USC Aiken Psychology Theses   Psychology Department

5-2020

Examining Entitlement and Antagonism as Distinguishing Features of Narcissism

Zane M. Repp
University of South Carolina - Aiken

Examining Entitlement and Antagonism as Distinguishing Features of Narcissism

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the Department of Psychology

University of South Carolina Aiken

In Partial Fulfillment

Of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

By

Zane M. Repp

May 2020

Abstract

Objective: In this study, I worked to examine possible core features in narcissism. Researchers largely accept that there are at least two main dimensions of narcissism, grandiosity and vulnerability. However, these two dimensions have very different presentations in individuals, with very different personality factors, interpersonal traits, and relationships to other psychopathology. This raises the question of whether grandiosity and vulnerability are two versions of the same disorder, or if they would be better understood as different pathologies. This study examines whether the features of entitlement and antagonism can be used to distinguish grandiosity and vulnerability as both unique versions of narcissism separate from other similar disorders. **Method:** A sample of undergraduate students completed measures of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, antagonism, entitlement, borderline features, and psychopathy. Two separate linear regression models were run for grandiose and vulnerable narcissism to measure what variables best accounted for the variance within those domains. **Results:** Psychopathy and antagonism were significant predictors of grandiose narcissism, and entitlement appeared to be nearing significance as a predictor. Borderline features and entitlement were significant predictors of vulnerable narcissism, and antagonism failed predict any additional variance in the model. **Conclusions:** These results reinforce a dimensional understanding of personality disorders. Further, this study contradicted prior research in the sense that antagonism failed to add meaningful predictive value to models of both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. However, entitlement came close to being a significant predictive factor for both dimensions of narcissism, suggesting it may be the core factor that should be used to distinguish narcissism from other disorders.

Examining Entitlement and Antagonism as Distinguishing Features of Narcissism

Narcissism theory has evolved significantly. While the idea of vanity or pride has existed throughout history, modern study of the disorder characterized by these traits became significant in the early 20th century. As different researchers examined narcissism, they all added a unique take on how to better understand the disorder. One of the earliest psychological descriptions of narcissism comes from Sigmund Freud in 1914 in his work *On Narcissism: an Introduction* (Sandler, Person, & Fonagy, 2012). Freud describes narcissism as a type of self-love, likening it to having a sexual attraction to one's own body and thus suggesting a connection between narcissism and homosexuality. The psychoanalyst Heinz Kohut in 1968 later modified this definition, replacing the sexual drives that Freud used. He saw the key features of narcissism as grandiose-exhibitionist fantasies and an inability to have empathy for oneself for those fantasies (Meronen, 1999). Henry Murray (1938) further encouraged this idea of self-love being a key feature of narcissism; he promoted the idea that narcissism may also be associated with negative social behaviors such as dominating others, "ruthless self-seeking," and belittling others. Ernest Jones (1913) also described those with narcissism as thinking that they were superior to others, but he emphasized aloofness and mysteriousness as key features. He argued that they are unsocial and often uninvolved with others.

While there were significant differences between these conceptualizations, one can see early commonalities in these early definitions of narcissism. For example, all of them have some concept of an elevated sense of self-worth, though descriptions of what that self-worth looks like varied. Jones's (1913) aloof, unsocial description seems contradictory to the belittlement and exploitation of Murray's narcissism. Self-worth is an important trait in both explanations, but its importance is not readily apparent to those who have not dug through the contradictory theories.

A similar problem exists in modern research on narcissism. While researchers' understanding of narcissism has grown greatly, those who are not immersed in the most current findings and theories likely will feel that the definition of narcissism is being pulled in two different directions by contradictory and incompatible theories. While confusing, current theory does suggest that there is a common "core" of narcissism that can be used to better harmonize these competing conceptions into a more unified package. To do so, it is first necessary to better understand what accounts for all of the discrepancies in narcissism research. After this, one can borrow key elements from different conceptualizations of narcissism, namely the Five Factor Model of Personality and the Narcissism Spectrum Model, to explain these differences. These tools should help to create a model that best accounts for narcissistic features.

Contradictions in Narcissism

One area where there is little to no contradiction about the definition of narcissism is in the public opinion about the disorder. Miller and colleagues (2017) conducted research which suggested that popular opinion regarding narcissism is relatively uniform. They interviewed 1,900 individuals, gave them an example of an individual's behavior, and had them rate those individuals on levels of narcissism. They found that the overwhelming amount of people saw narcissism as being mostly composed of traits such as grandiosity, exhibitionism, risk taking, assertiveness, and entitlement. These factors are mostly associated with the dimension of grandiose narcissism. Therefore, the confusion around what defines narcissism comes largely from the findings that traits such as negative affectivity and introversion have been found in studies of those scoring high on scales of narcissism (Miller et al., 2017).

Despite the popular consensus, research has shown that the presentation of narcissism can vary depending on the individual person and the situation that they are in, with some narcissistic

features looking entirely contradictory. One way of understanding these contradictions is to view narcissism as not just a single construct, but as a broad term or category. In this model, narcissism can take on a multitude of different aspects or qualities (i.e., high self-esteem or low self-esteem) and still be considered narcissism. It then becomes important to define exactly what features should be considered a part of narcissism and to identify the defining traits of a "narcissist."

Hendin and Cheek (1997) describe the concept of a "jingle fallacy" in discussing narcissism. This term refers to when different constructs, and likewise the scales that measure those constructs, are given the same name. Because of this, those who discuss those constructs often have an (understandably) implicit assumption that any qualities describing one construct or scale must likewise apply to the other because they have the same name. For example, research on workplace behavior previously assumed that individual personalities and internal values were highly related and assumed that they were overlapping constructs (Lievens et al., 2002). While it makes sense that a person's internal beliefs would have a significant impact on their daily behavior, empirically values and personality were not strongly related (Higgs & Lichtenstein, 2010). This phenomenon is a good description of what has happened in the discussion on narcissism. Modern researchers use narcissism as an umbrella term to categorize the different constructs being measured by the different scales. While looking for this one true narcissism, researchers tend to find qualities of this narcissism that appear incongruous. There are several different examples of these contradictions in the narcissism research. Barnett and Powell (2016) found evidence that those with narcissistic traits become angry and aggressive because of their low self-esteem. Vaillancourt (2013) found that students with high self-esteem and high narcissism were the most aggressive and retaliatory. Smith and colleagues (2015) found that

narcissistic traits are linked to high self-esteem and relatively peaceful behavior in juvenile

offenders. In the same study, they linked other narcissistic traits to low self-esteem and harmful

behavior in juvenile offenders. Meanwhile Bailey and Desai (2013) found no significant

relationships between narcissism, self-esteem, and aggression. These relationships appear

completely contradictory at first examination. In these few studies, narcissism was associated

with high self-esteem, low self-esteem, aggression, and peaceful behavior. These contradictory

findings could possibly be explained by a problem in measurements, or a jingle fallacy; the

narcissism being measured in one study is not the same as the narcissism being measured in

another study.

Another strong example of contradictory findings about narcissism can be found in

research on the effect narcissistic traits have on the workforce. Penney and Spector (2002) found

that those with narcissistic personality traits are more likely to perceive their work place as

constraining and also more likely to get angry at those constraints. Those individuals are then

more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors such as mocking coworkers, stealing

from their company, and giving a poor performance at work (Penney & Spector, 2002).

Narcissists appear to have a unique quality of lashing out at job constraints that is not seen in the

general population. In addition, those who are more likely to value themselves above others, a

common trait associated with narcissism, are more likely to make decisions in the workplace that

benefit themselves rather than the company (Van Dijk & Brown, 2006).

While one would think that this would surely mark narcissists as workplace problems,

other research has shown them to be a possible benefit in business. For instance, Emmons (1984)

found that the trait of narcissism is a strong predictor of leadership qualities in a person. Further,

Chatterjee and Hambrick (2011) found that CEO's with higher measures of narcissistic traits

often made more bold decisions that financially benefitted their companies. Other studies have found that narcissistic traits can help an individual to stand out in a work environment and even to be better liked by peers, at least in the short term (Judge, Piccolo, & Kosalka, 2009).

At first glance, readings of the literature may make it seem that all of these findings are incompatible. However, much research has gone into exploring these differences, which has led to the concept that narcissism is not a singular entity but rather has notable variability (Ackerman et al., 2011; Hendin & Cheek, 1997). The different factors that compose narcissism help to account for the contradictory findings found beforehand; therefore, to examine the key components in narcissism, one must understand its different domains.

Differences between Grandiosity and Vulnerability

There is a prevailing conceptualization of narcissism as being composed of two different factors: grandiosity and vulnerability. Grandiosity is more closely related to the traditional view of narcissism (Miller et al., 2014). It is commonly associated with and measured by the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). For many years, research into narcissism focused almost exclusively on the grandiose dimension (Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). Research has now shifted to examining both dimensions of narcissism, aided greatly by the development of measurements of vulnerability such as the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin and Cheek, 1997) and the Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI; Pincus et al., 2009).

Having multiple scales has opened several opportunities for research on narcissism, but it has also helped to further the confusion on how to understand narcissism. For example, Samuel and Widiger (2008) found that there is little correlation among narcissism scales overall, with the only common factor being low levels of agreeableness, also referred to as high antagonism. They

also found some of the greatest differences were in scales measuring the factors of neuroticism

and extroversion, which emphasizes how personality is one of several key defining features

between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism.

Personality

Some of the most significant differences between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism

are seen in how they score on different factors of personality factors. Miller and colleagues

(2018) argue that narcissism can be understood as a combination of three personality traits:

antagonism, extraversion, and neuroticism. They go on to elaborate that personality differences

between the two dimensions are seen because grandiose narcissism is associated with high

extraversion and low neuroticism, while vulnerable narcissism is associated with high

neuroticism and low extraversion. Both dimensions share the common trait of antagonism. Miller

and colleagues describe this antagonism as "a tendency to interact with others in an antagonistic

manner (e.g., manipulative, callous, noncooperative, angry)" (Miller et al., 2001, p. 1014).. They

found that both grandiosity and vulnerability were positively correlated with antagonism,

although grandiosity had the stronger correlation.

Those who have high levels of grandiosity tend to have higher levels of self-esteem and

lower levels of neuroticism than their vulnerable counterparts (Brown et al., 2009). This means

that they are more emotionally resilient in situations that would threaten their self-esteem than

individuals with higher levels of vulnerable narcissism, a trait that contributes to grandiose

narcissism being considered by some (with notable controversy) the more adaptive version of

narcissism (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). Further, grandiosity has been linked to higher levels of

immodesty, noncompliance, low altruism, and dishonesty (Miller et al., 2011).

Vulnerable narcissism appears to have a very different emotional profile than grandiosity. Miller and colleagues (2018) argue that vulnerable narcissism can be mostly understood as a combination of stable negative emotionality and high antagonism. Vulnerable narcissists tend to have feelings of emptiness, helplessness and poor self-esteem (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009). They are seen as more passive, shy, and inhibited people, who do not enjoy public attention. They also have poor tolerance of criticism from others or of their own failures (Ronningstam, 2009). Interestingly, while vulnerable narcissists have a sense of suffering and poor self-esteem, they still maintain a sense of their own specialness, suggesting an existing feeling of entitlement despite their negative self-esteem (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009). It could also suggest that they believe they should receive special treatment because of their emotional fragility (Miller et al., 2011).

Overall, neuroticism appears to be the greatest predictor of vulnerable narcissism. This was notably examined by Miller and colleagues (2018) where they used dominance analyses to determine what personality factors were most important for defining vulnerable narcissism. Neuroticism accounted for an average of 65% of variance in vulnerable narcissism. Antagonism accounted for an average of 18.5% of variance. Further, they found that vulnerable narcissism and neuroticism as measured by the Five Factor Model had a .94 correlation. The authors go on to suggest that current measures of vulnerable narcissism may be focusing too much on the neuroticism component of vulnerable narcissism, as it is a key factor in many personality disorders. They suggest that increased focus in research on vulnerable narcissism needs to examine the antagonism dimension, which was the second most important factor in explaining the variance.

Interpersonal traits

The unique personality traits of the grandiose narcissist paint a picture of an individual who is very social, projecting confidence to others while experiencing few emotional issues themselves. This persona is so effective that individuals tend to have very positive opinions of grandiose narcissists when they first meet them. However, those same peers tend to grow to dislike the narcissists as they spend more time with them (Campbell & Campbell, 2009; Wurst et al., 2016).

An example of how grandiose narcissism can positively affect social relationships can be seen in romantic relationships. Dufner and colleagues (2013) examined what makes narcissists attractive. High narcissism was correlated with higher levels of mate appeal in both the laboratory and with the narcissist's friends. Further, they showed that narcissists were more successful in a natural environment at attracting mates and that this was largely due to the narcissists' physical attractiveness and social boldness. The narcissists' self-enhancement factors contributed to their short-term relational success. Notably, these features of narcissism are all contained within the grandiose dimension, suggesting that it is the dimension responsible for these positive relationships. Further, this shows that grandiose features can give a person advantages in early relationships.

Later problems tend to occur for grandiose narcissists as their relationships are progressing (Wurst et al., 2016). A major contributor for this is the aggression they display in relationships. Grandiose narcissists tend to display large amounts of instrumental aggression. This means that they will engage in aggression in order to exact some purpose, such as to get revenge on someone who wronged them. For instance, a grandiose narcissist may only try to verbally harass a coworker if the narcissist felt the coworker had insulted their work results. Studies have generally supported this image. Research has shown that narcissists with high

grandiose traits tend to use their aggression only when they feel directly attacked and when they can use it to advance their self-image (Krizan, 2015). Further, studies have shown that they direct their aggression towards those they feel have wronged them (Bushman et al., 2009). Narcissism has been seen as such an aggressive personality disorder that it has been put in what has been called the "Dark Triad" of personality alongside Antisocial Personality Disorder and Machiavellianism. Furthermore, studies suggest that anger is the mediating factor between narcissistic features and poor workplace behavior (O'Boyle et al., 2012; Penney & Spector, 2002).

With regards to interpersonal attachment, research has had conflicting findings. Some studies have suggested grandiose narcissists tend to form secure or dismissive attachment to others (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003). Grandiosity has, in other studies, showed little relation to any attachment style (Miller et al., 2011). Their spouses have described them as uniquely "aggressive, outspoken, show-off, egotistical, assertive, and not modest" (Wink, 1991, p. 595).

