversely, the grandiose narcissism factor was signiﬁcantly negatively correlated with Neu- roticism and signiﬁcantly positively correlated with Extraversion and ratings of narcissism. The correlations between the narcissism fac- tors and Neuroticism and Extraversion were signiﬁcantly different from one another, as were the correlations between the narcissism factors and stranger ratings of narcissism (ts 4.55, p .001).

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Psychopathology and Affect

With regard to psychopathology symptoms (e.g., depression, anxiety), vulnerable narcissism manifested signiﬁcant positive correlations with all 10 scales; these correlations were all signiﬁcantly different from those manifested by the grandiose factor (with the exception of the correla- tions with hostility; ts 4.25, p .001), which manifested no signiﬁ- cant correlations with these scales (see Table 5). The narcissism

Correlations Between Narcissism and Psychological Distress, Affect, and DSM-IV PDs

Psychopathology

M SD a Vulnerable Grandiose

Somatization 9.65 3.76 .81 .29na .04b Obsessive-compulsive 11.79 4.82 .82 .47na .06b Interpersonal sensitivity 6.54 3.49 .86 .61na .09b Depression 9.11 4.13 .87 .55na .04b Anxiety 8.82 3.49 .79 .38na .01b Hostility 7.08 2.82 .81 .37n .17

Phobic anxiety 6.18 2.71 .82 .35na .07b Paranoia 7.23 3.43 .81 .54na .15b Psychoticism 7.09 3.04 .72 .54na .08b Global distress 79.70 28.30 .97 .55na .01b

Affect

Positive 32.18 6.63 .84 .25na .13b

Negative 19.13 6.22 .85 .40na .08b

DSM-IV PDs

Paranoid 1.81 2.04 .82 .53na .29nb

Schizoid .84 1.04 .55 .07 .01

Schizotypal 2.19 2.00 .75 .42na .03b

Antisocial .61 1.29 .89 .06 .24n

Borderline 3.06 2.93 .87 .54na .12b

Histrionic 2.89 1.81 .57 .24na .53nb

Narcissistic 4.57 3.14 .82 .43n .48n

Avoidant 2.16 1.92 .71 .54na .31nb

Dependent 1.94 1.48 .47 .42na .12b

Obsessive-compulsive 3.99 1.84 .44 .38n .14

Note. Correlations within each row with different superscripts are signiﬁcantly different at

p .001 (test of dependent rs; Cohen & Cohen, 1983). PDs 5 personality disorders.

np .001.

dimensions also manifested divergent relations with positive and neg- ative affect such that vulnerable narcissism manifested a signiﬁcant negative correlation with positive affect and a signiﬁcant positive cor- relation with negative affect; these correlations were signiﬁcantly differ- ent from those manifested by grandiose narcissism (ts 4.25, p .001), which manifested null correlations with both.

Finally, we examined the correlations between the narcissism fac- tors and DSM-IV PDs. Vulnerable narcissism generated positive

correlations with 8 of 10 DSM-IV PDs, with a mean correlation of .37. Grandiose narcissism generated four signiﬁcant positive correlations (and one signiﬁcant negative correlation: avoidant PD) with the PDs, with a mean correlation of .15. Vulnerable narcissism manifested sig- niﬁcantly larger correlations with paranoid, schizotypal, borderline, avoidant, and dependent PDs (ts 3.45, p .001), whereas grandiose narcissism manifested a signiﬁcantly larger correlation with histrionic PD (t 4.14, p .001). The two narcissism factors were equally strongly correlated with NPD symptoms, suggesting that DSM-IV NPD includes a blend of both narcissism dimensions.

DISCUSSION

Variants of Narcissism and Their Nomological Nets

The current data suggest that two relatively distinct forms of nar- cissism—grandiose and vulnerable—can be extracted from analyses using three prominent measures of trait narcissism: the NPI, PNI, and HSNS. Correlating the sets of correlations from Tables 3–5 (78 correlations for each narcissism factor) enabled an examination of the total statistical similarity of the nomological networks of the narcissism variants. Overall, the nomological networks for grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were unrelated (r 5 .06, ns).

