

Patterns of Relationship Behaviors among Narcissists

Research Thesis

Presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements for graduation *with research distinction* in
Psychology in the undergraduate colleges of The Ohio State University

by

Cheyenne Drotleff

The Ohio State University

April 2020

Project Advisor: Associate Professor Amy Brunell, Department of Psychology

Abstract

Most of the literature studying narcissism in romantic relationships focuses on grandiose narcissists, leaving little known about how communal and vulnerable narcissists behave and perceive their relationships. This study aimed to see how each facet of narcissism differs in relationships and how experiencing power might impact relationship behaviors. Study 1 assessed various relationship variables in terms of narcissism in two samples: one consisting of a predominately older, mostly married online sample, and the other consisting of mainly younger, casually dating undergraduate students. Study 1 found that communal narcissists reported a more positive perception of their relationships and endorsed more positive behaviors in their relationships such as less attention to alternatives, less negative behaviors in response to conflict, and more commitment than that of grandiose narcissists. Vulnerable narcissists' patterns of relationship behaviors were similar to those of grandiose narcissists by reporting more attention to alternatives, more negative accommodation and less overall satisfaction. Study 2 examined the extent to which narcissists change their responses to their relationship behaviors when they are led to believe they have power. Study 2 found that power impacted perceived closeness and led to reports of more negative behaviors in dating relationships for both communal and vulnerable narcissists but found no changes in perceived behavior for grandiose narcissists.

Keywords: narcissism, power, romantic relationships

Patterns of Relationship Behaviors among Narcissists

Trait narcissism is a personality dimension defined by an overall sense of entitlement, self-absorption, lack of regard for others (Naderi, 2018), and an inflated and unrealistically positive view of one's self (Gebauer, Sedikides, Verplanken, & Maio, 2012). Yet with these seemingly negative characteristics, most narcissists are initially perceived by others as charming, self-assured, and popular (Fatfouta, Zeigler-Hill, & Schröder-Abé, 2017). This positive illusion of narcissism is also believed to be true by narcissists themselves, perceiving themselves to be more intelligent, more creative, and superior to in general compared to nonnarcissists, even though these beliefs might not be accurate (Gebauer et al., 2012). Narcissists' dominant, manipulative, and aggressive behaviors are used as a way to gain social and personal success, help maintain their view of self-worth, and ultimately gain power. Narcissists are able to achieve this need for personal success through two different domains: communal and agentic. Agentic domains focus on satisfying core self-motives through means that only benefit oneself including self-esteem, power, a sense of entitlement, social status, influence, and competition (Luo, Cai, Sedikides, & Song, 2014). Communal domains, on the other hand, focus more on others and the relationship one has with other people, however, still with core self-motives in mind. This domain is accomplished through being helpful, caring, maintaining positive relationships with others, and associating oneself with humanitarian organizations (Lou et al., 2014). These two different domains, while differing in their orientation to oneself versus others, are both ways to validate a narcissist's power and sense of self-worth. Trait narcissism, as a whole, is believed to be strongly self-oriented and lacking in other orientation (Lou et al., 2014); however, not every form of narcissism may function this way.

Three Facets of Trait Narcissism

Trait narcissism has three facets: grandiose, vulnerable, and communal narcissism. Grandiose narcissism is associated with an inflated view of self-esteem that remains stable throughout the course of time (Miller & Campbell, 2008), higher levels of aggression, a tendency for social dominance (Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Clinton, & Piotrowski, 2014), fantasies of one's own superiority, and the use of exploitation to self-enhance (Pincus et al., 2009; Zeigler-Hill, Clark, & Pickard, 2008). This form of narcissism, in general, is associated with subjective well-being (Żemojtel-Piotrowska et al., 2014). The next form of narcissism, vulnerable narcissism, is defined by a fragile and unstable self-esteem (Miller & Campbell, 2008) that is contingent on the appraisal of others, includes feelings of shame, the need for approval of others (Pincus et al., 2009; Zeigler-Hill et al., 2008), and is typically associated with feelings of entitlement and the tendency to exploit others for their own personal gain (Ackerman et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2009). Lastly, communal narcissism is a form of grandiose narcissism; communal narcissism differs from grandiose narcissism by the domains in which individuals use to self-enhance. Unlike grandiose narcissism, communal narcissism focuses on communal domains rather than agentic domains as a way to gain power. Communal narcissists have an inflated view of self with focus on core self-motives, similar to grandiose narcissists, however, they exaggerate their characteristics to be better-than-average predominately in the communal domain rather than the agentic domain (Gebauer et al., 2012), meaning they believe themselves to be the most helpful, most caring, and most trustworthy an individual can be. Research has found that these exaggerations are not accurate and that communal narcissists are not significantly more communal than nonnarcissists (Gebauer et al., 2012). This better-than-average effect is the tendency for individuals to perceive their abilities and qualities as better than that of their

average peers; for example, being more attractive, more intelligent, or more capable than others (Alicke & Govorum, 2005) even though this perception might not be accurate.

Narcissism and Romantic Relationships

In terms of studying research on narcissism and relationships, most research has been done involving grandiose narcissism. When dealing with romantic relationships, grandiose narcissists maintain their need for dominance and self-absorption. Previous research has shown that grandiose narcissism is associated with a lack of empathy, an inability to perspective-take, and a lack of need for intimacy (Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984). Along with these characteristics, grandiose narcissists engage in pragmatic and game-playing love styles, (Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002), leaving their partners guessing about their commitment to their relationship while also looking for particular aspects in their partner. This means that grandiose narcissists tend to play hard to get in relationships and tend to pick their partners based on a list of characteristics they desire or feel that they would be a good reflection of them. When picking partners, grandiose narcissists tend to choose partners that are self-orientated rather than other-orientated (Campbell, 1999). Grandiose narcissists look for partners that are more perfect and admiring than they are caring or emotionally needy, or what can be labeled as “trophy” partners (Campbell, 1999). This preference could be because they choose their partners as a reflection of themselves. Grandiose narcissists tend not to be needy or caring toward others, and they ultimately aim toward perfection. This tendency also could be a reflection of their own need for self-enhancement by wanting to be admired by someone of higher status and focusing on superficial qualities instead of intimacy (Campbell, 1999). Grandiose narcissistic relationships emphasize pleasure and power over intimacy.

In terms of sexual behavior, research has shown that grandiose narcissists tend to engage more in having casual sex with many partners (Zara & Özdemir, 2017). Individuals with a narcissistic personality have a strong tendency toward sexual permissiveness and place their importance on physical pleasure (Zara & Özdemir, 2017) and having the best trophy partner possible. Because of this, narcissists' commitment in their relationships is weak due to their attention to alternatives (Campbell & Foster, 2002). Focusing on other alternatives means grandiose narcissists pay attention to other possible partners they could have and possibly use as a way to “upgrade” or find a better partner than they already have. Grandiose narcissists tend to pay more attention to their alternatives than non-narcissists possibly because they are always looking for a more attractive, higher-status, “better” partner (Campbell & Foster, 2002), which could be a part of their game-playing love style that reflects on their need for wanting only the best for themselves and leaving their partner guessing.

Because their relationships tend to focus on enhancing their own positive self-views and not on intimacy, romantic relationships involving grandiose narcissists tend to experience difficulties. One test in their relationship involves the way that grandiose narcissists tend to devalue their partners in an attempt to create dominance and build up their own views of their self-worth. Previous research has shown that grandiose narcissists will use narcissistic rivalry and admiration in romantic relationships with manipulation to get what they want from their partners (Sauls, Zeigler-Hill, Vrabel, & Lehtman, 2019). While manipulation is a common trait in narcissism, narcissistic rivalry and narcissistic admiration produce different strategies when maintaining a relationship. Narcissistic rivalry is associated with manipulation, bullying, bargaining, disengagement, and negative associations whereas narcissistic admiration is also associated with manipulation but does not have positive associations with other specific

influence strategies, such as bargaining, disengagement. (Sauls et al., 2019). While these differ in their strategies, both narcissistic rivalry and admiration are used as ways to manipulate and influence romantic partners (Sauls et al., 2019). Individual approaches in relationships may vary but in general, most involve some form of manipulation to get what they want and have their needs met for validation of self-worth.