In contrast with how grandiose narcissists relate to others, vulnerable narcissism has a very distinctive feature of difficulty with emotional regulation. Krizan and colleagues (2015) suggest that it is the emotional experiences unique to the vulnerability dimension that are responsible for the phenomenon of "narcissistic rage," a situation where a narcissist will encounter a threat to their ego or self-worth, experience extreme emotional discomfort, and lash out at others because of that emotional discomfort. Vulnerable narcissists are further known to use withdrawal and avoidance when confronted with these threatening situations. Spouses of those with vulnerable traits described them as "worrying, emotional, defensive, anxious, bitter, tense, and complaining" (Wink, 1991, p. 595). Overall, vulnerable narcissism is associated with higher levels of attachment avoidance. They are more likely to distance themselves from

romantic partners. They are also more likely to have higher levels of fear that their relationships

will end or that they are not loved by their partner (Miller et al., 2011).

Psychopathology

Another difference between the two disorders is how they relate to other measures of

psychopathology. Grandiosity has weak, if any, relations to psychological distress (Sedikides et

al., 2004). Grandiosity has been shown to positively correlate with antisocial personality disorder

(Miller et al., 2010). At the same time, vulnerable narcissism is linked to higher levels of many

common affective disorders such as depression and anxiety. It has also been shown to have an

extremely high correlation with Borderline Personality Disorder (r=.94), suggesting the two

disorders are closely linked (Miller et al., 2010). Further, vulnerable narcissism is much more

common to see in psychiatric treatment for several reasons; these include higher levels of

psychological distress, self-injury, and suicide attempts (Pincus et al., 2009).

Motivation

While hostility is a key trait for both dimensions of narcissism, there are significant

differences associated with narcissists' reasoning for their behavior. Grandiosity and

vulnerability show different relations to the reasoning behind their disagreeable behavior.

From an internal perspective, grandiosity is associated with reinterpreting outside

experiences to support their exaggerated positive image, even if the image does not fit those

experiences. This behavior contributes to create a view of oneself as entitled and superior to

others. This can lead to anger, self-promotion, exploitation of others, and aggression to make the

outside world fit with the internalized beliefs about oneself (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010).

Grandiosity is associated with maladaptive traits, but those negative traits tend to involve the

individual's entitlement and exploitation of others. Negative attributes ascribed to grandiose

narcissists include being domineering, conceited, and arrogant (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). Studies with the NPI, a measure later shown to mostly measure grandiose narcissism, showed that grandiose narcissists were more likely to use aggression in scenarios where they faced threats to their own self and self-worth (Raskin & Hall, 1981). These disagreeable behaviors appear to be used to promote the narcissists own ambitions.

An example of this difference can be seen in a "tragedy of the commons" scenario, where participants were given a chance to advance their own interests at the chance of hurting a community pool of resources (Miller et al., 2011). Miller and colleagues found that grandiose narcissists showed the most motivation to enrich themselves while also harming others. They displayed a strategy of winning at any cost, without concern for who was hurt because of their actions. Vulnerable narcissists did not display this approach to winning and decision making.

Further, in a study by Krizan and Johar (2015), vulnerability had a stronger and more consistent relation with aggression and anger than grandiosity. The researchers created a scenario where they had the narcissist experience an aggressive action from someone (having them put hot sauce on one's food) in a way that was designed not to provoke an ego threat from narcissists. In this laboratory setting, vulnerability was linked to an increase in aggression towards both the aggressor and an innocent third party. However, grandiosity was not linked to an increase in aggression in any experiments where there was not a direct ego threat. All of this research suggests that grandiosity is associated with a higher level of calculation in its disagreeable acts. Grandiose narcissists appear to only engage in hostile behavior when it serves their own interests, and not as a result of uncontrollable emotions. In contrast, vulnerability was linked to higher levels of aggression towards an aggressor and innocent others, suggesting that hostility associated with vulnerable narcissism is better explained by poor emotional control.

To further explore vulnerability, Miller and colleagues (2018) argue that poor and hostile attribution biases and negative affect are a main contributor to vulnerable narcissists' high elevations in antagonism. This type of emotional experience will lead vulnerable narcissists to act differently than grandiose narcissists. For example, if a vulnerable narcissist receives a poor score on a test, he or she will experience intense emotional discomfort, which may cause the narcissist to lash out aggressively. In contrast, a grandiose narcissist who received a poor score on a test will be focused on ways to restore his or her self-image. The grandiose narcissist may try to discredit the teacher or may try to get revenge on those who scored better than him or her. Overall, the vulnerable narcissist will have a much more intense emotional experience, and his or her behaviors will likely be due to a lack of control over those emotions.

Miller and colleagues (2011) argue that grandiosity and vulnerability may have similar levels of entitlement for different reasons. They suggest that those high on the grandiose dimension may believe that they are simply better than others, and their entitlement may be linked to a sense of wanting to be dominant. Vulnerable narcissists may, in contrast, see themselves as entitled due to the emotional distress they experience, causing them to demand special care.

Developmental factors

With regards to the development of narcissism, research has found some predictors for vulnerable narcissism, with relatively weak predictors of grandiose narcissism. Research seems to suggest that early experiences play a greater role in the development of vulnerable narcissism. For instance, Miller and colleagues (2010) found that vulnerable narcissism was linked to early experiences of low warmth from parents, poor parenting techniques, excessive parental control, and negative attachment styles. Grandiosity has had weaker relations to early developmental

experiences. Carlson and Gjerde (2009) also found evidence of early grandiose narcissistic traits

in preschoolers who had higher levels of narcissism later in life, but effects were small.

Differences within Grandiose Narcissism

Within the concept of grandiose narcissism, there appear to be even further subcategories.

Grandiosity appears to be made up of the two dimensions of admiration and rivalry. The

categories are different, but they both serve the same purpose of elevating the narcissist's image

above others. Their distinction is notable, however, because they tend to lead to very different

behaviors in an individual. First, admiration is the sub dimension within grandiosity which is

positively correlated with self-esteem. One of the key features of those with high levels of this

dimension is to display positive qualities. They present a confident persona which makes them

initially well-liked and attractive to other people, though that image tends not to last over time as

people see through their act (Back et al., 2013; Wurst et al., 2016). For example, the admiration

feature of grandiose narcissism would be displayed when a person goes into a job interview and

starts listing numerous positive qualities about themselves, even if they are exaggerated or not

true. Eventually, people will come to see that exaggeration may hurt the relation and image of

the narcissist, but overall, this is one of the more benign aspects of narcissism.

Rivalry can be considered the more harmful side of grandiose narcissism. The goal for

rivalry is very different; instead of building the narcissist up, the individual wants to tear others

down who are "threats." The narcissist may engage in aggression to hurt those that have

somehow injured the narcissist's ego (Back et al, 2013). In the interview example, a rivalry

narcissist would start to tell the interviewer negative things about the other applicants in order to

make them look worse than the narcissist. Obviously, this can lead to strained social

relationships with other people. Research has supported this, as Wurst and colleagues (2016)

found that the rivalry dimension of narcissism is positively correlated with poorer images and relationships with the people around the narcissist.

A person may have different levels of each of these dimensions. Wetzel and colleagues (2016) found three different groupings of the narcissistic traits, with individuals grouping into low, medium, and high levels of narcissism. Those who had medium and high levels of narcissism had more maladaptive traits such as impulsivity and psychopathy. Further, they found that individuals tended to express the dimensions of rivalry and admiration in one of two ways. Either the individual would have very agentic characteristics due to the expression of admiration qualities, or the individual would have agentic and aggressive characteristics due to the expression of both admiration and rivalry.

Trait-Based Approach to Personality Disorders

Research on psychological disorders has moved from viewing disorders as distinct categories that certain people either do or do not fit into, to looking at disorders as existing on spectrums, where individuals may have differing levels of traits associated with the disorder (Krueger & Markon, 2006). Miller and colleagues (2018) suggest that personality disorders are better viewed as clusters of these more basic personality traits. This perspective has influenced research on and understanding of personality disorders. A prevailing opinion in personality literature is that personality disorders exist as extreme, maladaptive versions of normal personality features (Krueger et al., 2005). This interpretation has been central to current theories of narcissism such as the Narcissism Spectrum Model, which views narcissistic personality disorders as extreme versions of normal personality features (Krizan et al., 2018).

Research and diagnosis of Personality Disorders is currently moving towards a spectrum trait-based model. While the DSM-5 kept the categorical models of classification from previous

additions, it also presented an optional spectrum trait-based model for assessing personality

disorders. The PID-5 is composed of 25 different traits that correspond to 5 core personality

domains (Waters & Bagby, 2018). These 5 domains are negative affect, detachment, antagonism,

disinhibition, and psychoticism. These domains have been found to be structured similarly to the

Five Factor Model of personality (Dreuger et al., 2012), and the PID-5 in general has done a

reasonable job of assessing personality pathology (Krueger & Markon, 2014). This trait based

approach to personality disorders could be a useful assessment method in helping to determine

how entitlement is a key differentiating trait of narcissism from Borderline and Antisocial

Personality Disorders.

Fluctuation between Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism

A further advantage of a dimensional approach to personality disorders allows for

individual variability along one or more spectrums. Narcissistic grandiosity and vulnerability

clearly have major differences; current research shows entirely different nomological networks

for the two dimensions (Miller et al., 2011). This may cause one to assume that those who are

high on one dimension of narcissism are not high on the other. This idea even appears to have

empirical support; grandiose and vulnerable narcissism do not share a strong correlation (Miller

et al., 2017). However, an alternate view is that there are individuals who fluctuate between the

two dimensions. This fluctuation would not be measured by most of the existing tools that

measure narcissism. Ronningstam (2009) suggests that grandiose and vulnerable traits can

fluctuate based on an individual's experiences. Ronningstam suggests that threats to self-esteem

can cause narcissists to become more hostile and grandiose in order to defend their egos. At the

same time, they could also be overcome with feelings of shame and detachment from these same

experiences.

Actual research on this theory has been very limited. The only notable study is a survey conducted by Gore and Widiger (2016). In it, clinicians and clinical psychology professors reported that they had encountered patients who were primarily grandiose narcissists but would go through periods of time where they displayed significant vulnerable traits. Interestingly, they did not report the reverse of this relationship; vulnerable narcissists did not appear to display significant symptoms of grandiosity.

Oltmanns and Widiger (2018) looked at this lack of research on fluctuation between narcissism dimensions. They designed a scale that measures the fluctuation between narcissistic traits of grandiosity and vulnerability. They cite the Rosenberg Self Stability Scale (RSSS) as evidence that fluctuation between different levels of a trait can be measured, as that scale measures fluctuation in self-esteem. In their study, they identified three scales of narcissistic fluctuation: indifference/anger, grandiosity/shame, and assertiveness/insecurity.

The fluctuation scales correlated with measures of both grandiosity and vulnerability (Oltmanns & Widiger, 2018). They were also strongly associated with neuroticism and affective lability, which suggests that affective changes may be a possible contributor to fluctuation in narcissistic traits. The authors note that there was only a modest correlation between grandiosity and vulnerability in their study, suggesting that people are not endorsing both grandiose and vulnerable traits at the same time. They further conclude that the narcissistic fluctuation scales are both associated with antagonism, extraversion, and neuroticism, which are the key personality traits that compose narcissism. They ultimately conclude that fluctuation had a stronger relationship with neuroticism and vulnerability than it had with extraversion and grandiosity respectively.

This research suggests that the measurement of narcissism needs to consider more factors than simply grandiosity and vulnerability, and that these factors should be examined from a dimensional perspective. The study showed evidence that at least some narcissistic individuals show fluctuation between the dimensions of grandiosity and vulnerability, an occurrence that seems to deserve more research. Furthermore, emotional fragility, neuroticism, and vulnerability seem to be significant predictors of this fluctuation, possibly even being moderating variables.

Maladaptive and Adaptive Narcissism

Many researchers view narcissism as maladaptive or an extreme version of normal personality traits (Krizan et al., 2017; Krueger et al., 2005). This view is consistent with viewing personality disorders in general on a spectrum and encourages the use of non-clinical populations as valid participant pools for studying narcissistic features. In contrast, other researchers such as Pincus and colleagues (2009) have looked to differentiate narcissistic features themselves as either adaptive or maladaptive. Some researchers found evidence for this differentiation of narcissism. Wink, Dillon, and Fay (2005) examined how narcissism related to spirituality in older adults, and they found two different constructs of narcissism. One was a healthier version of narcissism which promoted autonomy and spirituality, while the other was a hypersensitive version of narcissism that was unrelated to spirituality. Further supporting this idea, Miller and Campbell (2008) also found results suggesting both a relatively healthy and unhealthy version of narcissism. When measuring narcissism with the Narcissistic Personality Inventory or NPI (a measure of more grandiose narcissistic traits), the researchers found individuals to have a type of narcissism with extraverted tendencies and emotional resiliency. When measuring with a clinical measure of narcissism called the Personality Diagnostic Questionnaire (PDQ-4), the researchers found a version of narcissism with high levels of emotional instability, negative affect, and

introversion. These results suggested two dimensions exist within narcissism: one with healthier features such as emotional resiliency, and one with less healthy features such as neuroticism. Notably, both shared the quality of high antagonism, but both further differentiated from each other on self-esteem and developmental factors. The "healthy" dimension found with the NPI positively correlated with self-esteem, while the "unhealthy" dimension found with the PDQ-4 was negatively or nonsignificantly correlated with self-esteem while also being related to more reports of parenting problems while the participants were growing up. This has led some researchers to speculate that grandiose narcissism represents a healthy or adaptive version of narcissism while vulnerability is an unhealthy version (Pincus et al., 2009). This idea is understandable as grandiosity has been linked to several qualities that are not generally seen as pathology such as leadership or extraversion (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). However, more recent research suggests that this may be an outdated method of differentiating the two main features of narcissism.

In order to view grandiosity as a healthy version of narcissism, one has to deemphasize several parts of the personality. To start, grandiosity has also been paired with several traits that are associated with pathology such as antagonism, deceitfulness, and manipulativeness (Miller et al., 2014). It is also strongly associated with psychopathy, which is generally considered a maladaptive personality trait (Vize et al., 2018). As Miller and colleagues (2017) point out, those who see grandiosity as healthy are often deemphasizing or ignoring the interpersonal distress that grandiose causes in relationships and overemphasizing the internal distress associated with vulnerable narcissism; they point out that pathology involves both internal distress and external impairment. The grandiose narcissist may not experience strong internal distress, but their behaviors often lead to significant impairment in their environments. Social behaviors such as

their poor altruism and noncompliance will likely cause external distress for the narcissist and those around them, which can lead to hostile and angry relationships. While this type of external impairment is different from the internal distress that vulnerable narcissists experience, it is still a significant cause of suffering in the grandiose narcissist's life. Because of this, it seems unfitting to refer to grandiose narcissism as an adaptive or "healthy" form of narcissism.