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Personality

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism manifested divergent person- ality proﬁles. In fact, the personality proﬁle manifested by the vul- nerable narcissism factor was negatively but nonsigniﬁcantly related to the personality proﬁle manifested by the grandiose factor. Con- sistent with previous studies (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Miller et al.,

2010), the two narcissism variants overlap primarily with regard to an antagonistic and entitled interpersonal orientation; they diverge

substantially, however, in relation to Neuroticism and Extraversion (these differences are further manifested in signiﬁcant differences in global self-esteem).

It is important to note that even the relations manifested by gran-

diose and vulnerable narcissism with Agreeableness were not iden-

tical. First, grandiose narcissism was signiﬁcantly more strongly

negatively related to the overall Agreeableness domain score. Sec- ond, the individual facets covered by Agreeableness differed in their relation to the narcissism variants such that grandiose narcissism was more strongly associated with immodesty, noncompliance, (low) altruism, and dishonesty. Several of these traits are among the more reliable correlates of antisocial behavior (Miller, Lynam, & Le- ukefeld, 2003). We believe there are different pathways to the an- tagonistic interpersonal relations manifested by individuals with either of these narcissism variants. Vulnerable narcissism appears to be associated with a hostile attribution bias such that the inten- tions of others are viewed as being malevolent. These biases are re- lated to aggressive behavior (e.g., Dodge, Price, Bachorowski, & Newman, 1990). Hostile attribution biases have also been linked with childhood events such as child abuse or maltreatment and harsh discipline (e.g., Dodge, Bates, & Pettit, 1990)—events that are related to vulnerable but not grandiose narcissism (Miller et al., 2010). In general, we believe that there are both different etiological pathways to disagreeableness as well as different forms of disagreeableness, and that grandiose and vulnerable narcissism differ on both. Individuals who are high on grandiose narcissism may be antagonistic for instrumental reasons (e.g., personal gain) related to status and dominance, whereas individuals high on vulnerable narcissism may behave in hostile and distrustful ways due to heightened affective dysregulation and negative interpersonal schemas that are linked with traumatic childhood expe- riences (e.g., Rogosch & Cicchetti, 2004).

We believe that these factors may also contribute to similar levels of entitlement, as both forms of narcissism were positively related to entitlement. Although individuals with either form of narcissism ex- pect to receive special treatment, the rationale for these feelings of entitlement may be different. More speciﬁcally, individuals high on the grandiose narcissism dimension may believe they are entitled to special treatment because they are better than others (e.g., more at- tractive, more intelligent, more likable), whereas individuals high on the vulnerable narcissism dimension may believe they deserve special consideration because of their fragility.

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Interpersonal Behavior

Attachment. As expected, only vulnerable narcissism evinced a pathological attachment style, as demonstrated by signiﬁcant

relations with both attachment avoidance and anxiety. The combi- nation of high avoidance and attachment is indicative of a ‘‘fearful’’ attachment style in which individuals are thought to maintain neg- ative views of the self and others. Fearful attachment styles have been linked with a number of problematic outcomes, including bor- derline PD (e.g., Minzenberg, Poole, & Vinogradov, 2006), aggres- sion (e.g., Tweed & Dutton, 1998), drug dependence (Schindler et al.,

2005), and other risky behaviors (Gwadz, Clatts, Leonard, & Gold- samt, 2004). Bartholomew and Horowitz (1991) found that fearful attachment styles are associated with less intimacy, disclosure, and ability to count on others for support, as well as the tendency to

‘‘assume a subservient role in close relationships’’ (p. 230). Etiolog-

ically, both attachment anxiety and avoidance are associated with

histories of child sexual abuse, whereas only anxiety is related to

emotional and physical abuse and neglect (Minzenberg et al., 2006).