Research and self-reports have also shown that narcissists are less accommodating to their partners in relationships (Campbell & Foster, 2002). Accommodation can take two forms: constructive and destructive. These are the ways in which a partner responds to problems in their relationship. Positive, or constructive, accommodation involves healthy practices such as walking away and talking about the problem later after cooling off. Negative, or destructive, accommodation involves unhealthy responses to problems such as yelling or ignoring the partner. A grandiose narcissist's lack of accommodation can be a lack of the use of constructive responses to problems in their relationships, which also mediates a narcissists' lack of commitment to their relationship and contributes to the difficulties of maintaining their relationship. Overall, romantic relationships with grandiose narcissists are challenging and tend to be manipulative, sexually orientated, lacking in intimacy and subject to problems involving commitment and infidelity. Because the research done on narcissism in romantic relationships has focused on the agentic form of narcissism—grandiose narcissism—little is known about how communal narcissists behave in their relationships.

Communal Narcissism and Power

One interesting finding within communal narcissism is that when communal narcissists are empowered, they become less communal and behave in ways more similar to grandiose narcissists (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015). At this point, their means of self-enhancement switches

from the communal domain to the agentic one, focusing on themselves instead of others. For example, they go from endorsing statements such as “I am the most helpful person” to “I am more capable than other people”. Thus, their focus becomes like that of a grandiose narcissist: me not others, impacting their behaviors to be more self-focused. Communal narcissists become more communal when their sense of power is threatened, and yet become less communal when it is validated (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015). This means communal narcissists are only communal for their own well-being as a means to gain power and not necessarily to benefit other individuals. Communal narcissists engage in communal behaviors to gain power and not to help others. For example, after receiving validation of power, communal narcissists become less willing to help others through volunteering (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015).

Outside of understanding the ways communal narcissists maintain social relationships with others to self-enhance, little is known about the way communal narcissists behave in romantic relationships. More specifically, nothing is known about the way communal narcissists’ behavior changes within a romantic relationship after their need for validation of power is met. Romantic relationships have a strong dependency on communal domains such as caring and trusting, so if communal narcissists become less communal after being empowered, in theory, they should become less caring, less trustworthy, and less helpful. If this were true, would a communal narcissist be more likely to engage in infidelity against their romantic partner after being empowered? Would experiencing an increased sense of power allow individuals to perceive having better and more alternatives to their relationship, thus making their investment into the relationship decrease? The aim of this study is to answer that question and better understand how narcissists--communal narcissists in particular-- behave and maintain their romantic relationships.

Study 1

Study one investigates the extent to which narcissism variables are related to relationship variables including relationship quality, satisfaction, accommodation, willingness to sacrifice, and the investment model. Based on previous research, our hypothesis is that higher levels of trait narcissism would be associated with lower levels of relationship satisfaction and commitment.

Method

Participants

Sample A. Participants were recruited from Amazon's Mechanical Turk. All participants were required to be in a romantic relationship to participate in this study and at least 18 years of age. Understanding that they were volunteering for a research study, participants were told that they would be compensated \$0.75 in exchange for their participation. Initially, 238 participants started the survey, and of these, 1 did not qualify to participate, and 7 signed the consent form but did not answer any of the questions, and 24 had incomplete data that were removed from analysis. Of the remaining participants, 206 completed the entire survey and were used for data analyses. These participants took 16.32 minutes ($SD = 8.96$) to complete the study on average. Due to a computer programming error, information on the age of the participants was not collected. Statistically, the average age of an mTurk user is 31 years of age (Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011). This sample was composed of 137 females, 67 males, and one individual self-reporting as "other". Looking at race, 84.5% of these participants self-identified as White, 7.8% self-identified as Black, and another 6.8% indicated they were Hispanic. In terms of relationship

status, 8.7% were dating, 14.6% were living together, 75.7% were either married or engaged, and 0.5% reported dating casually.

Sample B. Participants were recruited from Introductory Psychology courses from a regional campus of a large Midwestern University. Initially, 289 participants completed the study, but 63 of these participants were not in a relationship. This left of a sample of 226 participants (62 men, 155 women, 1 non-binary, and 2 who preferred not to answer). Reporting on race, 71.7% of these participants self-identified as White, 17.7% self-identified as Black, and another 4.4% indicated they were Hispanic. Due to a computer programming error, not all participants were asked their age (Mean age = 19.07, SD = 3.05, n = 185). Looking at relationship status, 84.1% were dating, 13.6% were living together, engaged, or married, and 2.3% were in a casual dating relationship.

Materials

Narcissism Questionnaires:

Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI): The 40-item NPI (Raskin & Terry, 1998) is a measure of grandiose narcissism that asks participants to choose between two statements, one narcissistic and one nonnarcissistic, that describes them better. Example item is “I am not sure if I would make a good leader” (nonnarcissistic statement) or “I see myself as a good leader” (narcissistic statement). To code the responses, narcissistic statements are given a score of one and nonnarcissistic statements a score of zero which are then summed up for the total score.

The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS): The 10-item HSNS (Hendin & Cheek, 1997) is used to measure self-reports of vulnerable narcissism. This measure asks participants to rate a

series of statements on a 9-point scale (1= very untrue of me, 9= very true of me) on the extent to which each item is characteristic of their feelings and behaviors. Example item is “I feel that I am temperamentally different than most people”. Scores are then summed such that higher scores represent higher vulnerable narcissism.

Communal Narcissist Inventory (CNI): The 16-item CNI (Gebauer et al., 2012) measures communal narcissism. This inventory asks participants to rate a list of self-thoughts on a 7-point scale (1= strongly disagree, 7= strongly agree) to indicate if they have had this or similar self-thoughts. An example item is “I am generally the most understanding person”. Scores are then summed up such that higher scores represent higher communal narcissism.

Relationship Questionnaires

Willingness to Sacrifice (WTS): The 8-item WTS (Rusbult et al., 1997) measures willingness to give up activities for a romantic relationship. This inventory first asks participants to write down their four most important activities outside of their relationship. After writing these four activities, participants are asked to rate on an 8-point scale (1= definitely would not consider giving up activity, 8= would definitely consider giving up activity) how willing they would be to give up each activity they listed for the sake of their relationship. An example item is “Imagine it was not possible to engage in Activity 1 and maintain your relationship. Perhaps it’s impossible because of your partner’s needs or wishes. Perhaps it is impossible to do the activity because of obligations to your partner or relationship. To what extent would you consider giving up Activity 1?”. Scores are then summed such that higher scores represent a higher willingness to sacrifice for ones’ relationship.

Mutual Communal Behavior Scale (MCBS): The 10-item MCBS (Williamson & Schultz, 1995) measures behaviors and interactions in romantic relationships. This inventory asks participants to rate a series of statements on a 4-point scale (1= almost never, 4= almost always) on how accurately they describe how the participant and their partner interact. An example item is “My partner seems to enjoy responding to my needs”. The scores are then summed such that higher scores represent more mutual communal behavior within the relationship.

Accommodation: The 16-item Accommodation scale (Rusbult et al., 1991) measures the way participants respond to their partners when dealing with problems in a romantic relationship. This inventory asks participants to rate a series of statements on an 8-point scale (0= never do this, 8= constantly do this) on how often they respond in that way to problems in their relationships. An example item is “When my partner behaves in an unpleasant manner, I forgive my partner and forget about it”. Each item on the list represents a different form of accommodation: active/positive, active/negative, passive/positive, and passive/negative. Scores were summed to create an index of positive accommodation and an index of negative accommodation.