Psychodynamic Mask Theory and Self-esteem

Self-esteem has been a contentious topic within research into grandiose narcissism. Different studies have linked narcissism to both high and low self-esteem at different times. Often, grandiose is linked with higher self-esteem while vulnerability is linked to low self-esteem. Other researchers have suggested that grandiose narcissism should also be associated with low self-esteem and that the grandiose behaviors of the narcissistic individuals are really just a façade. Bosson and colleagues (2008) describes this Psychodynamic Mask Theory as the idea that the outward confident and praise seeking behavior only serves to hide deep insecurities within a narcissist. This theory suggests that narcissists are thus very sensitive to any situation which they feel may threaten their self-esteem. There has been some research which supported variable and implicit self-esteem in being important factors in understanding narcissism.

Giacomin and Jordan (2016) found that the level of narcissistic traits often fluctuates throughout the day depending on what the different challenges and ego threats the individual encountered. One potential explanation could be that narcissists have an underlying low level of self-esteem and only pretend to be self-confident at times. Myers and Zeigler-Hill (2012) used a bogus pipeline technique to uncover how narcissists feel about themselves when they likely believe that the examiner will know if they are lying. In the test, the researchers connected certain participants to what the participants were told was a functioning lie detector. The test is

useful for showing the differences in answers when groups of individuals believe that they cannot get away with lying. Narcissists in the bogus pipeline condition gave more negative opinions of themselves than those in the control condition, suggesting narcissists may be presenting a more positive view of themselves than they truly believe. However, they only found this result in females. In another study, Barnett and Powell (2016) found support for the psychodynamic mask model. They found that individuals with high levels of narcissism used verbal and physical aggression to "mask" their low levels of self-esteem. However, Barnett and Powell likewise only found this relationship in women; male participants with high levels of narcissism did not fit this psychodynamic mask model.

However, in another bogus pipeline study by Brunell and Fisher (2014), those with high levels of grandiose narcissism also had high levels of self-esteem. This positive correlation contradicts previous studies and the psychodynamic mask model, and it suggests that grandiose narcissists are not "pretending" to have a high self-esteem. Zeigler-Hill and Bessler (2013) argue that narcissists actually have very low self-esteem but simply act like they have high self-esteem. In a study of 891 undergraduate students, Zeigler-Hill and Bessler (2013) found that different facets of narcissism had different associations with self-esteem. For example, NPI entitlement was negatively associated with self-esteem, while NPI leadership was positively associated with self-esteem. They also found that part of narcissism is associated with daily fluctuations of self-esteem; however, vulnerability is the only facet that they found with this fluctuation.

Overall, the level of self-esteem that narcissists have is up for debate. The Mask model suggests that narcissists have a high explicit self-esteem in that they present a confident front, but at the same time, they have low internal or implicit self-esteem. Research has been inconclusive

with regards to whether this is accurate, with notable questions as to how one could measure "implicit" self-esteem (Bosson et al., 2008).

Narcissism Spectrum Model and Entitlement

With the conflicting findings on narcissism, a new idea has been proposed for defining true narcissism. The Narcissism Spectrum Model was recently presented by Krizan and Herlache (2018). In their article, the authors present a new model of narcissism to try to explain the contradictory nature of narcissism. The model rests on entitled self-importance being the key feature that determines narcissism. This construct has the idea that the common trait in those with narcissism is that they consider their own goals and desires as superior to other people (Krizan & Herlache, 2018). Many leading psychologists who work with narcissists have stated that their entitlement is a key feature in explaining their behavior. Further, entitlement has been found to be a common factor in both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, the two most common forms of narcissism currently. In this conceptualization of narcissism, entitlement is more than a simple desire to be treated fairly or to be happy. Rather, it relates to an expectation of being treated better than others (Miller et al., 2012).

The first thing to note is that the NSM does not discriminate between clinical and subclinical versions of narcissism. Krizan and Herlache (2018) argue that a clinical diagnosis of narcissism is a more severe form of an underlying spectrum of narcissistic features. This model of looking at pathology on a spectrum has been applied in research on antisocial personality disorder and substance abuse (Krueger et al., 2005). Further, this spectrum model is represented in the dimensional option for diagnosing personality disorders presented in the DSM-5, which is called the PID-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). This new measure in the DSM-5 has had limited success at measuring the dimensions of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Miller

et al., 2013). The current researchers were also unaware of any current research with regards to the PID-5 and the NSM.

The NSM presents many unique ways of explaining several of the contradictory facets of narcissism. It seems to partially explain how the divide between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism works. First, entitlement is a factor that can exist and be expressed in different ways for different people, which may explain some of the various phenotypes of narcissism. For example, an individual could conceptually have high entitlement while having either low or high self-esteem. Whether or not one has a high or low opinion of oneself, one could still see one's goals and desires as more important than those of other people. Thus, more extreme entitlement may lead to differing behaviors in people with narcissism, depending on their level of self-esteem.

Krizan and Herlache (2018) further explain how grandiose and vulnerability can be explained via their NSM by looking at them as different expressions of entitlement. They described grandiose as a bold-approach oriented type of entitlement, while vulnerability is a reactive-avoidance type of entitlement. Research has shown differences for how grandiose and vulnerable people act in social situations. Grandiose narcissists have a more approach-oriented interaction style, while vulnerable narcissists had a more reactive-oriented interaction style (Wood et al., 2015). However, entitlement is still a key feature in both versions of narcissism (Miller et al., 2012).

While the NSM shows promise for research into narcissism, there are still questions that need to be understood about the model. For instance, a key claim of the model is that entitlement is a key feature of narcissism. If that is true, then one would expect entitlement to successfully distinguish narcissism from other disorders that correlate with narcissism. Two such personality

disorders that have ties to narcissism are Borderline Personality Disorder and Antisocial

Personality Disorder. To further evaluate entitlement as a defining feature of narcissism, one

needs to understand the relationship between entitlement and these closely-related disorders.

Borderline Personality Disorder and Narcissism

Borderline personality disorder has a strong correlation with narcissism, especially

vulnerable narcissism features (Miller & Campbell, 2008; Pincus et al., 2009). It is not

uncommon to see Borderline Personality Disorder and Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD)

coexisting in research. Comorbidity between narcissism and Borderline Personality Disorder

(BPD) has measured from 17-80% (Diamond et al., 2014). Stinson and colleagues (2008) found

in a national survey of adults in the United States that 37% of those who had been diagnosed

with NPD were also comorbid with BPD. These comorbidity rates are further complicated by the

similarities that the two disorders share in their presentations. Both personality disorders feature

high levels of neuroticism, displaying high amounts of anxiety, depression, and general

emotional instability. This general level of neuroticism has been found in several additional

personality disorders, leading some to suggest that it may be a feature common among

personality disorders as opposed to simply between narcissism and borderline (Miller, 2014). In

fact, Miller (2014) suggests that vulnerable narcissism may not be a unique feature of narcissism

because its profile of high neuroticism is seen in borderline, paranoid, schizotypal, and avoidant

personality disorders. Instead, Miller (2014) suggests that grandiosity should be seen as the

central feature to narcissism. Vulnerable narcissism and borderline personality also share

common personality traits; both are positively correlated with neuroticism and antagonism while

being negatively correlated with extraversion (Miller et al., 2014; Mullins-Sweatt et al., 2006).

These assertions seem opposed to the NSM, which suggests that the key feature defining narcissism is entitlement. The question then arises whether entitlement is a better differentiator of narcissism from BPD. Research on BPD's relationship to entitlement has been mixed. In a meta-analysis of the underlying schemas for BPD, 5 out of 17 studies examined showed a significant positive correlation between entitlement schemas and BPD (Barazandeh et al., 2016). Furthermore, Pryor and colleagues (2008) examined the correlation between undergraduate personality factors and two different entitlement scales. They found that BPD was correlated with entitlement, but not as strongly as NPD. Notably, BPD correlated more strongly with the entitlement dimension on the NPI than it did with the PES. The authors suggest that this may be due to the type of entitlement that the entitlement dimension from the NPI was measuring. They reported that it measures entitlement that focuses more on "interpersonal distrust, coldness, and noncompliance as well as decreased positive affect and interpersonal dominance than the PES" (Pryor et al., 2008, p. # 519).

Overall, there appear to have been relatively few studies that have looked directly at entitlement levels of BPD. This makes sense, as borderline features are characterized by features that seem in opposition to entitlement, such as shame (Barazandeh et al., 2016; Unoka & Vizin, 2017). However, with the apparent relationship between BPD and NPD and the NSM suggesting that entitlement is a key feature of NPD, it seems prudent to further explore how entitlement compares between these two disorders. This study also looks to go farther than the NSM and examine antagonism as another key feature of narcissism in addition to entitlement.

Antisocial Personality Disorder, Psychopathy, and Narcissism

Like BPD and NPD, Antisocial Personality Disorder (ASPD) and NPD are also common comorbid personality disorders (O'Boyle et al., 2012). Researchers have paid especially close

attention to the relationship between NPD and psychopathy, one of the more severe features of

ASPD and one of NPD's strongest connections to ASPD. NPD and psychopathy are members of

the Dark Triad due to their association with negative behaviors such as hostility, aggression, and

criminality (O'Boyle et al, 2012). Psychopathy specifically describes traits of individuals who are

unconcerned with adhering to societal standards and display a lack of remorse or guilt when their

behaviors negatively impact others. This often leads to those with psychopathic traits engaging in

criminal activity (Hare & Neumann, 2009). Psychopathy and narcissism can look very similar at

times. Both disorders can lead to selfishness when dealing with others, and individuals with

either personality trait may deliberately conceal from others these personality factors in order to

avoid social rebuke (O'Boyle et al., 2012). Further, grandiose traits share a positive correlation

with grandiose narcissism specifically (Vize et al., 2018). From a Five-Factor Model perspective,

it is also notable that narcissism and psychopathy both are positively correlated with antagonism

(Decuyper et al., 2009).

When considering ASPD's association with the NSM, it is important to understand the

relationship between ASPD and entitlement. The self-entitled nature of those with ASPD would

likely suggest that they would be linked to high levels of entitlement (Anderson et al., 2014).

Ozdel and colleagues (2015) found support for this hypothesis when they discovered that those

with antisocial personality disorder scored high on measures of entitlement. Notably, antisocial

behaviors are positively correlated to entitlement in individuals with grandiose beliefs, high self-

esteem, and emotional stability (Crowe et al., 2016). Antisocial behaviors being linked to

entitlement presents challenges for the NSM. If entitlement is a key factor of antisocial

personality features, then it is unclear how entitlement can also be used as the defining feature of

narcissism. This study hopes to rectify that disparity. It also wishes to expand on the scope of the

NSM by examining antagonism as well as entitlement as a key feature of narcissism that distinguishes it from other disorders.

Central and Peripheral Features of Narcissism.

Overall, numerous studies have looked at narcissism and found that three personality features explain the majority of the dimension. Miller and Campbell (2008) found that antagonism was the common trait between clinical and personality views of narcissism. They also found that the two domains had the most variance within the domains of extraversion and neuroticism; clinical narcissism conceptualizations captured neuroticism more while personality narcissism conceptualizations captured extraversion more. These findings suggest that high antagonism is the personality trait central to all versions of narcissism, while an individual's levels of neuroticism and extraversion are peripheral features that better differentiate the type of narcissism.

Current Study

The Narcissism Spectrum Model presents a new way of defining narcissism. Looking at entitlement as the key distinguishing feature has a potential to help explain the confusion surrounding the different factors of grandiose and vulnerability. This study wishes to expand on the NSM by examining antagonism as an additional defining factor for narcissism. To examine both of these factors, the current study looks to examine if entitlement and antagonism can differentiate narcissism from other disorders closely related to narcissism. To clarify, if entitlement and antagonism are key defining traits of narcissism, those traits will likely be the strongest predictors of narcissism, above and beyond traits of other closely related personality disorders.

In this study, I hypothesize that higher levels of antagonism and entitlement will be stronger predictors of grandiose narcissism than an individual's level of psychopathy. Likewise, this study hypothesizes that higher levels of antagonism and higher levels of entitlement will be stronger predictors of vulnerable narcissism than an individual's level of borderline personality traits.

Method

Participants and Procedures

Participants were undergraduates at the University of South Carolina Aiken recruited through SONA systems, and they were granted course credit in exchange for their participation in the study. The participants were required to complete three hours of research participation for their classes, and they were rewarded with a half hour of research for completion of this study. Students arrived to the laboratory at their scheduled time and completed the study at a desk separated by partitions on both sides for privacy. Up to four participants could complete the study at the same appointment session. All participants signed an informed consent document (see Appendix A) and then completed an information sheet capturing their basic demographic information. Participants then completed a series of questionnaires via pencil-and-paper format. The entire procedure took around 30-45 minutes. All participants were administered all of the measures, but the order in which they completed them was randomized. After completion of the measures, the participants were informed that the experience was over, debriefed on the purpose of the study, and thanked for their participation.

Measures

Demographic Variables*:* The participants reported gender, ethnicity, age, educational level, occupation, and major in college (see Appendix B).

Five Factor Narcissism Inventory – Short Form (FFNI-SF; Sherman, Miller, Few, Campbell, Widiger, Crego, & Lynam, 2015): The Five Factor Narcissism Inventory (FFNI) is a 148- item self-report measure that was developed to measure Narcissistic Personality Disorder from a Five Factor Model perspective (Glover et al., 2012). It has been shown to be a valid and reliable measure of both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2014). The FFNI measures the singular dimensions of grandiosity and vulnerability comparably if not better than traditional measures of those dimensions, namely the Narcissistic Personality Disorder and the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale. For this study, the short form was utilized which has been shown to be comparable to the long form profile of narcissism. Notably, the FFNI-SF has been shown to have nearly identical profiles between it and the long version for profiles of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism (Sherman et al., 2015; see Appendix C). Cronbach's alpha for the FFNI-SF is .89

Borderline Personality Questionnaire (BPQ; Poreh et al., 2006): The BPQ is a self-report measure for borderline personality disorder features. It is composed of 80 yes or no questions assessing individuals on the presence of traits associated with Borderline Personality Disorder. In a study by Chanen and colleagues (2008), the BPQ was found to be the most accurate for overall diagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder in youth and young adults. This scale is composed of the following 9 subscales: Impulsivity, Affective Instability, Abandonment, Relationships, Self-Image, Suicide/Self-Mutilation, Emptiness, Intense Anger, and Quasi-Psychotic States. In Poreh and colleagues' study, they summed the average score for an answer on each subscale together to get an average sum of scores, which was 21.06 (SD=12.91). Cronbach's alpha for the BPQ is .95 (see Appendix D).

Self-Report of Psychopathy (SRP-2; Lester, Salekin, and Sellbom, 2013): This is a self-report measure of traits associated with psychopathy. It is composed of 58 questions on a 5-point Likert scale where respondents rate how much statements apply to them. Lester, Salekin, and Sellbom (2013) described the SRP-II as a rich source of information for studying psychopathy's different factors. The researchers found four factors being measured within the SRP-II, which were interpersonal, fearlessness, coldheartedness, and disinhibition/impulsivity. The researchers further demonstrated that the SRP-2 was a valid measure of this four-factor model of psychopathy. This study used these four factors in calculating the Psychopathy scale. The score was averaged for each of the four factors and averaged together to make one total score (Cronbach's alpha = .87) (see Appendix E).