The current results mirror those found by Dickinson and Pincus

(2003), who reported that the majority of individuals classiﬁed as

vulnerable narcissists manifested a fearful attachment style.

Grandiose narcissism, on the other hand, manifested null to small

negative relations with attachment anxiety and avoidance. These

patterns suggest that grandiose narcissism is largely unrelated to at-

tachment styles with a trend toward secure attachments (Dickinson

& Pincus, 2003). The lack of attachment difﬁculties is consistent with

the evidence suggesting that grandiose narcissism is unrelated to

traumatic childhood events, poor parenting (psychological intrusive-

ness, lack of warmth: Miller, Dir, et al., 2010; parental drinking:

Brennan, Shaver, & Tobey, 1991), low self-esteem, and emotional

dysregulation (e.g., Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991; Miller & Camp-

bell, 2008)—constructs known to be related to insecure attachment

styles. Consistent with the differences between these two forms of

narcissism with regard to the interpersonally oriented traits such as

Extraversion and Agreeableness, individuals with grandiose or vul-

nerable narcissism appear to maintain substantively different schemas

about relations with others. Individuals who are higher on the vul-

nerable narcissism dimension fear the loss of intimate relationships

and avoid developing close, intimate relationships that involve inter-

dependence and emotional disclosure. Alternatively, individuals who

are higher on the grandiose narcissism dimension are not fearful or

suspicious of these relationships; this is likely due to the fact that these

individuals are more likely to cause their romantic partners distress

than be the recipient of such distress (e.g., Miller, Campbell, & Pilkonis, 2007).

Social cognition. Mirroring the signiﬁcant negative relations be- tween both forms of narcissism and Agreeableness, both vulnerable and grandiose narcissism factors were related to reacting to various interpersonal situations with anger and aggression. There was a sta- tistical trend (i.e., po. 01) such that grandiose narcissism manifested larger correlations with the likelihood of using verbal and physical aggression to resolve these situations. This increased willingness to behave in an overtly aggressive manner found in individuals higher on grandiose narcissism may be due to their higher levels of inter- personal dominance and assertiveness versus those who score higher on vulnerable narcissism.

Negotiation. We also examined the relations between the narcissism variants and decision making in response to a classic ‘‘tragedy of the commons’’ situation in which individuals had to decide how much to exploit a resource, knowing that too much exploitation would hurt themselves (and their competitors) whereas too little exploitation might result in a loss of proﬁts for the individual. Only the grandiose di- mension was positively related to a motivation to make a larger proﬁt than one’s competitors and actually choosing to use a greater number of resources, although the correlations manifested by the two narcis- sism variants were not statistically signiﬁcantly different. The differ- ences between the two narcissism variants on this task were expected given the differences between these forms of narcissism with regard to behavioral approach motivation (e.g., Foster & Trimm, 2008), dom- inance, and a concern for others. Of the two forms of narcissism, only individuals higher on the grandiose dimension appear to approach the world with a zero-sum attitude and a willingness to win at any cost.

Thin slices. The current study is the ﬁrst to examine how strangers view individuals who differ on these narcissism dimensions. Consis- tent with previous research using this thin slice methodology (Fried- man, Oltmanns, Gleason, & Turkheimer, 2006; Oltmanns et al.,

2004), grandiose narcissism was positively correlated with strangers’ ratings, based on 60-s video clips, of Extraversion and negatively correlated with ratings of Neuroticism. Vulnerable narcissism was unrelated to all stranger ratings.

Overall, it is clear that individuals with elevated scores on either grandiose or vulnerable narcissism have substantially different intra- and interpersonal styles, particularly with regard to the experience of negative and positive emotionality. These differences are rather ro- bust as they have been conﬁrmed via self- and informant-report, as well as by strangers who have had minimal ‘‘contact’’ with the in- dividuals. Research suggests that the initial likability that is associ- ated with grandiose narcissism may eventually turn to dislike over time (i.e., Paulhus, 1998). This change over time is consistent with research that has shown that individuals with symptoms of NPD are known to cause signiﬁcant distress to those with whom they are in- volved (Miller, Campbell, & Pilkonis, 2007).