Self-determined Motivation for Being in a Relationship: The 18-item measure based on Self-Determination Theory (Blais et al., 1990) measures self-reports about reasons why the participants are in their romantic relationship with their partner. Each item asks participants to rate a series of statements about their feelings on their relationship on a 7-point scale (1= does not correspond at all, 7= corresponds exactly) to indicate the degree to which the statements correspond with their reasons for keeping their relationship with their partner. An example item is “Because this person is the person I have chosen to share my life plans that are important to me”. Each item represents a different form of motivation: extrinsic, intrinsic, a-motivation,

identified, integrated, and introjected. Each form of motivation is given a weighted score with intrinsic, integrated, and identified given scores of +3, +2, +1 respectively and scores for amotivation, external, and introjection assigned scores of -3, -2, -1, respectively. All scores are then combined into an overall index.

Investment Model: The 22-item Investment Model Scale (Rusbult et al., 1997) contains four subsets of questions, each measuring commitment, investments, alternatives and satisfaction of romantic relationships. This inventory asks participants to rate a series of statements on a 9-point scale (0= do not agree at all, 8= agree completely) on how much they agree with each statement in regard to their relationship. Questions 1-7 measure commitment in a relationship, 8-12 measure satisfaction, 13-17 measure attention to alternatives, and questions 18-22 measure investments in a relationship. An example item is “I want our relationship to last a very long time”. Scores are then summed such that higher scores represent a higher satisfaction and commitment to the relationship. The theory behind this is the higher satisfaction and investment one has in their relationship, the higher the commitment they will have as well. Having higher alternatives predicts lower commitment. The variable alternative measures ones’ attention to alternatives such as other potential partners or the idea of being single. An individual having higher attention to alternatives is expected to have lower commitment to their relationship. Investments, as a variable, measures both tangible and intangible items such as money, resources, memories, and time. A person having more investments in their relationship is expected to be more committed to their relationship. Commitment then predicts success in the relationship lasting.

Relationship Power Inventory (RPI): The 20-item RPI (Farrell, Simpson, & Rothman, 2015) measures self-reports on power in romantic relationships. This inventory asks participants to rate

a series of statements on a 7-point scale (1= never, 7= always) on how true each statement is of themselves and their partner generally in their relationship. An example item is “My partner has more say than I do when we make decisions in our relationship.” Scores are then summed such that higher scores represent perceiving having more power over a partner in the relationships.

The Inclusion of Other in the Self (IOS): The IOS (Aron, Aron, & Smollan, 1992) is a pictorial measure of relationship closeness. Within this measure, seven images of Venn diagrams with increasing degrees of overlap and increasing in size are presented. Participants are asked to choose which Venn diagram best represents their relationship with their romantic partner; a 1 is given for the circles that have no overlap and a 7 is assigned to the circles with the most overlap. The Venn diagrams with more overlap represent a greater degree of closeness.

Procedures

Participants starting the survey were first asked if they were presently in a romantic relationship. After giving their consent, participants completed a series of measures about their level of narcissism and then about their romantic relationship. After completing all measures, participants were then asked to report information about their demographics such as age, gender, and ethnicity. Once filling out this information, the survey ended, and the participants were awarded their money (Sample A) or research credit (Sample B).

Results and Discussion

Correlations

Cronbach’s α , means, and standard deviations for study measures are presented in Table 1. Bivariate correlations were computed on both samples and are summarized in Tables 2 (Sample A; mTurk sample) and 3 (Sample B; student sample). Independent samples t-tests were

computed to examine gender differences and are summarized in Table 3. Males were coded as 1's while females were coded as 2's for analysis. Data from sample A, which consisted of predominately married couples, revealed strong correlations between communal narcissism and mutual communal behavior, both positive and negative accommodation, satisfaction, and self-determination to be in a relationship (all p 's < .010). In this sample, communal narcissists reported being more communal in their behaviors and more committed to their relationships as compared to grandiose narcissists. Communal narcissists also reported higher satisfaction in their relationships and more investments, again compared to grandiose narcissists. There was no relationship found for communal narcissists and attention to alternatives whereas grandiose narcissists reported a positive relationship. No significant relationship was found for communal narcissists and power while grandiose narcissists reported having more power in their relationships. Communal narcissists were associated with both positive and negative accommodation whereas grandiose narcissists were only positively associated with negative accommodation and exhibit significant relationship with positive accommodation. Grandiose narcissists reported less inclusion of others in the self while communal narcissists reported higher levels of inclusion of others. This pattern was replicated in sample B, a more casually dating undergraduate sample; however, weaker correlations were found for these variables with both communal and grandiose narcissism. In this set of data, no relationship was found for positive accommodation for both facets; however, grandiose narcissists still found a stronger correlation for negative accommodation as compared to communal narcissists.

Looking at vulnerable narcissism, in sample A (mTurk sample), vulnerable narcissism was negatively correlated with communal behaviors, self-determination for being in a relationship, and inclusion of other in the self. Vulnerable narcissism was also positively

correlated with the use of negative accommodation and having attention to alternatives. This pattern was then replicated in sample B (undergraduate sample) by finding a positive correlation for the use of negative accommodation only while also including a negative correlation for satisfaction. These correlations matched those associated with grandiose narcissists.

Gender

Examining the association between relationship variables and gender (see Table 4) revealed that for both samples, males reported having less perceived power in their relationships, and gave more attention to their alternatives as compared to women. Males also reported having overall less self-determination to be in a relationship for both samples. The mTurk sample A found higher levels of grandiose narcissism in males, however, the reverse pattern was found for the student sample B.

Regression Analyses

Linear regressions were computed on each set of data to determine the unique contribution of each narcissism variable. For the mTurk sample (sample A), there was a significant negative association between communal narcissism and power and positive associations on mutual communal behaviors, positive accommodation, satisfaction, investments, commitment, autonomy, control, and inclusion of others in the self. Significant negative associations between grandiose narcissism were found on mutual communal behavior, positive accommodation, or constructive behaviors, self-determination theory composite, intrinsic, integrated, and identified motivations, satisfaction, investments, commitment, autonomy, and inclusion of others in the self. Positive associations of grandiose narcissism were found for negative accommodation, attention to alternatives, and power. These findings were reported

within the married couples sample A (mTurk sample), however, only partial replications were found in the student sample B for mutual communal behavior, satisfaction, attention to alternatives, and commitment. Vulnerable narcissists patterns of relationships behaviors again looked similar to that of grandiose narcissists by showing positive associations with negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors, for both samples, and positive associations for attention to alternatives in sample A (mTurk sample). Also, in sample A (mTurk sample), analyses revealed negative associations for communal behaviors, self-determination for being in a relationship, and commitment. Found in sample B (student sample) were negative associations with satisfaction, communal behaviors, and self-determination, as well as willingness to sacrifice. Associations between vulnerable narcissism and communal behaviors and self-determination composite were just shy of reaching significance (p 's = 0.055). Summaries of these regressions can be found in Table 5 and Table 6.

Discussion

Overall, data from sample A (mTurk sample) revealed that grandiose narcissists were less communal, accommodating, motivated and less satisfied in their relationships. Grandiose narcissists were also found to be less invested in their relationships, paid higher attention to their alternatives and were less committed as well. Grandiose narcissists reported having the power in their relationships while communal narcissists reported having less power and a strong inclusion of others within the self. Vulnerable narcissists were similar to that of grandiose narcissists by reporting higher attention to alternatives and less commitment, and endorsed more negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors, while also being less communal and less self-determined.

Previous literature examining the behaviors of narcissists in relationships has found a pattern of grandiose narcissists having higher attention to their alternatives and an overall sense of less commitment in their relationships (Campbell & Foster, 2002). This finding was replicated in both a dating and married sample of individuals in this study, reporting higher levels of attention to alternatives and lower levels of commitment for grandiose narcissists but not communal narcissists. Communal narcissists reported having no association to attention to alternatives and a higher level of commitment in relationships. Grandiose narcissists are also known for their lack of accommodation in relationships (Campbell & Foster, 2002) which was replicated in the data found from the mTurk sample. This pattern of behavior was not replicated in the younger dating sample, which could be explained in that a dating relationship involves less overall accommodation as compared to marriage.