Psychological Entitlement Scale: (PES; Campbell, Bonacci, Shelton, Exline, & Bushman, 2004). The PES focuses on personal entitlement in individuals. Campbell and colleagues (2004) found the scale to be reliable and valid, as well as stable over time. They found that average entitlement scores were 31.5 for males (SD = 9.4) and 30.7 for females (SD = 8.1). The PES had an alpha coefficient of .79. Krizan and Johar (2012) found entitlement as measured by the PES to be strongly associated with both grandiosity and vulnerability. Further, the PES focuses on internal beliefs rather than the outward functional behaviors of individuals, which is why Krizan and Herlache (2018) argue that it can be used to assess narcissistic entitlement independent of what other dimensions of narcissism an individual possesses (see Appendix F).

Personality Inventory for the DSM-5 (PID-5; Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2012): the PID-5 is a measure of maladaptive personality traits developed and distributed with the DSM-5 (Krueger, Derringer, Markon, Watson, & Skodol, 2012). It measures personality disorders from a Five Factor Model perspective by breaking the five factors into 25

different traits to be measured. It is composed of 220 questions that asks respondents to rate their

behavior on a 4 point Likert scale. The 25 traits are then combined into 5 domains of negative

affectivity, detachment, disinhibition, antagonism, and psychoticism. For this study, only the

domain of antagonism was used to measure trait antagonism in participants. Higher scores on the

PID-5 antagonism domain have been shown to capture lower scores on the Five Factor Model

dimension of agreeableness (Thomas et al., 2013). Participants' responses on the PID-5 domain

of antagonism were used to measure their trait levels of antagonism. Cronbach's alpha for the

antagonism domain was .97.

Results

With regard to demographics, the sample of participants was composed of 55 females and

18 males (*N*=73). In the sample, 61.6% of the sample was white, 2.7% were Hispanic, 30.1%

were African American, 1.4% were Asian, 1.4% were American Indian/Alaskan Native, and

2.7% identified as other. Further, 60.3% of the participants were freshmen, 4.1% were juniors,

30.1% were sophomores, 5.5% identified as other. Three participants identified as being dual

enrolled and one participant reported completing the course as a requirement for a post college

degree. Average scores for participants are presented in Table 1. A correlation of variables was

run. Several significant positive correlations were found among many of the variables measured

in the study. These correlations are reported in Table 2.

Antagonism and Entitlement Predictors of Narcissism

It was hypothesized that high levels of entitlement, antagonism, and psychopathy would

be significant predictors of grandiose narcissism. Specifically, I predicted that entitlement and

antagonism would account for higher levels of variability in grandiose narcissism than

psychopathy traits alone would. To test this, a linear regression model was run with the variables

of psychopathy, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for grandiose narcissism. A

linear regression model was chosen to best measure unique variation within the model. This

method would best demonstrate whether antagonism and entitlement were measuring a unique

aspect of narcissism that was not captured by psychopathy. Participants' scores on the SRP-2,

PID-5 antagonism scale, and PES were used as the variables of psychopathy, antagonism, and

entitlement. Psychopathy, antagonism, and entitlement were predictor variables in the model;

grandiose narcissism was the outcome variable. The model explained 68.8% of the variance ($p <$

$.001$). Psychopathy alone predicted 60% of the variance. High levels of psychopathy ($b = .569; p$

$< .001$) and antagonism ($b = .325; p < .001$) were the most significant predictors in the model.

Entitlement appeared to be nearing significance but was not a significant predictor in the model

($b = .069; p = .059$).

To better analyze how each factor helped to explain variability in the model, a three-stage

hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. Grandiose narcissism was entered as the

outcome variable. Psychopathy was entered as stage one in the regression, entitlement was

entered as stage two, and antagonism was entered as stage three. In this hierarchical regression,

psychopathy contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,71) = 106.680, p < .001$, and

accounted for 60.0% of the variability in grandiose narcissism. Adding entitlement to the model

accounted for an extra 2.7% of variability and caused the model to predict a higher amount of

variability, $F(2,70) = 58.760, p < .001$. Adding antagonism to the model accounted for an

additional 6.1% of variability and caused the model to predict a higher amount of variability, F

$(3, 69) = 50.708, p < .001$. When all three independent variables were combined on the third

stage of the model, entitlement was no longer a significant predictor.

It was hypothesized that high levels of entitlement, antagonism, and borderline features would be significant predictors of vulnerable narcissism. Specifically, I predicted that entitlement and antagonism would account for higher levels of variability in vulnerable narcissism than borderline traits alone would. To test this, a linear regression model was run with borderline features, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for vulnerable narcissism. As stated above, a linear regression model was chosen to best measure unique variation within the model. Participants' total scores on the BPQ, PID-5 antagonism scale, and PES were used as the variables of borderline features, antagonism, and entitlement respectively. Borderline features, antagonism, and entitlement were predictor variables in the model; vulnerable narcissism was the outcome variable. The model explained 43.7% of the variance ($p < .001$). Borderline features alone predicted 36.3% of the variance. High levels of borderline features ($b = .628; p < .001$) and entitlement ($b = .290; p < .001$) were the most significant predictors in the model. Antagonism was not a significant predictor in the model ($b = -.056; p = .599$).

To better analyze how each factor helped to explain variability in the model, a three-stage hierarchical multiple regression was conducted. Vulnerable narcissism was entered as the outcome variable. Borderline features were entered at stage one in the regression, entitlement was entered at stage two, and antagonism was entered at stage three. In this hierarchical regression, borderline features contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1, 71) = 40.506$, $p < .001$, and accounted for 36.3% of the variability in vulnerable narcissism. Adding entitlement to the model accounted for an extra 7.2% of variability and caused the model to predict a higher amount of variability, $F(2, 70) = 26.939$, $p < .001$. Adding antagonism to the model accounted for an additional 6.1% of variability and caused the model to predict a higher

amount of variability, $F(3, 69) = 50.708$, $p < .001$. When all three independent variables were combined on the third stage of the model, antagonism was no longer a significant predictor.

Gender Differences

Some gender differences have been observed in research on narcissism. Overall, grandiose narcissism appears to be more common in males, while vulnerable narcissism does not appear to be more common in males or females (Grijalva et al., 2015). To explore potential differences in gender, the data was split in groups between males and females. Due to the lack of male participants, gender was not examined as a predictive factor. Further, the low power in the male group presents concerns for being able to detect significant effects of entitlement and antagonism among those participants. For the female group ($N = 55$), a linear regression model was run with the variables of psychopathy, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for grandiose narcissism. The model explained 72.9% of the variance ($p < .001$). High levels of psychopathy ($b = .521$; $p < .001$), entitlement ($b = .115$; $p = .007$), and antagonism ($b = .379$; $p < .001$) were all significant predictors in the model. A second linear regression model was run with borderline features, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for vulnerable narcissism. The model explained 45.3% of the variance ($p < .001$). High levels of borderline features ($b = 2.279$; $p < .001$) and entitlement ($b = .230$; $p = .003$) were significant predictors in the model. Antagonism was not a significant predictor in the model ($b = -.112$; $p = .504$).

For the male group ($N = 18$), a linear regression model was run with the variables of psychopathy, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for grandiose narcissism. The model explained 69.6% of the variance ($p = .001$). High levels of psychopathy ($b = .808$; $p = .005$) was the most significant predictor in the model. High levels of entitlement ($b = -.014$; $p = .850$), and antagonism ($b = -.006$; $p = .981$) were not significant predictors. A second linear

regression model was run with borderline features, antagonism, and entitlement as predictor variables for vulnerable narcissism. The model explained 42.7% of the variance ($p = .045$). High levels of borderline features ($b = 2.376; p = .026$) was the most significant predictor in the model. Entitlement ($b = .085; p = .692$) and antagonism ($b = .086; p = .887$) were not significant predictors in the model.

Post Hoc Analyses

Psychopathy features were entered as outcome variables in the second stage of a hierarchical regression to attempt to better explain variability in vulnerable narcissism. The addition of psychopathy only explained an additional 0.1% of variability. While the model was still significant, $F (4, 68) = 13.222, p < .001$, psychopathy was not a significant predictor ($b = .024; p = .848$).

As neuroticism has been called another key trait in vulnerable narcissism, I attempted to use the negative affectivity domain from the PID-5 to better predict vulnerable narcissism. It was added in the second stage of a hierarchical regression with borderline features, entitlement, antagonism as the first stage. The model predicted an extra 8.4% of variability and caused the model to predict a significantly higher amount of variability, $F (4, 62) = 14.253, p < .001$. When entered alone on the first stage of a hierarchical regression, negative affect predicted 42.4% of variance in the model by itself, $F (1, 65) = 47.939, p < .001$. Borderline features only added 1.3% to the total variance explained on the second stage of the hierarchical regression, $F (2, 64) = 24.885, p < .001$. Entitlement and antagonism were added to the third stage and explained an additional 4.2% of the variance, $F (4, 662) = 14.253, p < .001$).

Discussion

The purpose of this study was to better understand the differences between grandiose and vulnerable forms of narcissism when compared to other measures of personality. The goal was to test what features are best used to distinguish core narcissism from other disorders. Specifically, this study explored how antagonism and entitlement could potentially help explain the variance within narcissism and help to distinguish it from other personality disorders. It was hypothesized that entitlement and antagonism would be stronger predictors of grandiose narcissism than a measure of psychopathy. I specifically predicted that entitlement and antagonism would account for higher levels of variability than psychopathy alone would predict. Results did not support this hypothesis. Psychopathy traits were much stronger predictors of grandiose narcissism than both entitlement and antagonism.

Likewise, it was hypothesized that entitlement and antagonism would be stronger predictors of vulnerable narcissism than a measure of borderline personality disorder. As with grandiosity, results do not support this hypothesis. Borderline traits were much stronger predictors of vulnerable narcissism than both entitlement and antagonism. One thing that was certain from this data was the significant overlap among the measures of different personality disorders. In fact, the strongest predictor of a personality disorder in this study was one's standing on measures of other personality disorders.

These findings add to an ever-growing amount of support for a dimensional approach to studying personality disorders. Researchers have often expressed the inadequacy of categorical understandings of personality disorders as unique disorders (Clark, 2007). Personality disorders display significant comorbidity among themselves, raising the question if they should be seen as unique disorders (Trull & Durrett, 2007). Individuals often meet criteria for multiple personality

disorders at once. This was one of the main contributors to the fifth edition of the Diagnostic and

Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-5) developing a new way of measuring

maladaptive traits to better assess individuals who's personality pathology do not fit into the

description of a single personality disorder (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). This

movement towards a dimensional understanding of personality disorders further emphasizes the

importance of this research study: if narcissism is to continue to exist as a unique disorder, a

better understanding of what makes it unique needs to be empirically demonstrated across

multiple studies. This study worked to further that research into discovering what those "core"

defining features may, or may not, be.

　　　While entitlement and antagonism did not have a greater predictive value for narcissism

than other measures of different personality disorders, they did significantly add to the variance

predicted in the models. Prior research has suggested that both antagonism (Miller et al., 2016)

and entitlement (Krizan & Herlache, 2018) would be defining features in narcissism. In this data

set, higher levels of antagonism were able to better differentiate grandiose narcissism from

psychopathy, a closely related personality disorder. This suggests that high levels of antagonism

may be a core feature of grandiose narcissism that differentiates it from other personality

disorders. These findings fit with prior research on antagonism and grandiose narcissism. For

example, a meta-analysis completed by Samuel and Widiger (2008) found that narcissism had

several strong negative correlations with the Five Factor trait of antagonism. Theoretically, the

Five Factor Model of narcissism, which holds grandiose narcissism to be a combination of high

antagonism and high extraversion, has been shown to be most consistent with expert ratings and

descriptions of narcissism (Miller et al., 2014). This research further adds to the importance of

these features by showing that high levels of antagonism are key to differentiating narcissism

from similar personality disorders. These findings continue to suggest that one should not be

considered a grandiose narcissist without possession of a core antagonistic trait. In contrast to

prior research, higher levels of antagonism did not add any predictive value when predicting

vulnerable narcissism from borderline features. As stated, the Five Factor Model of narcissism

would predict antagonism to be a core component of vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2014).

Research on the Five Factor Narcissism Inventory that was used in this study suggests that

antagonism is a core domain that is assessed by the measure (Miller et al., 2016). While

antagonism was positively correlated to vulnerability in this study, it did not help to better

explain the construct when in a model with entitlement and borderline features. While surprising,

there are notable conclusions to be drawn from these outcomes.

First, these findings reinforce the importance borderline features (and the concept of

neuroticism in general) have in understanding vulnerable narcissism. The two disorders have had

very high correlations in past studies. From a Five Factor Model lens, the two share very high

correlations with neuroticism, and Miller argues that neuroticism is the greatest core concept

behind vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2018). No matter the results of how other "core"

features of narcissism affect vulnerability, research has largely shown that neuroticism is a larger

component of the disorder. Second, sole antagonism added little predictive value when compared

to entitlement and borderline features. It is possible that antagonism captured by the FFNI is

better explained by borderline features and entitlement. One thing to note is that while

antagonism was not a significant predictor of vulnerability in the model, entitlement was, and the

two concepts are not entirely unrelated. Entitlement is one of many subscales that comprises a

small part of the antagonism dimension in the FFNI (Miller et al., 2016). Further, vulnerable and

grandiose narcissism likely relate to antagonism differently. Miller and colleagues (2011) found

that vulnerable narcissism had a weaker relationship to antagonism than grandiose narcissism did. Therefore, while past research points towards antagonism being a key factor in narcissism, this data may suggest that the type of antagonism that is key to vulnerable narcissism could be better understood by borderline features and entitlement. Given this, entitlement appears to show the most promise as an identifiable "core" feature of narcissism.

In this data, higher levels of entitlement were significant predictors of vulnerable narcissism and were nearly significant predictors of grandiose narcissism. Entitlement came very close to being the single factor that significantly distinguishes narcissism from similar disorders, which adds support to the Narcissism Spectrum Model's assertion that entitlement is the core feature of narcissism that unites both grandiosity and vulnerability. This definition unites current research on narcissism with very early ideas of the disorder being an exaggerated sense of self-importance (Jones, 1913). Further, Krizan and Herlache (2018) argue that entitlement as a core features allows narcissism to better differentiate itself from psychopathologies that are also highly antagonistic. In this model, the narcissist's antagonistic behavior is performed for self-serving behaviors in either bold-approach methods or reactive avoidance methods to obtain what the narcissist wants. This allows entitlement to be a core feature of both grandiosity and vulnerability while being expressed differently by both.