The initial likability of individuals high on grandiose narcissism may position these individuals to inﬂict more damage to those with whom they interact than individuals with traits consistent with vul- nerable narcissism.

Vulnerable and Grandiose Narcissism and Psychopathology/Affect

Consistent with the differences in emotion-related personality traits such as Neuroticism and Extraversion, individuals high on vulner- able narcissism reported a wide array of psychological problems in- dicative of signiﬁcant distress, such as depression, anxiety, hostility, paranoia, and interpersonal sensitivity. Similarly, these individuals reported experiencing little positive affect and a substantial degree of negative affect. Alternatively, individuals high on grandiose narcis- sism appeared largely resilient to these problems, as grandiose narcissism manifested no signiﬁcant relations with indices of psychological distress or negative affect.

With regard to personality pathology, the grandiose narcissism factor manifested greater discriminant validity than did the vulner- able narcissism factor in that it evinced signiﬁcant positive correla- tions primarily with the Cluster B PDs (i.e., antisocial, histrionic, narcissistic). Conversely, vulnerable narcissism evinced more limited speciﬁcity in that it was signiﬁcantly positively related to 8 of the 10

PDs. Vulnerable narcissism is strongly correlated with Neuroticism/

negative emotionality, which is a core component of many DSM-IV

PDs (e.g., Saulsman & Page, 2004) and may be linked to a tendency

to endorse symptoms of all forms of psychopathology, including

somatic problems (e.g., Johnson, 2003). As expected, vulnerable

narcissism manifested substantial correlations with measures of bor- derline PD. Miller and colleagues (2010) suggested that the nomolog- ical networks of vulnerable narcissism and borderline PD are so highly overlapping that one could question whether they represent distinct constructs. It is noteworthy that the narcissism factors were equally strongly related to DSM-IV NPD. Although the DSM-IV NPD cri- teria emphasize grandiosity over vulnerability (Fossati et al., 2005; Miller, Hoffman, Campbell, & Pilkonis, 2008), it is clear that the DSM-IV text includes substantial descriptions of narcissistic vulnera- bility, which may be reﬂected in the questions used to assess NPD in self-report measures (e.g., Miller, Campbell, Pilkonis, & Morse, 2008).

Assessing and Conceptualizing Narcissistic Vulnerability and Grandiosity

Two pertinent questions arise from the current data revolving around the assessment and conceptualization of narcissistic vulner- ability and grandiosity. We address the assessment issue ﬁrst. The current data suggest that two of the putatively grandiose scales from the PNI (i.e., PNI Self-Serving Self-Enhancement and Grandiose Fantasies) load as or more strongly on the vulnerable factor than the grandiose factor. In fact, only the PNI Entitlement scale manifested a signiﬁcant loading only on the grandiose factor. As noted earlier, this divergence is not entirely unexpected, as factor analytic ﬁndings reported by the authors of the PNI (see Wright, Lukowitsky, Pincus,

& Conroy, 2010) demonstrated that the PNI Entitlement scale man-

ifested a quite small loading on the PNI grandiose factor (i.e., .36)

compared to those manifested by PNI Self-Serving Self-

Enhancement (i.e., .82) and Grandiose Fantasies (i.e., .78). As

such, it is not surprising that PNI Entitlement loaded with other

narcissism factors when a broader array of narcissism scales were

included. To further explore why these two PNI scales loaded as or

more strongly on the vulnerable factor, we examined their relations

with the domains of the FFM. These correlations provide some clues

for understanding this divergence in that neither of these PNI scales

manifested correlations with FFM domains thought to be indicative

of grandiosity (i.e., low Agreeableness, high Extraversion). In fact,

their proﬁles of correlations appeared to be a blend of both narcis-

sism factors (e.g., high Neuroticism indicative of vulnerability, small

elevations in Extraversion indicative of grandiosity), albeit with an

emphasis on vulnerability.