Looking at vulnerable narcissism, our data revealed in sample A strong negative associations for mutual communal behavior and self-determination for being in a relationship, and strong positive associations with negative accommodation, attention to alternatives and control. Within the dating sample, sample B, a strong negative association was found for satisfaction and a strong positive association was found for negative accommodation. Having little replication of the patterns found from sample A in sample B could again be explained by the overall lower commitment of the styles of these relationships. Vulnerable narcissism is typically associated with feelings of entitlement and the tendency to exploit others for their own personal gain (Ackerman et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2009) which is consistent with the strong association for the need of control and tendency for the use of negative accommodation within relationships.

Grandiose narcissists are well-known for their need for power and social dominance (Żemojtel-Piotrowska, Clinton, Piotrowski, 2014), which was replicated in both sets of data, which showed an association between grandiose narcissism and higher levels of perceived power. In sample A, communal narcissism was associated with having a perceived sense of less power in their relationships and no association to power in sample B. While power for communal narcissists is also important, the means by which communal narcissists achieve their power differs significantly, making it hard to predict the way they perceive their own power. Along with the need for power, grandiose narcissists have a tendency to not need intimacy and to pick their partners pragmatically, focusing on admiration as compared to finding a partner that is caring or needy (Campbell, 1999) which can create a lack of intimacy. In sample A, grandiose narcissism was associated with lower levels of the inclusion of others in the self which can replicate the findings that grandiose narcissists tend not to be emotionally intimate and inclusive in their relationships. In this same sample, the opposite pattern was found for communal narcissists, having a strong positive association with the inclusions of others in the self. Based on data collected from both samples, it is evident that communal, vulnerable, and grandiose narcissists perceive and maintain their relationships differently.

Little is known about communal narcissists in romantic relationships, particularly how their behaviors change when their need for power is being met. Results from Study 1 showed that overall, communal narcissists reported having higher quality relationships than grandiose narcissists and vulnerable narcissists. Study 2 sought to examine if this pattern would hold true after empowering a communal narcissist. Previous research has found communal narcissists become less communal after being empowered and behave more similarly to grandiose narcissists (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015). Because of this finding, I predicted that after

empowering a communal narcissist, their reports of their perceptions and behaviors in their romantic relationships will change such that they are not as communal as they might claim.

Study 2 was developed to examine this question. Grandiose narcissism and vulnerable narcissism were also examined.

Study 2

Study 2 builds from the findings of Study 1, again assessing relationship quality and satisfaction for the three facets of narcissism. In addition to these assessments, this quasiexperiment assesses the willingness to engage in infidelity against ones' romantic partner after experiencing a sense of empowerment. Based on previous research and the results from study one, I hypothesized that those higher in trait narcissism would be more willing to engage in infidelity after being empowered.

Method

Participants

In the experimental study all 227 participants were recruited through The Ohio State University Newark's REP research pool. All participants needed to be in a romantic relationship to participate in this study and be at least 18 years of age. Out of the 227 participants, 43 said they were not presently in a romantic relationship, and an additional four said their relationship was friendship status. This left a total of 180 participants who completed the study and were in a romantic relationship (63 males, 115 females, 1 transgendered, and 1 who did not answer). Examining race, 70.0% of these participants self-identified as white, 20.6% identified as black, 5.0% identified as Hispanic, 4.4% identified as Asian/Asian American, 1.7% identified as Native American/Pacific Islander, 3.9% identified as 'other' and the remaining 3.3% preferred not to

answer. The average age of these participants was 18.77 years with a standard deviation of 1.617. In terms of relationship status, 63.3% were dating, 7.8% were living together, engaged, or married, and 22.8% were in a casual dating relationship.

Materials

The narcissism measures and relationship measures were the same as those described in Study 1. In addition to the questionnaires described in Study 1, the Intentions Toward Infidelity Scale (ITS; Jones et al., 2011) was also assessed. The 7-item ITIS measures behavioral intentions to commit infidelity in romantic relationships. This inventory asks participants to rate a series of statements on a 7-point scale (-3= not at all likely, 3= extremely likely) on how likely they would be to do each of the following statements. An example item is “How likely are you to be unfaithful to a partner if you knew you wouldn’t get caught?”. Scores are then summed such that higher scores represent higher intentions to engage in infidelity within a romantic relationship. Refer to Table 1 for summary statistics.

In addition, the Ten Item Personality Inventory (TIPI; Gosling et al., 2003) was administered, but it was used as part of the study manipulation and was not analyzed. The TIPI measures the Big Five personality traits through a series of characteristics. This inventory asks participants to rate a series of statements on a 7-point scale (1= disagree strongly, 7=agree strongly) on the extent of how much the characteristics in the statements agree with their personality. Example items are “Extraverted, enthusiastic”, “anxious, easily upset”, “open to new experiences, complex”, “reserved, quiet”, and “disorganized, careless”.

Procedure

Participants beginning the survey were first asked for their consent, agreeing to participate in this study in exchange for partial research credit. After giving their consent, participants completed the personality measures and again asked if they were presently in a romantic relationship. For those that responded negatively, the survey ended. Participants responding that they were in a relationship were then told their results of their personality assessments were being calculated, and after a moment were given false feedback about their personality. More specifically, participants were randomly assigned to a power condition. In the negative/low power feedback condition, participants were told the following:

“You’re the type who will not be in a position of power later in life. You may already feel that you are working toward being in a powerful position now, but by your mid-20s this trend will be even more pronounced, though ultimately unrealized. It is expected that you will not be in charge of many resources, and you will not exert authority over people. Based on your personality profile, the odds are you’ll end up being in a powerless role as a subordinate.”

Participants in the positive/high power feedback condition were given the following:

“You’re the type who will be in a position of power later in life. You may already feel that you are working toward being in a powerful position now, but by your mid-20s this trend will be even more pronounced. It is expected that you will be in charge of many resources, and you will exert authority over people. Based on your personality profile, the odds are you’ll end up being in a very powerful position.”

After receiving their feedback, participants then began the portion of the survey that assessed their perceptions of romantic relationship. After completing these relationship

measures, participants were asked a series of questions regarding their demographics (age, race, sexual orientation). They were then fully debriefed on the true purpose of the study.

Results and Discussion

Gender

First, to examine if there were gender differences in narcissism and relationship variables, t-tests were computed. This analysis is summarized in Table 7. Males were coded as 1 while females were coded as 2 for analysis. Overall, males tended to report endorsing more positive accommodation, or constructive behaviors, having more willingness to sacrifice, and having more intentions toward infidelity than females.

Correlations

Next, correlations were computed among study variables. These correlations are summarized in Table 8. From this analysis, grandiose narcissism was positively correlated with negative accommodation, attention to alternatives, and intentions toward infidelity. Grandiose narcissism was negatively correlated with self-determination to be in a relationship. Correlations computed for communal narcissists found that communal narcissism was positively associated with communal behaviors, satisfaction, attention to alternatives, and commitment. Lastly, vulnerable narcissism was positively correlated with attention to alternatives and intentions toward infidelity and showed a negative correlation for self-determination for being in a relationship.