When splitting the sample into two different groups based on sex, the results were mostly supportive of the overall results, with a few exceptions. In both males and females, borderline features and psychopathy features were both the strongest predictors of vulnerable and grandiose narcissism respectively. Entitlement was a strong predictor for both vulnerability and grandiosity in the female participants, but it did not significantly predict it in either dimension of narcissism in males. Antagonism was a strong predictor of grandiosity but not vulnerability in females; it

was a poor predictor of grandiosity and vulnerability in males. Splitting the group based upon sex appears to even further illustrate how entitlement distinguishes narcissism from other personality disorders, adding to the predictive value of borderline or psychopathy traits. Most notably, entitlement was a significant predictor of grandiosity in the model, while it had only been nearing significance in the overall model. Given more power in the study, it is possible that antagonism and entitlement will be significant predictors in male participants as well; however, future studies will need to confirm this assumption. Despite this, narcissism in the female group was clearly differentiated from other personality disorders by levels of entitlement. This further supports the study's goal of demonstrating entitlement as a defining feature for both grandiose and vulnerable narcissism.

There were some notable differences between the current study and past research. Samples were relatively similar. Miller and colleagues (2016) collected their samples from both undergraduates and a sample of participants receiving mental health treatment in the community. Krizan and Herlache (2018) only describe their sample as "young adults." As my sample was composed of undergraduate students, Miller and colleagues' sample has somewhat greater diversity in participants than this study's. As my results are at somewhat of odds with their conclusions, it should be a goal of future research to replicate this study in other populations, such as those seeking clinical treatment.

Other notable differences are seen in the types of analyses that this study and other research on the Five Factor Model and Narcissism Spectrum Model have done. Miller and colleagues (2016) used a factor analyses of participant responses to personality questionnaires to determine that extraversion, antagonism, and neuroticism were the most important factors composing both dimensions of narcissism. Antagonism was unique to both grandiosity and

vulnerability. This study expands on Miller and colleagues work by using the factor relationships that Miller discovered as predictor variables. The results of this linear regression suggest that while antagonism is significantly related to vulnerability, this relationship may be better explained by vulnerability's high correlation with borderline features. Likewise for the Narcissism Spectrum Model, initial research used factor analysis to determine how well grandiose and vulnerable traits loaded onto a single trait of entitlement (Krizan & Herlache, 2018). This study expands upon this research by demonstrating in a different statistical analysis (linear regression) that entitlement continues to stand out as a core, distinguishing feature of both dimensions of narcissism.

In the present study, there was a notable difference in the amount of variance accounted for in the models of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. My model of grandiosity predicted much more variance than my model of vulnerability. It was unclear exactly why this discrepancy occurred. One potential explanation could be that research currently has a better understanding of grandiose narcissism than vulnerable narcissism. One of the most historically popular scales for narcissism in research has been the NPI, a measure which has been shown to primarily assess grandiose features (Ackerman et al., 2011). This likely has given grandiose narcissism somewhat of an advantage in that there has been more time to research it. Further, Miller and colleagues (2018) have suggested that the current measures of vulnerable narcissism may not be capturing all of the factors in the disorder. They suggest that current measures of narcissism may be focusing too much on the neuroticism aspect of vulnerable narcissism and not on the antagonism domain. Despite this, antagonism failed to explain any additional variance when placed into my model alongside borderline features, suggesting there may be other factors that better explain the variance within vulnerable narcissism.

To explore this question, I conducted exploratory analyses to attempt to account for more variance in vulnerability. Traits of psychopathy did not explain a significant amount of variance. The domain of negative affect in the PID-5 was also explored as a potential predictor. It was a significant predictor that helped to explain additional variance in the model when added in as a variable with entitlement, borderline features, and antagonism. Further, negative affectivity alone predicted around as much variance as entitlement, borderline features, and antagonism combined. This is not surprising, as negative affect or neuroticism has been suspected as a primary feature of vulnerable narcissism (Miller et al., 2018). These analyses further illustrate that when compared to grandiosity, vulnerability is not as well understood. Future research needs to look at additional measures to better assess what other factors may be composing vulnerable narcissism.

Limitations and Future Directions

This research is important because it is among the first studies to show the Narcissism Spectrum Model's ability to actually distinguish narcissism as a unique disorder. This study showed promising results for the NSM's main hypothesis that entitlement was a core, distinguishing feature of narcissism. However, there were notable limitations to this study. The sample for this study was based on a student population. Future studies should repeat the study with differing populations, including clinical populations. While the NSM assumes that there is little difference between clinical and non-clinical levels of narcissism with regard to the role of entitlement, data to reproduce the findings of this study in clinical populations would give more empirical support to that claim. This study's sample of students appeared largely comparable to prior studies of personality disorders; however, published studies using the measures in this study are limited. The average scores for grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in this study was

not significantly different from average levels in an Italian study. Likewise, levels of entitlement

were not significantly different than prior research would suggest. Notably, levels of borderline

features were significantly higher than expected in this sample student population (*M*=25.06,

SD=15.60) compared to past research by Poreh and colleagues (2006; *M*=21.06, *SD*=12.91).

These higher levels of borderline features could potentially have affected these results.

  Further, this study was limited in the measurement tools used. The SRP-2 and BPQ were

chosen as measurements of different personality disorders largely out of convenience. Future

studies should look to more comprehensive measures of similar personality disorders to try to

reproduce these results. The Personality Assessment Inventory is a likely candidate for follow-up

studies. The PAI measures both borderline features and antisocial features, allowing for one

measure to look at two of the three personality disorders being assessed in this study.

  This study was also limited in its ability to study gender differences. The great majority

of respondents identified as female. Some research has suggested that males are more narcissistic

(Tschanz et al., 1998), while some has shown little differences on levels of narcissism based on

gender (Bleske-Rechek et al., 2008). A more recent meta-analysis by Grijalva and colleagues

(2015) found that men were more likely to be labeled narcissistic due to scoring higher on the

NPI. As discussed before, the NPI is a controversial measure which likely mostly measures

grandiose features of narcissism (Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010). Grijalva and colleagues (2015)

also found no differences in levels of vulnerable narcissism between males and females. Given

these past studies on differences in narcissism between males and females, this author hoped to

explore how the interaction between entitlement, antagonism, and narcissism would relate to

different sexes. However, the number of males in this study was very limited, making it difficult

to make any overarching claims about males. Neither antagonism nor entitlement were

significant predictors of grandiosity or vulnerability in this study's models. In contrast, looking

at only the female participants appears to further support the broad hypotheses of this study.

Entitlement was a significant predictor of vulnerability in females, and both entitlement and

antagonism were significant predictors of grandiosity in females. This again appears to show

that, at least in female populations, the narcissism spectrum model is a promising method of

defining narcissism from other personality disorders. Notably, the addition of the male

participants to the model appeared to lessen the predictive power of entitlement for grandiosity.

Future research should look at this as a potential difference between the sexes.

This study was also limited by an underlying assumption of grandiose and vulnerable

narcissism as stable traits in individuals. This has been the overwhelming assumption in research

on these two dimensions of narcissism. Clinicians who treat narcissistic patients have been the

main proponents that individuals can fluctuate in their levels of grandiose and vulnerable

narcissism (Gore and Widiger, 2016). Oltmanns and Widiger (2018) developed a scale for

measuring these fluctuations, and their initial research suggested that, at least in some narcissistic

individuals, their behavior fluctuated between primarily grandiose and vulnerable. Future studies

should look at how those individuals who may have different levels of grandiose or vulnerable

traits may differ from those who more consistently display traits from only one dimension. This

study was limited in that it only looked at two ways of measuring narcissism, being high on

either grandiosity or vulnerability. However, it could be that in actuality, individuals could

belong to this third group that fluctuates between the two. While this study suggests that

entitlement could be the common factor between vulnerable and grandiose narcissism, it is

unclear if it would continue to be a common factor in those in this fluctuation group. Future

research should replicate this study to confirm if entitlement remains a common factor for all

presentations of narcissism.

Lastly, entitlement in this study was only nearing significance as a strong predictor of

grandiose narcissism in this study's model. Future studies should attempt to further explore this

relationship. Ideally, larger samples and more replication will show a stronger relationship with

entitlement and grandiose narcissism. If this relationship is not shown, then the conclusion that

entitlement is a key factor in both dimensions of narcissism would be seriously challenged. It is

possible that entitlement is only a strong predictor of vulnerable features while only antagonism

is a strong predictor of grandiose features when placed in a model with similar personality

disorders. This would suggest that antagonism is more related to grandiosity and entitlement is

more related to vulnerability, which would support the idea of grandiosity and vulnerability

being unique disorders and not two dimensions of one disorder. Somewhat supporting this view,

entitlement in this study became a non-significant predictor of grandiosity when antagonism was

added in the final stage of the hierarchical model. Because the two items are highly correlated, it

could be that the aspects of entitlement that grandiosity is predicted by are closer related to

antagonism than the entitlement features that are predicting vulnerability. The data in this study

largely seemed to be indicative of grandiosity and vulnerability being united by the concept of

entitlement. However, because this data was unfortunately not entirely conclusive, future studies

are needed to better demonstrate the relationship of entitlement in both grandiosity and

vulnerability.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*

(5th ed.). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.

Anderson, J., Sellbom, M., Wygant, D., Salekin, R., & Krueger, R. (2014).

Examining the associations between DSM–5 Section III antisocial personality disorder

traits and psychopathy in community and university samples. *Journal of Personality

Disorders*, *28*, 675–697. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2014_28_134

Back, M., Küfner, A.. Dufner, M., Gerlach, T., Rauthmann, J., & Denissen, J.

(2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of

narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*, 1013-1037.

https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034431

Bagby, R., Costa Jr., P., Widiger, T. Ryder, A., and

Marshall, M. (2005). DSM-IV personality disorders and the Five-Factor Model of

personality: a multi-method examination of domain- and facet-level

predictions. *European Journal of Personality 19*, 307-324.

https://doi.org/10.1002/per.563

Bailey, C., & Coore Desai, C. (2013). Exploring determinants of aggression -- self-esteem,

narcissism and exposure to violence: Evidence from a sample of Jamaican school

children. *Journal of Eastern Caribbean Studies*, *38*, 63-84.Barazandeh, H., Kissane, D.,

Saeedi, N., & Gordon, M. (2016). A systematic review of the

relationship between early maladaptive schemas and borderline personality

disorder/traits. *Personality & Individual Differences*, *94,* 130-139.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.021

Barnett, M., & Powell, H. (2016). Self-esteem mediates narcissism and aggression among women, but not men: A comparison of two theoretical models of narcissism among college students. *Personality & Individual Differences*, *89*, 100–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.09.042

Bleske-Rechek, A., Remiker, M., & Baker, J. (2008). Narcissistic men and women think they are so hot--But they are not. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *45*, 420–424. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.05.018

Bosson, J., Lakey, C., Campbell, W., Zeigler, H., Jordan, C., & Kernis, M. (2008). Untangling the links between narcissism and self-esteem: A theoretical and empirical review. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*, 1415–1439. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00089.x

Brunell, A., & Fisher, T.(2014). Using the bogus pipeline to investigate grandiose narcissism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *55*, 37–42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.05.015

Bushman, B., Baumeister, R., Thomaes, S., Ryu, E., Begeer, S., & West, S. (2009). Looking again, and harder, for a link between low self-esteem and aggression. *Journal of Personality*, *77*, 427-446. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00553.x

Cain, N., Pincus, A., & Ansell, E. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28,* 638–656. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2007.09.006

Campbell, W., & Campbell, S. (2009). On the self-regulatory dynamics created by the particular benefits and costs of narcissism: A contextual reinforcement model and

examination of leadership. *Self and Identity*, *8*, 214–232.

https://doi.org/10.1080/15298860802505129

Campbell, W., Bonacci, A., Shelton, J., Exline, J. , & Bushman, B. (2004).

Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report

measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *83*, 29–45.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa8301_04

Carlson KS, & Gjerde PF. (2009). Preschool personality antecedents of narcissism in

adolescence and young adulthood: a 20-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Research in*

Personality. 43:570–78. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.03.003

Ceylan, V., Kose, S., Akin, E., & Turkcapar, M. (2017). Normative data and factorial

structure of the Turkish version of the Borderline Personality Questionnaire (Turkish

BPQ). *Psychiatry and Clinical Psychopharmacology, 27*, 143–151.

https://doi-org/10.1080/24750573.2017.1298422

Chatterjee, A., & Hambrick, D. (2011). Executive personality, capability cues, and risk

taking: How narcissistic CEOs react to their successes and stumbles. *Administrative*

Science Quarterly, *56*, 202–237. https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2010.54484461

Clark, L. (2007). Assessment and diagnosis of personality disorder: perennial issues and an

emerging reconceptualization. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *58*, 227–257.

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.57.102904.190200

Crowe, M., LoPilato, A., Campbell, W., & Miller, J. (2016). Identifying two groups

of entitled individuals: Cluster analysis reveals emotional stability and self-esteem

distinction. *Journal of Personality Disorders, 30*, 762–775.

https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2015_29_229

Decuyper, M., De Pauw, S., De Fruyt, F., De Bolle, M., & De Clercq, B. (2009). A meta-

analysis of psychopathy-, antisocial PD- and FFM associations. *European Journal of*

Personality, *23*, 531–565. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.729

Diamond, D., Levy, K., Clarkin, J., Fischer-Kern, M., Cain, N., Doering, S., & ...

Buchheim, A. (2014). Attachment and mentalization in female patients with comorbid

narcissistic and borderline personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research,*

And Treatment, *5*, 428-433. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000065

Dickinson, K., & Pincus, A. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable

narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *17*, 188–207.

https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.17.3.188.22146

Dufner, M., Rauthmann, J., Czarna, A., & Denissen, J. (2013). Are narcissists sexy?

Zeroing in on the effect of narcissism on short-term mate appeal. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Bulletin, *39*, 870–882. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167213483580

Emmons, R. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality

Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *48*, 291–300.

https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_11

Fossati, A., Somma, A., Borroni, S., & Miller, J. (2018). Assessing Dimensions of Pathological

Narcissism: Psychometric Properties of the Short Form of the Five-Factor Narcissism

Inventory in a Sample of Italian University Students. *Journal of Personality Assessment,*

100, 250–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2017.1324457

Giacomin, M., & Jordan, C. (2016). The wax and wane of narcissism: grandiose narcissism

as a process or state. *Journal of Personality*, *84*, 154-164.

https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12148

Glover, N., Miller, J., Lynam, D., Crego, C., & Widiger, T. (2012). The Five-Factor

Narcissism Inventory: A five-factor measure of narcissistic personality traits. *Journal*

Of Personality Assessment, *94*, 500-512. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.670680

Gore, W., & Widiger, T. (2016). Fluctuation between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism.