A second assessment issue relates to whether grandiose narcissism, as measured by the NPI, assesses a construct indicative of pathology (e.g., Cain et al., 2008; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). The current nar- cissism factor, made up of the NPI scales and PNI Entitlement, man- ifested a number of correlates that are indicative of potential problems, including strong correlations with trait antagonism (e.g., manipula- tiveness, noncompliance, immodesty), symptoms of histrionic and nar- cissistic PDs, aggressive social cognition, and risky and exploitative decision making. These results, along with others that demonstrate a link between grandiose narcissism and externalizing behaviors (e.g., Miller et al., 2010) suggest that grandiose narcissism, as measured by the NPI, is not simply a marker of psychological health. We believe that it is vital that clinicians and researchers not equate the lack of internalizing symptoms found with grandiose narcissism with good psychological health (in much the same way one would not make this assumption when conceptualizing the construct of psychopathy).

Finally, the current results raise questions about the nature of vulnerable and grandiose narcissism. That is, should these narcissism factors be viewed as largely distinct ‘‘types’’ or dimensions (that is, one may be grandiosely or vulnerably narcissistic but not usually both), or should they be viewed as alternative phenotypic represen- tations of the same underlying core of narcissism? The latter view is consistent with the assumption that most narcissistic individuals will vacillate between these two ‘‘narcissistic states’’ depending on a variety of factors, including environmental/interpersonal triggers. Pincus and Lukowitsky (2010) reviewed writings by a number of prominent narcissism theorists and suggest that narcissistic individ- uals may ﬂuctuate between states of grandiosity and vulnerability. Ultimately, there is no clear answer to this vital question. Future research is needed that uses a longitudinal design, perhaps using a method such as ecological momentary assessment, which may be able to address this question.

Limitations

The current study assessed variants of narcissism in relatively large samples of undergraduates. It will be important that future work examine the generalizability of these ﬁndings using more diverse samples that may be more likely to have higher rates of one or both of these narcissism dimensions and psychopathology (e.g., commu-

nity and clinical samples). In addition, it will be interesting to expand the nomological networks examined to include differences in other important domains of functioning such as work and romance, par- ticularly via the use of informant reports. One might expect that ro- mantic partners, coworkers, bosses, and psychotherapists might describe individuals high on grandiose or vulnerable narcissism in different terms. Ecological momentary assessment strategies may provide fascinating insights into the relations between environmental events that occur for individuals high on grandiose or vulnerable narcissism and subsequent changes in mood and behavior. In gen- eral, this line of work will be moved forward by an inclusion of re- search methodologies that are less reliant on accurate self-reports. Finally, it is important to note that the differences in the correlations between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism and the ‘‘thin slice’’ ratings of narcissism could be due to the deﬁnition of narcissism provided to the raters, which emphasized grandiosity. Future studies might examine this relation by asking judges to provide ratings of narcissism without providing any explicit guidance as to how to conceptualize narcissism; this type of rating would provide a more accurate glimpse into how independent raters conceive of the con- struct of narcissism.

CONCLUSIONS

The current results add to an expanding literature documenting sub- stantial differences in the nomological networks of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. With the exception of a shared tendency to- ward entitled and aggressive interpersonal behavior and schemas, the two forms of narcissism share little else with regard to basic personality traits, interpersonal behavior, and psychopathology. Im- portantly, these individuals are viewed by others in divergent ways, even after very minimal contact, such that individuals high on gran- diose narcissism are viewed as being more extraverted and less neu- rotic. The tendency to see individuals high on grandiose narcissism in a positive light, at least initially, may place these individuals in a position to do maximal damage to romantic partners, friends, family members, and coworkers. We believe it is vital that researchers and clinicians become more aware of the differences between these forms of narcissism so as to end the frequent commingling of these constructs.
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