Regressions

In order to examine the extent to which the power manipulation and narcissism variables combine to predict relationship variables, a series of regression analyses were computed. Prior to computing these regressions, the narcissism variables were centered. Gender was entered as a control variable at Step 1, along with the power manipulation. The narcissism variables were then entered at Step 2. Lastly, the interactions between each narcissism variable and the power manipulation were entered in Step 3. Step 3 analyses can be found in Table 9. Analyses found significant positive associations between communal narcissism with mutual communal behavior, satisfaction, investments, and commitment. A negative association for grandiose narcissism was found with positive accommodation, however, this value was just shy of significance ($p = 0.059$). A negative significant association for communal narcissism was found with negative accommodation. Significant positive associations for vulnerable narcissism were found with negative accommodation, attention to alternatives, and intentions toward infidelity. A negative significant association for vulnerable narcissism was found with self-determination for being in a relationship. Positive significant associations for the interaction between power and communal narcissism were found for negative accommodation and inclusion of others in the self. A significant negative association for the interaction between power and vulnerable narcissism with inclusion of others in the self was found.

Discussion

Results from these analyses reveal that communal narcissists, when not impacted by power, report that they are more satisfied, invested, and committed in their relationships and engage in more communal behaviors with their partners while also using less negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors. Communal narcissists experiencing power use more negative accommodation but have higher levels of inclusion of others in the self. Vulnerable

narcissists, when not experiencing low power, reported more negative accommodation, have higher attention to alternatives and intentions toward infidelity as well as less self-determination for being in a relationship. Vulnerable narcissists experiencing power have lower levels of inclusion of others in the self. No significant associations were found for grandiose narcissists, however, a negative association with positive accommodation almost reached significance ($p=0.059$)

Two of the most interesting findings from Study 2 involve negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors, and inclusion of other in the self, or closeness. When a communal narcissist has a perceived lower sense of power, there is no relationship found for closeness; however, when experiencing high power, a communal narcissist is positively associated with closeness. Looking at vulnerable narcissists, when experiencing low power, there is a small but positive relationship with closeness. After experiencing higher power, a vulnerable narcissist has a small but negative relationship with closeness, implying that power impacts the inclusion of others in the self for both communal and vulnerable narcissists. In terms of negative accommodation, communal narcissists experiencing low power have a negative association with endorsing negative accommodation, however, after experiencing high power, report a small but positive association with negative accommodation. Vulnerable narcissists experiencing low power report a small but positive relationship with negative accommodation and this positive association with negative accommodation is then strengthened for vulnerable narcissists after experiencing high power. This finding implies that power impacts the perception of negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors, for both communal and vulnerable narcissists.

General Discussion

Taken together, these two studies support the idea that each facet of narcissism behaves differently in romantic relationships. The data collected from both Study 1 and 2 support the existing literature, which shows that grandiose narcissists have an overall negative perception of their romantic relationships, including paying more attention to their alternatives, having less commitment toward their partner (Campbell & Foster, 2002), and endorsing negative accommodation to problems within their relationships. Grandiose narcissists appear to believe they have the power in their relationships and seem to have negative associations with closeness and a positive association with intentions toward infidelity.

Communal narcissists, unlike grandiose, have an overall positive perception of their romantic relationships, reporting more communal behaviors, more satisfaction and more commitment toward their relationship. Although these communal narcissists seem to be happy in their relationships, it is hard to tell how accurate this perception is based on the fact that communal narcissists tend to have a better-than-average perception of themselves and their communal qualities. Particularly, this perception might be impacted by this better-than-average effect when looking at how communal narcissists respond to problems in their relationships, especially after experiencing power. When a communal narcissist has low power, they report having a negative association with negative accommodation, however, this pattern flips once experiencing power, reporting a small but positive association with negative accommodation. Previous literature has shown that communal narcissists become less communal after experiencing power (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015), so this finding maps on to that phenomenon.

Vulnerable narcissists seem to perceive and behave in their relationships more similarly to that of grandiose narcissists. Vulnerable narcissists tended to endorse negative accommodation, or destructive behaviors, being less self-determined in their relationships,

having higher intentions toward infidelity, and paying more attention to alternatives. Vulnerable narcissists seemed less satisfied in their relationships and appeared to have a more negative perception of their relationships. The most interesting finding in this study for vulnerable narcissists comes from their inclusion of others in the self. When experiencing low power, a vulnerable narcissist has a small but positive association with closeness, however, after experiencing power, this pattern changes to a small but negative association for closeness. Although neither of these values reached significance, this finding implies that power might impact the closeness of their relationships for vulnerable narcissists.

This study aimed to see if power would impact intentions toward infidelity. There was no association for this relationship found in the data to support the idea that an increase in power would lead a narcissist to be more willing to cheat on their partner. An increase in power did impact the way that vulnerable and communal narcissists endorsed negative accommodation and closeness in their relationships, so the effect on power in relationship behaviors does exist and this data may not have found other impacts of different variables. Because of this future research should continue to examine how various forms of empowerment might impact relationship quality for each facet of narcissism. However, it is important to note that these findings are limited to a younger, undergraduate dating sample.

Future Research and Limitations

An idea for future research could be to introduce relationship threat to take away power from narcissists to see how their attitudes and behaviors toward their relationships might change. In terms of future work investigating how narcissists respond when their power is taken away specifically in their relationships, I predict that communal narcissists would endorse more communal behaviors as a way to try to save their relationship. For example, they might endorse

more constructive behaviors, pay less attention to their alternatives, and be more willing to sacrifice for their partners, similar to the way they responded to a power threat in this study. The biggest difference might be stronger changes in relationship behaviors because the threat is specific to their relationship. This behavior would most likely not last once the threat to their relationship has diminished, being that communal narcissists use their communal behaviors as a means to gain power (Giacomin & Jordan, 2015). I predict that grandiose and vulnerable narcissists would also endorse communal domains more, but not as much as communal narcissists. Instead, they would endorse more manipulative behaviors to try to convince their partners to maintain their relationships, such as using threats or bullying. This is based on the evidence that grandiose narcissists tend to endorse these behaviors to gain power in their relationships (Sauls, Zeigler-Hill, Vrabel, & Lehtman, 2019). Future research should also see how power impacts narcissists in older, married couples. One of the limitations of study 2 was that it was only run on younger undergraduate students who tended to endorse a more casual style of dating. Because of this style of dating, commitment and investments in the relationship might differ than that of a married couple, which could imply that power might have a different impact on different relationship types than the ones represented in study 2.

Another area for future research could be to examine both the partners and the narcissists in a relationship. The literature shows that grandiose narcissists tend to seek out trophy partners who do not endorse warm caring qualities (Campbell, 1999). These narcissists also then reported perceiving having the power in their relationships in this study. The data from sample A of study 1 finds that communal narcissists report feeling as though they do not have the power in their relationships. A follow-up question is: Who are communal narcissists' partners? Do they make the communal narcissists feel less power? Communal narcissists, who place importance on

communal rather than agentic domains unlike grandiose narcissists, might look for different qualities involving this communal emphasis in their partners. Future research can look further into these differences in partners and also see if these romantic partners have the same perceptions of their relationship quality as communal narcissists do. Another limitation of this study was the use of only self-reports from participants, leaving open the possibility for biases involving better-than-average perceptions found from narcissists. Seeking data from the partners of these narcissists, could provide answers to the question as to how much of the better-than-average effect leads to the higher quality report of romantic relationships from communal narcissists.

Little research exists as to how each facets of narcissism differs in terms of relationship behaviors. Most of the existing literature examining narcissism in romantic relationships focuses on grandiose narcissism, leaving little known about communal and vulnerable. This study is among one of the first to show how these other two facets behave and differ in relationships than that of grandiose narcissists. Because of this, there is more to study in these areas, making more research necessary to expand on the findings reported in this study.