Personality Disorders, *7*, 363–371. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000181

Grijalva, E., Newman, D., Tay, L., Donnellan, M., Harms, P., Robins, W., & Yan, T.

(2015). Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological*

Bulletin, *141*, 261–310. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038231

Hare, R., & Neumann, C. (2009). Psychopathy: Assessment and forensic implications.

Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, *54*, 791–802.

https://doi.org/10.1093/med/9780199551637.003.0007

Hendin, H., & Cheek, J. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of

Murray's Narcissism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*, 588-599.

https://doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204

Higgs, M., & Lichtenstein, S. (2010). Exploring the "Jingle Fallacy": a study of personality and

values. *Journal of General Management*, *36*, 43–61.

https://doi.org/10.1177/030630701003600103

Jones, E. (1913). Freud's theory of dreams. In E. Jones (Ed.), *Papers on Psycho-analysis* (pp.

312-345). London, England: Bailliere, Tindall & Cox.

https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(01)47838-x

Judge, T., Piccolo, R., & Kosalka, T. (2009). The bright and dark sides of leader traits: A

review and theoretical extension of the leader trait paradigm. *The Leadership Quarterly*,

20, 855-875. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2009.09.004

Krizan, Z., & Herlache, A. (2018). The Narcissism Spectrum Model: A synthetic view of

  narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Review: An Official Journal*

  Of the Society for Personality And Social Psychology, Inc, *22*, 3–31.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316685018

Krizan, Z., & Johar, O. (2012). Envy divides the two faces of narcissism. *Journal Of*

  Personality, *80*, 1415–1451. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2011.00767.x

Krizan, Z., & Johar, O. (2015). Narcissistic rage revisited. *Journal of Personality And Social*

  Psychology, *108*, 784–801. https://doi.org/10.3928/0048-5713-19860801-12

Krueger, R., Markon, K., Patrick, C., & Iacono, W. (2005). Externalizing

  psychopathology in adulthood: a dimensional-spectrum conceptualization and its

  implications for DSM-V. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *114*, 537-550.

  https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-843x.114.4.537

Krueger, R., Derringer, J., Markon, E., Watson, D., Skodol, A., (2012). Initial

  construction of a maladaptive personality trait model and inventory for DSM-5.

  Psychological Medicine. *42*:1879–90. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0033291711002674

Krueger, R., & Markon, K. (2014). The role of the DSM-5 personality trait model in

  moving toward a quantitative and empirically based approach to classifying personality

  and psychopathology. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *10*, 477–501.

  https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032813-153732

Lester, W., Salekin, R., & Sellbom, M. (2013). The SRP-II as a rich source of data on the

  psychopathic personality. *Psychological Assessment*, *25*, 32–46.

  https://doi.org/10.1037/e627572010-001

Lievens, F., van Dam, K., & Anderson, N. (2002). Recent trends and challenges in personnel

  selection. *Personnel Review*, *31*, 580. https://doi.org/10.1108/00483480210438771

Meronen, P. (1999). The return of narcissism: Heinz Kohut in the context of the history of

ideas. *International Forum of Psychoanalysis, 8*, 211-220.

https://doi.org/10.1080/080370699300056211

Miller, J., & Campbell, W. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality

conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality, 76*, 449–476.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x

Miller, J., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L., & Campbell, W. (2010). Searching

for a vulnerable dark triad: Comparing factor 2 psychopathy, vulnerable narcissism, and

borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, *78*, 1529–1564.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x

Miller, J., Hoffman, B., Gaughan, E., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. (2011).

Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal Of

Personality*, *79*, 1013-1042. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x

Miller, J., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., & Campbell, W. (2013). Grandiose and vulnerable

narcissism and the DSM–5 pathological personality trait model. *Journal of Personality

Assessment*, *95*, 284–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.685907

Miller, J., McCain, J., Lynam, D., Few, L., Gentile, B., MacKillop, J., & Campbell, W.

(2014). A comparison of the criterion validity of popular measures of narcissism

and narcissistic personality disorder via the use of expert ratings. *Psychological

Assessment*, *26*, 958-969. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036613

Miller, J., Lynam, D., & Campbell, W. (2016). Measures of narcissism and their

relations to DSM-5 pathological traits: A critical reappraisal. *Assessment*, *23*, 3–9.

https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191114522909

Miller, J., Lynam, D., McCain, J., Few, L., Crego, C., Widiger, T., & Campbell, W. (2016). Thinking structurally about narcissism: An examination of the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory and its components. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *30*, 1-18. https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi_2015_29_177

Miller, J., Lynam, D., Vize, C., Crowe, M., Sleep, C., Maples, K., Few, L., & Campbell, W. (2018). Vulnerable narcissism is (mostly) a disorder of neuroticism. *Journal of Personality*, *86*, 186–199. https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12303

Miller, J., Lynam, D. R., Hyatt, C., & Campbell, W. (2017). Controversies in narcissism. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *13*, 294–315. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-032816-045244

Miller, J., Price, J., & Campbell, W. (2012). Is the narcissistic personality inventory still relevant? A test of independent grandiosity and entitlement scales in the assessment of narcissism. *Assessment*, *19*, 8–13. https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191111429390

Miller, J., Price, J., Gentile, B., Lynam, D., & Campbell, W. (2012). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism from the perspective of the interpersonal circumplex. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *53*, 507–512. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.026

Miller, J., Widiger, T., & Campbell, W. (2010). Narcissistic personality disorder and the DSM-V. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, *119*, 640–649. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0019529

Mullins, L., & Kopelman, R. (1988). Toward an assessment of the construct validity of four measures of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *52*, 610. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa5204_2

Mullins-Sweatt, S., & Lengel, G. (2012). Clinical utility of the Five- Factor Model of

personality disorder. *Journal of Personality*, *80*, 1615–1639.

   https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2012.00774.x

Murray, H. (1938). *Explorations in personality*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Myers, E., & Zeigler-Hill, V. (2012). How much do narcissists really like themselves? Using

   the bogus pipeline procedure to better understand the self-esteem of narcissists. *Journal*

   of Research in Personality, *46*, 102–105. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2011.09.006

O'Boyle, E., Forsyth, D., Banks, G., & McDaniel, M. (2012). A meta-analysis of the

   Dark Triad and work behavior: a social exchange perspective. *The Journal of Applied*

   Psychology, 97, 557–579. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0025679

Oltmanns, J. & Widiger, T. (2018). Assessment of fluctuation between grandiose and

   vulnerable narcissism: Development and initial validation of the FLUX scales.

   Psychological Assessment, *30*, 1612–1624. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000616

Özdel, K., Türkçapar, M., Guriz, S., Hamamci, Z., Duy, B., Taymur, I., & Riskind, J.

   (2015). Early maladaptive schemas and core beliefs in antisocial personality disorder.

   International Journal of Cognitive Therapy, *8*, 306-317

   https://doi.org/10.1521/ijct.2015.8.4.306

Penney, L., & Spector, P. (2002). Narcissism and counterproductive work behavior: Do

   bigger egos mean bigger problems? *International Journal of Selection and*

   Assessment, *10*, 126–134. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2389.00199

Pincus, A., Ansell, E., Pimentel, C., Cain, N., Wright, A., & Levy, K. (2009).

   Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory.

   Psychological Assessment, *21*, 365-379. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016530

Pincus, A. & Lukowitsky, M. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality

   disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *6*, 421–446.

https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131215

Poreh, A., Rawlings, D., Claridge, G., Freeman, J., Faulkner, C., & Shelton, C. (2006).

The BPQ: A scale for the assessment of borderline personality based on DSM-IV

criteria. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *20*, 247–260.

https://doi.org/10.1521/pedi.2006.20.3.247

Pryor, L., Miller, J., & Gaughan, E. (2008). A comparison of the psychological

entitlement scale and the Narcissistic Personality Inventory's entitlement scale:

relations with general personality traits and personality disorders. *Journal Of*

Personality Assessment, *90*, 517-520. https://doi.org/10.1080/00223890802248893

Raskin, R., & Hall, C. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternative form

reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality*

Assessment, *45*, 159. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4502_10

Ronningstam E. 2009. Narcissistic personality disorder: facing DSM-V. *Psychiatr. Ann. 39*:

111–21 https://doi.org/10.3928/00485713-20090301-09

Samuel, D. & Widiger, T. (2008). A meta-analytic review of the relationships between the

five-factor model and DSM-IV-TR personality disorders: A facet level analysis. *Clinical*

Psychology Review, *28*, 1326-1342. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpr.2008.07.002

Sandler, J., Person, E., & Fonagy, P. (2012). *Freud's On Narcissism: An Introduction'*. London:

Routledge.

Sherman, E., Miller, J., Few, L., Campbell, W., Widiger, T., Crego, C., & Lynam,

D. (2015). Development of a short form of the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory: the

FFNI-SF. *Psychological Assessment*, *27*, 1110–1116.

https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000100

Smith, S., Lynch, R., Stephens, H., & Kistner, J. (2015). Self-perceptions and their

   prediction of aggression in male juvenile offenders. *Child Psychiatry and Human

   Development*, *46*, 609–621. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10578-014-0504-0

Stinson, F., Dawson, D., Goldstein, R., Chou, S., Huang, B., Smith, S., &

   Grant, F. (2008). Prevalence, correlates, disability, and comorbidity of DSM-IV

   narcissistic personality disorder: Results from the Wave 2 National Epidemiologic

   Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *69*,

   1033-1045. https://doi.org/10.4088/JCP.v69n0701

Thomas, K., Yalch, M., Krueger, R., Wright, A., Markon, K., & Hopwood, C.

   (2013). The convergent structure of DSM-5 personality trait facets and five-factor

   model trait domains. *Assessment*, *20*, 308–311.

   https://doi.org/10.1177/1073191112457589

Trull, T., & Durrett, C. (2005). Categorical and dimensional models of personality

   disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *1*, 355–380.

   https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.1.102803.144009

Tschanz, B., Morf, C., & Turner, C. (1998). Gender differences in the structure of

   narcissism: A multi-sample analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Sex Roles:

   A Journal of Research*, *38*, 863–870. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1018833400411

Unoka, Z., & Vizin, G. (2017). To see in a mirror dimly. The looking glass self is self-shaming

   in borderline personality disorder. *Psychiatry Research*, *258*, 322–329.

   https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2017.08.055

Vaillancourt, T. (2013). Students aggress against professors in reaction to receiving poor

   grades: An effect moderated by student narcissism and self-esteem. *Aggressive*

Behavior, *39*, 71–84. https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21450

Van Dijk, P., & Brown, A. (2006). Emotional labour and negative job outcomes: An

evaluation of the mediating role of emotional dissonance. *Journal of Management &*

Organization, *12*, 101–115. https://doi.org/10.5172/jmo.2006.12.2.101

Vize, C., Lynam, D., Collison, K., & Miller, J. (2018). Differences among dark triad

components: A meta-analytic investigation. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research,*

and Treatment, *9*, 101–111. https://doi.org/10.1037/per0000222

Wetzel, E., Leckelt, M., Gerlach, T., & Back, M. (2016). Distinguishing subgroups of

narcissists with latent class analysis. *European Journal of Personality, 30*, 374–

389. https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2062

Wink, P., Dillon, M., & Fay, K. (2005). Spiritual seeking, narcissism, and psychotherapy: how

are they related? *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, *44*, 143–158.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5906.2005.00272.x

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*,

590–597. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.590

Wood, D., Gardner, M., & Harms, P. (2015). How functionalist and process

approaches to behavior can explain trait covariation. *Psychological Review*, *122*,

84-111. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0038423

Wurst, S., Gerlach, T., Dufner, M., Rauthmann, J., Grosz, M., Küfner, A

Back, M. (2017). Narcissism and Romantic Relationships: The differential impact of

narcissistic admiration and rivalry. *Journal of Personality and Social*

Psychology, *112*, 280–306. https://doi.org/10.1037/e512142015-499

Zeigler-Hill, V. (2006). Discrepancies between implicit and explicit self-esteem: implications for

narcissism and self-esteem instability. *Journal of Personality*, *74*, 119-144.

https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2005.00371.x

Zeigler-Hill, V., & Besser, A. (2013). A glimpse behind the mask: facets of narcissism and

feelings of self-worth. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *95*, 249-260.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00223891.2012.717150

Table 1: Descriptive statistics

Measures	N	Mean	Median	Standard Deviation	Range	Maximum	Minimum
BPQ	73	**0.317**	0.304	**0.197**	0.800	0.010	0.810
PES	73	**3.036**	3.000	**1.054**	4.000	1.110	5.110
SRP	73	**2.585**	2.552	**0.432**	2.420	1.670	4.090
FFNI-SF: Grandiosity	73	**2.526**	2.568	**0.483**	2.030	1.630	3.660
FFNI-SF: Vulnerability	73	**2.992**	3.125	**0.723**	2.940	1.130	4.060
PID: Antagonism	73	**1.618**	1.571	**0.465**	2.550	1.000	3.550

Table 2: Correlations between variables

Column1	BPQ	PES	SRP	FFNI-SF: Grandiosity	FFNI-SF: Vulnerability	PID: Antagonism
BPQ	1	-0.026	.232*	0.095	.603**	.322**
PES		1	.506**	.532**	.252*	.394**
SRP			1	.775*	.272*	.604**
FFNI-SF: Grandiosity				1	0.221	.680**
FFNI-SF: Vulnerability					1	0.026
PID: Antagonism						1

Appendix A

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA

CONSENT TO BE A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Personality Relationships

KEY INFORMATION ABOUT THIS RESEARCH STUDY:
You are invited to volunteer for a research study conducted by Zane Repp. I am a graduate student in the Department of Psychology, at the University of South Carolina Aiken. The University of South Carolina Aiken, Department of Psychology is sponsoring this research study. The purpose of this study is to better understand how personality types of college students relate to each other. You are being asked to participate in this study because you are currently enrolled in Psychology 101 at USC Aiken. This study is being done at University of South Carolina Aiken Psychology 101 courses and will involve approximately 100 volunteers.

The following is a short summary of this study to help you decide whether to be a part of this study. More detailed information is listed later in this form.

This study is expected to take 30-45 minutes to complete. There are no risks to participating in this study. Your participation will not only reward you with course credit in your Psychology 101 courses, but you will also be contributing to generalized knowledge in the field of personality research. You are free to choose not to participate in this study and will be given the option of an alternative assignment in your course to complete your class credit.

PROCEDURES:

If you agree to participate in this study, you will do the following:
1. Be given a code that allows you to sign on to a secure website that will ask you
2. Complete a questionnaire asking about how you personally interact with others and the world around you.

DURATION:
Participation in the study involves one visit over a period of one day. The study visit will last about 30-45 minutes.