References

- Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What Does the Narcissistic Personality Inventory Really Measure? *Assessment, 18*(1), 67-87. doi:10.1177/1073191110382845
- Alicke, M. D., & Govorun, O. (2005). The better-than-average effect. In M. D. Alicke, D. A. Dunning, J. I. Krueger, M. D. Alicke, D. A. Dunning, & J. I. Krueger (Eds.), *The self in social judgment* (pp.85–106). New York, NY: Psychology Press
- Aron, A., Aron, E. N., & Smollan, D. (1992). Inclusion of Other in the Self Scale and the structure of interpersonal closeness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*(4), 596-612. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.63.4.596
- Blais, M. R., Sabourin, S., Boucher, C., & Vallerand, R. J. (1990). Toward a motivational model of couple happiness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 1021-1031. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.59.5.1021
- Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the Meaning and Measure of Narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(7), 951-964. doi:10.1177/0146167209335461
- Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. (2011). Amazons Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *PsycEXTRA Dataset*. doi: 10.1037/e527772014-223
- Campbell, W. K. (1999). Narcissism and romantic attraction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(6), 1254-1270. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.77.6.1254

- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*(2), 340–354. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.340
- Farrell, A. K., Simpson, J. A., & Rothman, A. J. (2015). The relationship power inventory: Development and validation. *Personal Relationships*, *22*(3), 387-413.
doi:10.1111/pere.12072
- Fatfouta, R., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Schröder-Abé, M. (2017). I'm merciful, am I not? Facets of narcissism and forgiveness revisited. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *70*, 166-173.
doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2017.07.007
- Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal Narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *103*(5), 854-878.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029629>
- Giacomin, M., & Jordan, C. H. (2015). Validating Power Makes Communal Narcissists Less Communal. *Self and Identity*, *14*(5), 583-601. doi:10.1080/15298868.2015.1031820
- Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A Very Brief Measure of the Big Five Personality Domains. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *37*, 504-528.
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing Hypersensitive Narcissism: A Reexamination of Murrays Narcism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *31*(4), 588-599.
doi:10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204

- Jones, D. N., Olderbak, S. G., & Figueredo, A. J. (2011). The Intentions Towards Infidelity Scale. In T.D. Fisher, C.M. Davis, W.L. Yarber, & S.L. Davis (Eds.) *Handbook of Sexuality-Related Measures* (3rd ed., pp. 251–253). New York, Routledge.
- Luo, Y. L., Cai, H., Sedikides, C., & Song, H. (2014). Distinguishing communal narcissism from agentic narcissism: A behavior genetics analysis on the agency–communion model of narcissism. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *49*, 52-58. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2014.01.001
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, K. W. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality approaches to narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, *76*, 449-476. doi:10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x
- Naderi, I. (2018). I'm nice, therefore I go green: An investigation of pro-environmentalism in communal narcissists. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, *59*, 54-64. doi:10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.08.010
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*, 365–379.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *54*(5), 890-902. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.54.5.890
- Rusbult, C. E., Verette, J., Whitney, G. A., Slovik, L. F., & AI, E. (1991). Accommodation processes in close relationships: Theory and preliminary empirical evidence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *60*(1), 53-78. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.60.1.53

Rusbult, C. E., Martz, J. M., & Agnew, C. R. (1998). The Investment Model Scale: Measuring commitment level, satisfaction level, quality of alternatives, and investment

size. *Personal Relationships*, 5(4), 357-387. doi:10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00177.x

Sauls, D., Zeigler-Hill, V., Vrabel, J. K., & Lehtman, M. J. (2019). How do narcissists get what they want from their romantic partners? The connections that narcissistic admiration and narcissistic rivalry have with influence strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 147, 33–42. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2019.04.025

Van Lange, P. A., Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., Arriaga, X. B., Witcher, B. S., & Cox, C. L. (1997). Willingness to Sacrifice in Close Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 72(6), 1373-1395. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.72.6.1373

Watson, P., Grisham, S. O., Trotter, M. V., & Biderman, M. D. (1984). Narcissism and Empathy: Validity Evidence for the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 48(3), 301–305. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4803_12

Williamson, G. M., & Schulz, R. (1995). Caring for a Family Member With Cancer: Past Communal Behavior and Affective Reactions1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(2), 93-116. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01586.x

Zara, A., & Özdemir, B. (2017). God complex: the effects of narcissistic personality on relational and sexual behavior. *Anatolian Journal of Psychiatry*, 19(1), 29–36.

doi:10.5455/apd.263103

Zeigler-Hill, V., Clark, C. B., & Pickard, J. D. (2008). Narcissistic subtypes and contingent self-esteem: Do all narcissists base their self-esteem on the same domains? *Journal of Personality*, 76, 753–774.

Żemojtel-Piotrowska, M., Clinton, A., & Piotrowski, J. (2014). Original article Agentic and communal narcissism and subjective well-being: Are narcissistic individuals unhappy? A research report. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 2(1), 10-16.
doi:10.5114/cipp.2014.43097

Table 1.

Cronbach's α , Means (M), and Standard Deviations (SD) for study measures.

	Study 1a			Study 1b			Study 2		
	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	α	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
NPI	.900	11.57	7.63	.842	14.83	6.69	.825	14.24	6.37
CNI	.925	3.95	1.02	.896	4.60	0.90	.930	4.74	0.98
HSNS	.780	3.93	0.95	.681	3.95	0.85	.781	4.15	0.91
MCBS	.918	3.28	0.58	.868	3.47	0.49	.846	3.44	0.45
ACC POS	.852	3.50	0.71	.825	3.47	0.74	.752	3.44	0.62
ACC NEG	.839	2.14	0.73	.780	1.92	0.67	.817	1.97	0.72
SDT	.807	16.57	11.29	.752	19.10	12.15	.777	18.10	10.63
SAT	.951	5.61	1.42	.898	5.63	1.29	.900	5.71	1.18
INVEST	.761	5.48	1.13	.715	5.08	1.16	.740	4.87	1.16
ALT	.896	2.75	1.63	.806	3.48	1.43	.833	3.66	1.46
COMMIT	.817	5.65	0.88	.703	5.70	0.83	.765	5.62	0.89
WTS	.735	2.75	1.08	.713	2.30	0.94	.727	2.38	0.93
POWER	.846	4.19	0.52	.800	4.17	0.50	.684	4.13	0.39
IOS	--	5.48	1.55	--	5.03	1.44	--	5.02	1.51
ITIS	--	--	--	--	--	--	.800	2.15	1.13

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self; ITIS = Intentions Toward Infidelity Scale

Table 2.*Correlations of Narcissism Measures and Relationship Variables for Sample A (mTurk Sample).*

	Correlations Sample A		
	NPI	CNI	HSNS
<u>Narcissism Measures</u>			
NPI	--		
CNI	$r = .416, p = .000^*$	--	
HSNS	$r = .099, p = .157$	$r = -.010, p = .883$	--
<u>Relationship Variables</u>			
MCBS	$r = -.092, p = .189$	$r = .183, p = .009^*$	$r = -.173, p = .013^*$
ACC POS	$r = -.107, p = .127$	$r = .189, p = .007^*$	$r = -.078, p = .265$
ACC NEG	$r = .371, p = .000^*$	$r = .222, p = .001^*$	$r = .351, p = .000^*$
SDT	$r = -.217, p = .002^*$	$r = -.028, p = .694$	$r = -.207, p = .003^*$
SAT	$r = -.081, p = .248$	$r = .190, p = .006^*$	$r = -.081, p = .248$
INVEST	$r = -.106, p = .131$	$r = .121, p = .085$	$r = .065, p = .351$
ALT	$r = .331, p = .000^*$	$r = .144, p = .040^*$	$r = .176, p = .011^*$
COMMIT	$r = -.138, p = .048^*$	$r = .167, p = .017^*$	$r = -.033, p = .638$
WTS	$r = .053, p = .449$	$r = -.028, p = .690$	$r = .048, p = .495$
POWER	$r = .144, p = .039^*$	$r = -.068, p = .336$	$r = -.023, p = .748$
IOS	$r = -.172, p = .014^*$	$r = .161, p = .021^*$	$r = -.156, p = .026^*$

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self

Table 3.*Correlations for Narcissism Measures and Relationship Variables for Sample B (Student Sample).*

	Correlations Sample B		
	NPI	CNI	HSNS
<u>Narcissism Measures</u>			
NPI	---		
CNI	$r = .419, p = .000^*$	---	
HSNS	$r = .087, p = .149$	$r = .016, p = .787$	---
<u>Relationship Variables</u>			
MCBS	$r = -.002, p = .980$	$r = .122, p = .072$	$r = -.121, p = .074$
ACC POS	$r = -.106, p = .123$	$r = -.052, p = .441$	$r = -.111, p = .101$
ACC NEG	$r = .143, p = .038^*$	$r = .036, p = .597$	$r = .234, p = .000^*$
SDT	$r = -.050, p = .473$	$r = .033, p = .634$	$r = -.125, p = .065$
SAT	$r = -.008, p = .902$	$r = .133, p = .047^*$	$r = -.139, p = .038^*$
INVEST	$r = .094, p = .171$	$r = .120, p = .073$	$r = .073, p = .280$
ALT	$r = .184, p = .007^*$	$r = .030, p = .658$	$r = -.024, p = .722$
COMMIT	$r = -.101, p = .141$	$r = .121, p = .070$	$r = -.046, p = .494$
WTS	$r = -.098, p = .153$	$r = -.027, p = .691$	$r = .072, p = .284$
POWER	$r = .184, p = .008^*$	$r = .065, p = .341$	$r = -.007, p = .915$
IOS	$r = -.021, p = .763$	$r = .085, p = .207$	$r = -.045, p = .500$

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self

Table 4.*Gender and Relationship Variables for Samples A and B.*

	Sample A			Sample B		
	Male	Female	(df) t, p	Male	Female	(df) t, p
NPI	M=13.16 SD=7.93	M=10.77 SD=7.41	(202) 2.121, .035*	M=14.31 SD=6.91	M=15.44 SD=6.34	(208) -1.137, .257
CNI	M=4.11 SD=1.03	M=3.88 SD=0.99	(202) 1.546, .124	M=4.45 SD=0.89	M=4.68 SD=0.92	(214) -1.672, .096
HSNS	M=3.89 SD=0.90	M=3.93 SD=0.96	(202) -0.294, .769	M=3.76 SD=0.90	M=4.05 SD=0.87	(214) -2.159, .032*
MCBS	M=3.20 SD=0.59	M=3.31 SD=0.57	(202) -1.285, .200	M=3.40 SD=0.52	M=3.51 SD=0.47	(212) -1.563, .120
ACC POS	M=3.65 SD=0.74	M=3.43 SD=0.68	(202) 2.157, .032*	M=3.62 SD=0.70	M=3.42 SD=0.75	(214) 1.793, .074
ACC NEG	M=2.18 SD=0.79	M=2.13 SD=0.70	(202) 0.490, .625	M=1.93 SD=0.61	M=1.91 SD=0.69	(214) 0.258, .796
SDT	M=14.72 SD=10.06	M=17.42 SD=11.74	(202) -1.614, .108	M=16.63 SD=13.68	M=20.28 SD=11.25	(213) -2.023, .044*
SAT	M=5.75 SD=1.06	M=5.53 SD=1.57	(202) 1.013, .312	M=5.70 SD=1.43	M=5.69 SD=1.18	(214) 0.042, .966
INVEST	M=5.43 SD=0.93	M=5.50 SD=1.21	(202) -0.395, .694	M=5.09 SD=1.19	M=5.10 SD=1.14	(213) -0.058, .954
ALT	M=3.34 SD=1.65	M=2.47 SD=1.55	(202) 3.711, .000*	M=3.65 SD=1.45	M=3.41 SD=1.43	(215) 1.103, .271
COMMIT	M=5.63 SD=0.75	M=5.66 SD=0.94	(202) -0.252, .801	M=5.52 SD=1.06	M=5.80 SD=0.68	(214) -2.340, .020*
WTS	M=2.81 SD=1.02	M=2.73 SD=1.12	(202) 0.481, .631	M=2.56 SD=0.95	M=2.21 SD=0.92	(214) 2.572, .011*
POWER	M=4.00 SD=0.44	M=4.29 SD=0.54	(202) -3.726, .000*	M=3.92 SD=0.49	M=4.27 SD=0.47	(210) -4.852, .000*
IOS	M=5.54 SD=1.53	M=5.45 SD=1.56	(202) 0.366, .715	M=4.90 SD=1.51	M=5.13 SD=1.41	(214) -1.048, .296

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self

Table 5.*Linear Regressions for Sample A (mTurk Sample).*

Variables	NPI β (t, p)	CNI β (t, p)	HSNS β (t, p)
MCBS $N = 205, R^2 = .090$	-.184 (-2.477, .014)*	.258 (3.483, .001)*	-.152 (-2.244, .026)*
POWER $N = 205, R^2 = .043$.214 (2.803, .006)*	-.157 (-2.067, .040)*	-.045 (-0.654, .514)
ACC POS $N = 205, R^2 = .080$	-.218 (-2.908, .004)*	.279 (3.746, .000)*	-.054 (-0.789, .431)
ACC NEG $N = 205, R^2 = .246$.296 (4.369, .000)*	.102 (1.512, .132)	.323 (5.232, .000)*
SDT $N = 205, R^2 = .085$	-.226 (-3.020, .003)*	.064 (0.866, .388)	-.184 (-2.716, .007)*
SAT $N = 205, R^2 = .071$	-.186 (-2.476, .014)*	.267 (3.569, .000)*	-.060 (-0.874, .383)
INVEST $N = 205, R^2 = .052$	-.200 (-2.626, .009)*	.205 (2.706, .007)*	.087 (1.264, .208)
ALT $N = 205, R^2 = .131$.310 (4.256, .000)*	.016 (0.226, .822)	.146 (2.201, .029)*
COMMIT $N = 205, R^2 = .080$	-.251 (3.763, .000)*	.271 (1.124, .262)	-.005 (2.552, .011)*
WTS $N = 205, R^2 = .007$	-.186 (-2.476, .014)*	.267 (3.569, .000)*	-.060 (-0.874, .383)
IOS $N = 205, R^2 = .110$	-.273 (-3.708, .000)*	.273 (3.726, .000)*	-.126 (-1.882, .061)

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self

Table 6.*Linear Regressions for Sample B (Student Sample).*

Variables	NPI β (t, p)	CNI β (t, p)	HSNS β (t, p)
MCBS $N = 211, R^2 = .037$	-.055 (-0.735, .463)	.154 (2.075, .039)*	-.132 (-1.930, .055)**
POWER $N = 207, R^2 = .035$.014 (2.409, .017)	.005 (0.115, .909)	-.017 (-0.433, .666)
ACC POS $N = 211, R^2 = .023$	-.101 (-1.345, .180)	.010 (0.132, .895)	-.110 (-1.595, .112)
ACC NEG $N = 211, R^2 = .070$.132 (1.789, .075)	-.025 (-0.340, .735)	.227 (3.375, .001)*
SDT $N = 211, R^2 = .024$	-.070 (-0.928, .354)	.076 (1.008, .314)	-.133 (-1.929, .055)**
SAT $N = 214, R^2 = .046$	-.067 (-0.904, .367)	.178 (2.410, .017)*	-.141 (-2.082, .039)*
INVEST $N = 213, R^2 = .017$.065 (0.864, .388)	.067 (0.898, .370)	.066 (0.961, .338)
ALT $N = 215, R^2 = .037$.204 (2.763, .006)*	-.037 (-0.496, .620)	-.024 (-0.354, .724)
COMMIT $N = 214, R^2 = .038$.083 (1.100, .273)	-.069 (-0.914, .362)	.107 (1.550, .123)
WTS $N = 212, R^2 = .014$	-.067 (-0.904, .367)	.178 (2.410, .017)*	-.141 (-2.082, .039)*
IOS $N = 214, R^2 = .013$	-.057 (-0.761, .447)	.100 (1.335, .183)	-.062 (-0.896, .371)