RISKS/DISCOMFORTS:

There are no risks to participating in this study.

BENEFITS:
Taking part in this study is not likely to benefit you personally. However, this research may help researchers to better understand how personality factors influence how people interact with their environments.

COSTS:
There will be no costs to you for participating in this study other than possible costs related to transportation to and from the research site.

PAYMENT TO PARTICIPANTS:

You will not be paid for participating in this study.

COLLECTION OF IDENTIFIABLE PRIVATE INFORMATION:
Information about you may be used for future research studies or may be shared with other researchers; however, this only will be done after identifiers linking the information to you are removed. This will be done without additional consent from you.

COMMERCIAL PROFIT:
No part of this study will be used for commercial profit.

RETURN OF CLINICALLY RELEVANT RESEARCH RESULTS:
Respondent's will not be informed of any clinically relevant research results.

USC STUDENT PARTICIPATION:
Participation in this study is voluntary. You are free not to participate, or to stop participating at any time, for any reason without negative consequences. Your participation, non-participation, and/or withdrawal will not affect your grades or your relationship with your professors, college(s), or the University of South Carolina.

If research credit is required for successful course completion, other alternative means for obtaining credit is available and you may discuss these options with your course instructor.

CONFIDENTIALITY OF RECORDS:

Unless required by law, information that is obtained in connection with this research study will remain confidential. Any information disclosed would be with your express written permission. Study information will be securely stored in locked files and on password-protected computers. Results of this research study may be published or presented at seminars; however, any reports, publications, or presentations will not include your name or other identifying information about you.

VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION:

Participation in this research study is voluntary. You are free not to participate, or to stop participating at any time, for any reason without negative consequences. In the event that you do withdraw from this study, the information you have already provided will be kept in a confidential manner. If you wish to withdraw from the study, please call or email the principal investigator listed on this form.

I have been given a chance to ask questions about this research study. These questions have been answered to my satisfaction. If I have any more questions about my participation in this study, or a study related injury, I am to contact Zane Repp at email ZREPP@USCA.EDU.

Questions about your rights as a research subject are to be directed to, Lisa Johnson, Assistant Director, Office of Research Compliance, University of South Carolina, 1600 Hampton Street, Suite 414D, Columbia, SC 29208, phone: (803) 777-6670 or email: LisaJ@mailbox.sc.edu.

I agree to participate in this study. I have been given a copy of this form for my own records.

If you wish to participate, you should sign below.

_____   _____
Signature of Subject / Participant   Date

_____   _____
Signature of Qualified Person Obtaining Consent   Date

Appendix B

Please answer honestly.

Gender

      1. Male

      2. Female

      3. Other: _____

Class

      1. Freshman

      2. Sophomore

      3. Junior

      4. Senior

      5. Graduate

      6. Other: _____

Please identify your ethnicity

_____

      Please identify your occupation

_____

      Please fill in your major

_____

Appendix C

FFNI-Short Form

This questionnaire contains 60 items. Each item is scored on a 1 to 5 scale, where 1 = the statement is false or that you strongly disagree; 2 = the statement is mostly false or you disagree; 3 = the statement is about equally true or false, you cannot decide, or you are neutral on the statement; 4 = the statement is mostly true or you agree; and 5 = the statement is definitely true or you strongly agree. Please read each item carefully and provide your answer that best corresponds to your agreement or disagreement. There are no right or wrong answers. Describe yourself honestly and state your opinions as accurately as possible.

1=Disagree strongly

2=Disagree a little

3=Neither agree nor disagree

4=Agree a little

5=Agree strongly

1. I am extremely ambitious.

2. Others say I brag too much, but everything I say is true.

3. Leadership comes easy for me.

4. When someone does something nice for me, I wonder what they want from me.

5. I deserve to receive special treatment.

6. I get lots of enjoyment from entertaining others.

7. It's fine to take advantage of persons to get ahead.

8. I often fantasize about someday being famous.

9. When people judge me, I just don't care.

10. I don't worry about others' needs.

11. I'm pretty good at manipulating people.

12. I often feel as if I need compliments from others in order to be sure of myself.

13. I hate being criticized so much that I can't control my temper when it happens.

14. When I realize I have failed at something, I feel humiliated.

15. I will try almost anything to get my "thrills".

16. I have a tremendous drive to succeed.

17. I only associate with people of my caliber.

18. I am comfortable taking on positions of authority.

19. I trust that other people will be honest with me.

20. I don't think the rules apply to me as much as they apply to others.

21. I like being noticed by others.

22. I will use persons as tools to advance myself.

23. I often fantasize about having lots of success and power.

24. I don't really care what others think of me.

25. I don't generally pay much attention to the woes of others.

26. I can maneuver people into doing things.

27. I am stable in my sense of self.

28. I have at times gone into a rage when not treated rightly.

29. I feel awful when I get put down in front of others.

30. I am a bit of a daredevil.

31. I aspire for greatness.

32. I do not waste my time hanging out with people who are beneath me.

33. Persons generally follow my lead and authority.

34. I'm slow to trust people.

35. It may seem unfair, but I deserve extra (i.e., attention, privileges, rewards).

36. I like being the most popular person at a party.

37. Sometimes to succeed you need to use other people.

38. I rarely fantasize about becoming famously successful.

39. I'm pretty indifferent to the criticism of others.

40. I'm not big on feelings of sympathy.

41. I can talk my way into and out of anything.

42. I feel very insecure about whether I will achieve much in life.

43. It really makes me angry when I don't get what I deserve.

44. I feel ashamed when people judge me.

45. I would risk injury to do something exciting.

46. I am driven to succeed.

47. I am a superior person.

48. I tend to take charge of most situations.

49. I often think that others aren't telling me the whole truth.

50. I believe I am entitled to special accommodations.

51. I love to entertain people.

52. I'm willing to exploit others to further my own goals.

53. Someday I believe that most people will know my name.

54. Others' opinions of me are of little concern to me.

55. I don't get upset by the suffering of others.

56. It is easy to get people to do what I want.

57. I wish I didn't care so much about what others think of me.

58. I feel enraged when people disrespect me.

59. I feel foolish when I make a mistake in front of others.

60. I like doing things that are risky or dangerous.

Appendix D

BPQ

Study ID: _____   **Date:** ___/___/_____

> **Instructions:** Please put a circle around the response that you feel best DESCRIBES YOUR USUAL SELF **(for the past two years or longer)** in relation to each statement. Circle T if you think the statement is true. Circle F if you think the statement is false. There are no right or wrong answers and there are no trick questions. Please respond as honestly as you can, but don't ponder too long over each item.
>
> Please **answer every question**, even though sometimes you may find it hard to decide.

Circle one

1.	I often do things without thinking them through.	T	F
2.	I often become depressed or anxious 'out of the blue'.	T	F
3.	People often leave me.	T	F
4.	I am rarely disappointed by my friends.	T	F
5.	I feel inferior to other people.	T	F
6.	I have threatened to hurt myself in the past.	T	F
7.	I do not believe that I have the skills to do anything with my life.	T	F
8.	I rarely get angry at other people.	T	F
9.	Sometimes I feel like I am not real.	T	F
10.	I will not have sex with someone unless I have known them for quite some time.	T	F
11.	I sometimes feel anxious or irritable and become sad a few hours later.	T	F
12.	When people close to me die or leave me, I feel abandoned.	T	F

13. I often exaggerate the potential of friendships only to find out later that they will not	T	F
14. If I were more like other people I would feel better about myself.	T	F
15. I have deliberately tried to hurt myself without trying to kill myself.	T	F
16. In general, my life is pretty boring.	T	F
17. I frequently get into physical fights.	T	F
18. People are sometimes out to get me.	T	F
19. My friends have told me that my mood changes very quickly.	T	F
20. I am afraid to spend time alone.	T	F
21. People who seem trustworthy often disappoint me.	T	F
22. I have made a suicide attempt in the past.	T	F
23. I often feel like I have nothing to offer others.	T	F
24. I have trouble controlling my temper.	T	F
25. I can read other people's minds.	T	F
26. I have tried 'hard' street drugs (e.g. cocaine, heroin).	T	F
27. My mood frequently alternates throughout the day between happiness, anger, anxiety	T	F
28. When my friends leave, I am confident I will see them again.	T	F
29. My friends often disappoint me.	T	F
30. I have cut myself on purpose.	T	F
31. I often feel lonely and deserted.	T	F
32. I have no difficulty controlling my temper.	T	F
33. I sometimes see or hear things that others cannot see or hear	T	F
34. It is not unusual for me to have sex on the first date.	T	F
35. I sometimes feel very sad but this feeling can change quickly.	T	F
36. People often let me down.	T	F
37. I wish I could be more like some of my friends.	T	F
38. I used to try to hurt myself to get attention.	T	F

39. I am often different with different people in different situations so that sometimes I	T	F
40. I easily become irritated by others.	T	F
41. Sometimes I can actually hear what other people are thinking.	T	F
42. I get high on drugs whenever I feel like it.	T	F
43. I rarely feel sad or anxious.	T	F
44. No one loves me.	T	F
45. When I trust people, they rarely disappoint me.	T	F
46. I feel that people would not like me if they really knew me well.	T	F
47. I get angry easily.	T	F
48. It is impossible to read others' minds.	T	F
49. I sometimes feel very happy but this feeling can change quickly.	T	F
50. I find it difficult to depend on others because they will not be there when I need them.	T	F
51. The relationships with people I care about have lots of ups and downs.	T	F
52. I feel comfortable acting like myself.	T	F
53. I have never made an attempt to hurt myself.	T	F
54. I rarely feel lonely.	T	F
55. I often find that the littlest things make me angry.	T	F
56. Sometimes I can't tell between what is real and what I have imagined.	T	F
57. When I drink, I drink too much.	T	F
58. I consider myself to be a moody person.	T	F
59. I have difficulty developing close relationships because people often abandon me.	T	F
60. My friends are always there when I need them.	T	F
61. I wish I were someone else.	T	F
62. I feel like my life is not interesting.	T	F
63. When I am angry, I sometimes hit objects and break them.	T	F
64. I often receive speeding tickets.	T	F

65. I often feel like I am on an emotional 'roller coaster'.	T	F
66. I feel like my family has deserted me.	T	F
67. I am very comfortable with who I am.	T	F
68. I often do things impulsively.	T	F
69. My life is without purpose.	T	F
70. I am not sure what I want to do in the future.	T	F
71. At times I eat so much that I am in pain or have to force myself to throw up.	T	F
72. People tell me that I am a moody person.	T	F
73. The people I love often leave me.	T	F
74. In social situations, I often feel that others will see through me and realise that I don't	T	F
75. I have been in the hospital for trying to harm myself.	T	F
76. I often feel empty inside.	T	F
77. Others often make me angry.	T	F
78. I often become frantic when I think that someone I care about will leave me.	T	F
79. I am confused about my long-term goals.	T	F
80. Others say I'm quick tempered.	T	F

Thank you for your assistance

Appendix E

Please choose the one you most agree with:
   a.   Strongly disagree
   b.   Disagree
   c.   Neutral
   d.   Agree
   e.   Strongly agree

1)   I enjoy driving at high speeds
2)   I enjoy giving "bossy" people a hard time.
3)   I think I could "beat" a lie detector.
4)   Sometimes you have to be crafty or sly.
5)   It's best to be dominant and assertive because no one else is going to look out for you.
6)   I worry a lot about possible misfortunes.
7)   I would prefer to change jobs fairly often.
8)   I can be cunning if I have to be.
9)   Everybody likes to hear my stories.
10) I am usually very careful about what I say to people.
11) I have often done something dangerous just for the thrill of it.
12) I wish I were more assertive.
13) I expect a great deal from other people.
14) I am not at all calculating.
15) I think of myself as self-assured and confident.
16) I didn't get into much trouble in elementary and high school.
17) I get a "kick" out of conning someone.
18) I get in trouble for the same things time after time.
19) I am very good at most things I try.
20) I was never in trouble with the police when I was a kid.
21) Being unemployed would depress me.
22) It's more effective to be straightforward and honest if you want people to do things for you.
23) I enjoy taking chances.
24) I wouldn't do anything dangerous just for the thrill of it.
25) I often worry unnecessarily.
26) I insist upon the respect that is due to me.
27) The best way to get things done is to be forceful and persistent.
28) When I was younger, I got into a lot of trouble at school.
29) Rules are made to be broken.
30) I usually feel quite confident when meeting new people.
31) Not hurting others feelings is important to me.
32) I would be good at a dangerous job because I like making fast decisions.
33) On average, my friends would say I am a kind person.
34) I see myself as a good leader.
35) I can read people like a book.
36) I can usually talk my way out of anything.
37) I have sometimes broken an appointment because something more interesting came along.
38) I enjoy gambling for large stakes.

39) I have a strong desire for power.
40) I would describe myself as a crafty individual.
41) I prefer having many sexual partners rather than just one.
42) I will never be satisfied until I get all I deserve.
43) One must live only for the present and not worry about the future.
44) If I ruled the world, it would be a much better place.
45) Sometimes at night, I get so worried about something that I can't fall asleep.
46) I don't think of myself as tricky or sly.
47) I almost never feel guilty over something I've done.
48) It's sometimes fun to see how far you can push someone before they catch on.
49) People can usually tell when I am lying.
50) I wouldn't describe myself as shy or timid.
51) Conning people gives me the "shakes".
52) When I do something wrong, I feel guilty even though nobody else knows it.
53) I always know what I am doing.
54) I find it easy to manipulate people.
55) I am a soft- hearted person.
56) I enjoy drinking and doing wild things.
57) Ideally, people should be undemanding.
58) I am the most important person in this world and nobody else matters.

Appendix F

Psychological Entitlement Scale

Please respond to the following items using the number that best reflects your own beliefs.

Please use the following 7-point scale:

1 = strong disagreement.

2 = moderate disagreement.

3 = slight disagreement.

4 = neither agreement nor disagreement.

5 = slight agreement.

6 = moderate agreement.

7 = strong agreement.

1. _____ I honestly feel I'm just more deserving than others.

2. _____ Great things should come to me.

3. _____ If I were on the Titanic, I would deserve to be on the first lifeboat!

4. _____ I demand the best because I'm worth it.

5. _____ I do not necessarily deserve special treatment.

6. _____ I deserve more things in my life.

7. _____ People like me deserve an extra break now and then.

8. _____ Things should go my way.

9. _____ I feel entitled to more of everything.