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self

Table 7.*Gender and Relationship Variables for Study 2.*

	Study 2 Sample		
	Male	Female	(df) t, p
NPI	M=15.43 SD=6.83	M=13.63 SD=6.00	(176) 1.815, .071
CNI	M=4.73 SD=0.95	M=4.76 SD=0.98	(176) -0.241, .809
HSNS	M=4.08 SD=0.96	M=4.19 SD=0.89	(176) -0.728, .468
MCBS	M=3.38 SD=0.46	M=3.48 SD=0.45	(174) -1.303, .194
ACC POS	M=3.58 SD=0.67	M=3.37 SD=0.59	(176) 2.163, .032*
ACC NEG	M=1.95 SD=0.72	M=1.98 SD=0.72	(176) -0.276, .782
SDT	M=16.48 SD=10.86	M=18.92 SD=10.49	(174) -1.461, .146
SAT	M=5.69 SD=1.18	M=5.72 SD=1.20	(176) -0.202, .840
INVEST	M=4.98 SD=1.17	M=4.81 SD=1.16	(176) 0.953, .342
ALT	M=3.92 SD=1.34	M=3.54 SD=1.50	(176) 1.659, .099
COMMIT	M=5.56 SD=0.85	M=5.65 SD=0.91	(176) -0.626, .532
WTS	M=2.61 SD=1.03	M=2.26 SD=0.85	(176) 2.410, .017*
POWER	M=4.08 SD=0.35	M=4.16 SD=0.41	(173) -1.315, .190
IOS	M=5.14 SD=1.71	M=4.95 SD=1.39	(176) 0.822, .412
ITIS	M=2.41 SD=1.16	M=2.03 SD=1.10	(175) 2.154, .033*

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self; ITIS = Intentions Toward Infidelity Scale

Table 8.*Correlations for Narcissism Measures and Relationship Variables for Study 2.*

	Correlations Study 2		
	NPI	CNI	HSNS
<u>Narcissism Measures</u>			
NPI	---		
CNI	$r = .248, p = .001^*$	---	
HSNS	$r = .158, p = .034^*$	$r = .282, p = .000^*$	---
<u>Relationship Variables</u>			
MCBS	$r = .045, p = .549$	$r = .251, p = .001^*$	$r = .031, p = .677$
Positive Acc.	$r = -.136, p = .068$	$r = .117, p = .117$	$r = -.002, p = .974$
Negative Acc.	$r = .214, p = .004^*$	$r = -.054, p = .472$	$r = .281, p = .000^*$
SDT	$r = -.156, p = .037^*$	$r = .069, p = .362$	$r = -.208, p = .005^*$
Satisfaction	$r = .018, p = .816$	$r = .225, p = .002^*$	$r = -.043, p = .562$
Investments	$r = -.092, p = .219$	$r = .141, p = .060$	$r = .128, p = .088$
Alternatives	$r = .283, p = .000^*$	$r = .233, p = .002^*$	$r = .335, p = .000^*$
Commitment	$r = .020, p = .785$	$r = .285, p = .000^*$	$r = -.001, p = .985$
WTS	$r = -.065, p = .389$	$r = -.036, p = .627$	$r = -.061, p = .414$
Power	$r = .080, p = .294$	$r = -.045, p = .557$	$r = .036, p = .634$
IOS	$r = .074, p = .327$	$r = .102, p = .174$	$r = -.023, p = .758$
IT IS	$r = .226, p = .002^*$	$r = .037, p = .622$	$r = .316, p = .000^*$

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self; ITIS = Intentions Toward Infidelity Scale

Table 9.*Regressions for Study 2.*

Variables	MCBS $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .104$	ACC POS $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .089$	ACC NEG $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .175$	SDT $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .116$	SAT $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .089$	INVEST $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = 0.84$
GENDER	.117 (1.559, .121)	-.172 (-2.256, .025)*	-.013 (-.182, .856)	.129 (1.712, .089)	.025 (.324, .746)	-.104 (-1.362, .175)
POWER	.009 (-.126, .900)	-.061 (-.813, .417)	.013 (.182, .856)	.037 (.504, .615)	.052 (.692, .490)	.043 (.579, .564)
GRANDIOSE	.008 (.072, .943)	-.217 (-1.904, .059)**	.169 (1.559, .121)	-.110 (-.970, .334)	.028 (.244, .807)	-.215 (-1.882, .062)
COMMUNAL	.334 (2.910, .004)*	.179 (1.538, .126)	-.352 (-3.174, .002)*	.174 (1.508, .133)	.296 (2.545, .012)*	.254 (2.170, .031)*
VULNERABLE	.030 (.273, .785)	-.125 (-1.142, .255)	.238 (2.285, .024)*	-.248 (-2.164, .032)*	-.086 (-.783, .435)	.094 (.854, .394)
GN X POWER	-.014 (-.126, .900)	.006 (.052, .958)	.055 (.520, .604)	-.041 (-.368, .713)	-.082 (-.738, .462)	.044 (.399, .691)
CN X POWER	-.041 (-.351, .726)	-.019 (-.164, .870)	.250 (2.280, .024)*	.035 (.306, .760)	.000 (-.003, .998)	-.078 (-.671, .503)
VN X POWER	-.106 (-.946, .345)	.151 (1.367, .174)	.077 (.729, .467)	-.002 (-.021, .983)	-.014 (-.129, .897)	.058 (.523, .601)

Table 9 Continued.*Regressions for Study 2.*

Variables	ALT $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .191$	COMMIT $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .114$	WTS $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .050$	POWER $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .029$	IOS $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .069$	ITIS $\beta (t, p)$ $R^2 = .172$
GENDER	-.142 (-1.978, .050)*	.058 (.768, .444)	-.205, (-2.633, .009)*	.103 (1.288, .200)	-.032 (-.417, .678)	-.156 (-2.152, .033)*
POWER	.030 (.429, .668)	.024 (.327, .744)	-.009 (-.118, .906)	-.010 (-.131, .896)	.013 (.167, .867)	-.068 (-.953, .342)
GRANDIOSE	.142 (1.328, .186)	-.019 (-.171, .865)	-.110 (-.938, .349)	.131 (1.095, .275)	.099 (.860, .391)	.184 (1.692, .093)
COMMUNAL	.196 (1.781, .077)	.360 (3.131, .002)*	.034 (.281, .779)	-.152 (-1.268, .207)	-.106 (-.904, .367)	-.068 (-.608, .544)
VULNERABLE	.218 (2.113, .036)*	-.144 (-1.330, .185)	-.017 (-.153, .879)	.041 (.350, .727)	.126 (1.139, .257)	.267 (2.546, .012)*
GN X POWER	.025 (.239, .812)	-.036 (-.326, .745)	.006 (.054, .957)	-.003 (-.028, .977)	-.018 (-.160, .873)	-.017 (-.160, .873)
CN X POWER	-.121 (-1.115, .266)	-.030 (-.264, .792)	-.030 (-.255, .799)	.069 (.585, .560)	.274 (2.349, .020)*	-.065 (-.589, .556)
VN X POWER	.094 (.899, .370)	.094 (.862, .390)	-.029 (-.259, .796)	-.023 (-.195, .845)	-.261 (-2.333, .021)*	.075 (.712, .477)

Note: NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; CNI = Communal Narcissist Inventory; HSNS = The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; MCBS = Mutual Communal Behavior Scale; ACC POS = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (positive total); ACC NEG = My Responses to Relationship Problems Scale (negative total); SDT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (total); SAT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (satisfaction total); INVEST = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (investments total); ALT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (alternatives total); COMMIT = Motivation for Being in a Relationship (commitment total); WTS = Willingness to Sacrifice; POWER = Relationship Power Inventory; IOS = The Inclusion of Other in the Self; ITIS = Intentions Toward Infidelity Scale