Appendix G

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Clinician Use
Instructions to the individual receiving care: This is a list of things different people might say about themselves. We are interested in how you would describe yourself. There are no "right" or "wrong" answers. So you can describe yourself as honestly as possible, we will keep your responses confidential. We'd like you to take your time and read each statement carefully, selecting the response that best describes you.						Item score
1	I don't get as much pleasure out of things as others seem to.	0	1	2	3	
2	Plenty of people are out to get me.	0	1	2	3	
3	People would describe me as reckless.	0	1	2	3	
4	I feel like I act totally on impulse.	0	1	2	3	
5	I often have ideas that are too unusual to explain to anyone.	0	1	2	3	
6	I lose track of conversations because other things catch my attention.	0	1	2	3	
7	I avoid risky situations.	0	1	2	3	
8	When it comes to my emotions, people tell me I'm a "cold fish".	0	1	2	3	
9	I change what I do depending on what others want.	0	1	2	3	
10	I prefer not to get too close to people.	0	1	2	3	
11	I often get into physical fights.	0	1	2	3	
12	I dread being without someone to love me.	0	1	2	3	
13	Being rude and unfriendly is just a part of who I am.	0	1	2	3	
14	I do things to make sure people notice me.	0	1	2	3	
15	I usually do what others think I should do.	0	1	2	3	
16	I usually do things on impulse without thinking about what might happen as a result.	0	1	2	3	
17	Even though I know better, I can't stop making rash decisions.	0	1	2	3	
18	My emotions sometimes change for no good reason.	0	1	2	3	
19	I really don't care if I make other people suffer.	0	1	2	3	
20	I keep to myself.	0	1	2	3	
21	I often say things that others find odd or strange.	0	1	2	3	
22	I always do things on the spur of the moment.	0	1	2	3	
23	Nothing seems to interest me very much.	0	1	2	3	
24	Other people seem to think my behavior is weird.	0	1	2	3	
25	People have told me that I think about things in a really strange way.	0	1	2	3	
26	I almost never enjoy life.	0	1	2	3	
27	I often feel like nothing I do really matters.	0	1	2	3	
28	I snap at people when they do little things that irritate me.	0	1	2	3	
29	I can't concentrate on anything.	0	1	2	3	
30	I'm an energetic person.	0	1	2	3	
31	Others see me as irresponsible.	0	1	2	3	

32	I can be mean when I need to be.	0	1	2	3	
33	My thoughts often go off in odd or unusual directions.	0	1	2	3	
34	I've been told that I spend too much time making sure things are exactly in place.	0	1	2	3	
35	I avoid risky sports and activities.	0	1	2	3	
36	I can have trouble telling the difference between dreams and waking life.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
37	Sometimes I get this weird feeling that parts of my body feel like they're dead or not really me.	0	1	2	3	
38	I am easily angered.	0	1	2	3	
39	I have no limits when it comes to doing dangerous things.	0	1	2	3	
40	To be honest, I'm just more important than other people.	0	1	2	3	
41	I make up stories about things that happened that are totally untrue.	0	1	2	3	
42	People often talk about me doing things I don't remember at all.	0	1	2	3	
43	I do things so that people just have to admire me.	0	1	2	3	
44	It's weird, but sometimes ordinary objects seem to be a different shape than usual.	0	1	2	3	
45	I don't have very long-lasting emotional reactions to things.	0	1	2	3	
46	It is hard for me to stop an activity, even when it's time to do so.	0	1	2	3	
47	I'm not good at planning ahead.	0	1	2	3	
48	I do a lot of things that others consider risky.	0	1	2	3	
49	People tell me that I focus too much on minor details.	0	1	2	3	
50	I worry a lot about being alone.	0	1	2	3	
51	I've missed out on things because I was busy trying to get something I was doing exactly right.	0	1	2	3	
52	My thoughts often don't make sense to others.	0	1	2	3	
53	I often make up things about myself to help me get what I want.	0	1	2	3	
54	It doesn't really bother me to see other people get hurt.	0	1	2	3	
55	People often look at me as if I'd said something really weird.	0	1	2	3	
56	People don't realize that I'm flattering them to get something.	0	1	2	3	
57	I'd rather be in a bad relationship than be alone.	0	1	2	3	
58	I usually think before I act.	0	1	2	3	
59	I often see vivid dream-like images when I'm falling asleep or waking up.	0	1	2	3	
60	I keep approaching things the same way, even when it isn't working.	0	1	2	3	
61	I'm very dissatisfied with myself.	0	1	2	3	

62	I have much stronger emotional reactions than almost everyone else.	0	1	2	3	
63	I do what other people tell me to do.	0	1	2	3	
64	I can't stand being left alone, even for a few hours.	0	1	2	3	
65	I have outstanding qualities that few others possess.	0	1	2	3	
66	The future looks really hopeless to me.	0	1	2	3	
67	I like to take risks.	0	1	2	3	
68	I can't achieve goals because other things capture my attention.	0	1	2	3	
69	When I want to do something, I don't let the possibility that it might be risky stop me.	0	1	2	3	
70	Others seem to think I'm quite odd or unusual.	0	1	2	3	
71	My thoughts are strange and unpredictable.	0	1	2	3	
72	I don't care about other people's feelings.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
73	You need to step on some toes to get what you want in life.	0	1	2	3	
74	I love getting the attention of other people.	0	1	2	3	
75	I go out of my way to avoid any kind of group activity.	0	1	2	3	
76	I can be sneaky if it means getting what I want.	0	1	2	3	
77	Sometimes when I look at a familiar object, it's somehow like I'm seeing it for the first time.	0	1	2	3	
78	It is hard for me to shift from one activity to another.	0	1	2	3	
79	I worry a lot about terrible things that might happen.	0	1	2	3	
80	I have trouble changing how I'm doing something even if what I'm doing isn't going well.	0	1	2	3	
81	The world would be better off if I were dead.	0	1	2	3	
82	I keep my distance from people.	0	1	2	3	
83	I often can't control what I think about.	0	1	2	3	
84	I don't get emotional.	0	1	2	3	
85	I resent being told what to do, even by people in charge.	0	1	2	3	
86	I'm so ashamed by how I've let people down in lots of little ways.	0	1	2	3	
87	I avoid anything that might be even a little bit dangerous.	0	1	2	3	
88	I have trouble pursuing specific goals even for short periods of time.	0	1	2	3	
89	I prefer to keep romance out of my life.	0	1	2	3	
90	I would never harm another person.	0	1	2	3	
91	I don't show emotions strongly.	0	1	2	3	
92	I have a very short temper.	0	1	2	3	
93	I often worry that something bad will happen due to mistakes I made in the past.	0	1	2	3	
94	I have some unusual abilities, like sometimes knowing exactly what someone is thinking.	0	1	2	3	
95	I get very nervous when I think about the future.	0	1	2	3	
96	I rarely worry about things.	0	1	2	3	
97	I enjoy being in love.	0	1	2	3	
98	I prefer to play it safe rather than take unnecessary chances.	0	1	2	3	
99	I sometimes have heard things that others couldn't hear.	0	1	2	3	
100	I get fixated on certain things and can't stop.	0	1	2	3	
101	People tell me it's difficult to know what I'm feeling.	0	1	2	3	
102	I am a highly emotional person.	0	1	2	3	
103	Others would take advantage of me if they could.	0	1	2	3	
104	I often feel like a failure.	0	1	2	3	
105	If something I do isn't absolutely perfect, it's simply not acceptable.	0	1	2	3	
106	I often have unusual experiences, such as sensing the presence of someone who isn't actually there.	0	1	2	3	

107	I'm good at making people do what I want them to do.	0	1	2	3	
108	I break off relationships if they start to get close.	0	1	2	3	
109	I'm always worrying about something.	0	1	2	3	
110	I worry about almost everything.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
111	I like standing out in a crowd.	0	1	2	3	
112	I don't mind a little risk now and then.	0	1	2	3	
113	My behavior is often bold and grabs peoples' attention.	0	1	2	3	
114	I'm better than almost everyone else.	0	1	2	3	
115	People complain about my need to have everything all arranged.	0	1	2	3	
116	I always make sure I get back at people who wrong me.	0	1	2	3	
117	I'm always on my guard for someone trying to trick or harm me.	0	1	2	3	
118	I have trouble keeping my mind focused on what needs to be done.	0	1	2	3	
119	I talk about suicide a lot.	0	1	2	3	
120	I'm just not very interested in having sexual relationships.	0	1	2	3	
121	I get stuck on things a lot.	0	1	2	3	
122	I get emotional easily, often for very little reason.	0	1	2	3	
123	Even though it drives other people crazy, I insist on absolute perfection in everything I do.	0	1	2	3	
124	I almost never feel happy about my day-to-day activities.	0	1	2	3	
125	Sweet-talking others helps me get what I want.	0	1	2	3	
126	Sometimes you need to exaggerate to get ahead.	0	1	2	3	
127	I fear being alone in life more than anything else.	0	1	2	3	
128	I get stuck on one way of doing things, even when it's clear it won't work.	0	1	2	3	
129	I'm often pretty careless with my own and others' things.	0	1	2	3	
130	I am a very anxious person.	0	1	2	3	
131	People are basically trustworthy.	0	1	2	3	
132	I am easily distracted.	0	1	2	3	
133	It seems like I'm always getting a "raw deal" from others.	0	1	2	3	
134	I don't hesitate to cheat if it gets me ahead.	0	1	2	3	
135	I check things several times to make sure they are perfect.	0	1	2	3	
136	I don't like spending time with others.	0	1	2	3	
137	I feel compelled to go on with things even when it makes little sense to do so.	0	1	2	3	
138	I never know where my emotions will go from moment to moment.	0	1	2	3	
139	I have seen things that weren't really there.	0	1	2	3	

140	It is important to me that things are done in a certain way.	0	1	2	3	
141	I always expect the worst to happen.	0	1	2	3	
142	I try to tell the truth even when it's hard.	0	1	2	3	
143	I believe that some people can move things with their minds.	0	1	2	3	
144	I can't focus on things for very long.	0	1	2	3	
145	I steer clear of romantic relationships.	0	1	2	3	
146	I'm not interested in making friends.	0	1	2	3	
147	I say as little as possible when dealing with people.	0	1	2	3	
148	I'm useless as a person.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
149	I'll do just about anything to keep someone from abandoning me.	0	1	2	3	
150	Sometimes I can influence other people just by sending my thoughts to them.	0	1	2	3	
151	Life looks pretty bleak to me.	0	1	2	3	
152	I think about things in odd ways that don't make sense to most people.	0	1	2	3	
153	I don't care if my actions hurt others.	0	1	2	3	
154	Sometimes I feel "controlled" by thoughts that belong to someone else.	0	1	2	3	
155	I really live life to the fullest.	0	1	2	3	
156	I make promises that I don't really intend to keep.	0	1	2	3	
157	Nothing seems to make me feel good.	0	1	2	3	
158	I get irritated easily by all sorts of things.	0	1	2	3	
159	I do what I want regardless of how unsafe it might be.	0	1	2	3	
160	I often forget to pay my bills.	0	1	2	3	
161	I don't like to get too close to people.	0	1	2	3	
162	I'm good at conning people.	0	1	2	3	
163	Everything seems pointless to me.	0	1	2	3	
164	I never take risks.	0	1	2	3	
165	I get emotional over every little thing.	0	1	2	3	
166	It's no big deal if I hurt other peoples' feelings.	0	1	2	3	
167	I never show emotions to others.	0	1	2	3	
168	I often feel just miserable.	0	1	2	3	
169	I have no worth as a person.	0	1	2	3	
170	I am usually pretty hostile.	0	1	2	3	
171	I've skipped town to avoid responsibilities.	0	1	2	3	
172	I've been told more than once that I have a number of odd quirks or habits.	0	1	2	3	
173	I like being a person who gets noticed.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
174	I'm always fearful or on edge about bad things that might happen.	0	1	2	3	
175	I never want to be alone.	0	1	2	3	
176	I keep trying to make things perfect, even when I've gotten them as good as they're likely to get.	0	1	2	3	
177	I rarely feel that people I know are trying to take advantage of me.	0	1	2	3	
178	I know I'll commit suicide sooner or later.	0	1	2	3	
179	I've achieved far more than almost anyone I know.	0	1	2	3	
180	I can certainly turn on the charm if I need to get my way.	0	1	2	3	
181	My emotions are unpredictable.	0	1	2	3	
182	I don't deal with people unless I have to.	0	1	2	3	
183	I don't care about other peoples' problems.	0	1	2	3	
184	I don't react much to things that seem to make others emotional.	0	1	2	3	
185	I have several habits that others find eccentric or strange.	0	1	2	3	
186	I avoid social events.	0	1	2	3	

		Very False or Often False	Sometimes or Somewhat False	Sometimes or Somewhat True	Very True or Often True	Item score
187	I deserve special treatment.	0	1	2	3	
188	It makes me really angry when people insult me in even a minor way.	0	1	2	3	
189	I rarely get enthusiastic about anything.	0	1	2	3	
190	I suspect that even my so-called "friends" betray me a lot.	0	1	2	3	
191	I crave attention.	0	1	2	3	
192	Sometimes I think someone else is removing thoughts from my head.	0	1	2	3	
193	I have periods in which I feel disconnected from the world or from myself.	0	1	2	3	
194	I often see unusual connections between things that most people miss.	0	1	2	3	
195	I don't think about getting hurt when I'm doing things that might be dangerous.	0	1	2	3	
196	I simply won't put up with things being out of their proper places.	0	1	2	3	
197	I often have to deal with people who are less important than me.	0	1	2	3	
198	I sometimes hit people to remind them who's in charge	0	1	2	3	
199	I get pulled off-task by even minor distractions.	0	1	2	3	
200	I enjoy making people in control look stupid.	0	1	2	3	
201	I just skip appointments or meetings if I'm not in the mood.	0	1	2	3	
202	I try to do what others want me to do.	0	1	2	3	
203	I prefer being alone to having a close romantic partner.	0	1	2	3	
204	I am very impulsive.	0	1	2	3	
205	I often have thoughts that make sense to me but that other people say are strange.	0	1	2	3	

206	I use people to get what I want.	0	1	2	3	
207	I don't see the point in feeling guilty about things I've done that have hurt other people.	0	1	2	3	
208	Most of the time I don't see the point in being friendly.	0	1	2	3	
209	I've had some really weird experiences that are very difficult to explain.	0	1	2	3	
210	I follow through on commitments.	0	1	2	3	
211	I like to draw attention to myself.	0	1	2	3	
212	I feel guilty much of the time.	0	1	2	3	
213	I often "zone out" and then suddenly come to and realize that a lot of time has passed.	0	1	2	3	
214	Lying comes easily to me.	0	1	2	3	
215	I hate to take chances.	0	1	2	3	
216	I'm nasty and short to anybody who deserves it.	0	1	2	3	
217	Things around me often feel unreal, or more real than usual.	0	1	2	3	
218	I'll stretch the truth if it's to my advantage.	0	1	2	3	
219	It is easy for me to take advantage of others.	0	1	2	3	
220	I have a strict way of doing things.	0	1	2	3	