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Background: Narcissism is a personality trait associated with both psychological health and resilience as well as with aggression and interpersonal problems. Aim: This study compares levels of total narcissism and subscale scores in inpatients, outpatients and a community sample. Methods: Inpatients (N = 186) were recruited from consecutively admitted patients to two closed units, and the outpatient group (N = 144) consisted of patients attending a psychiatric outpatient clinic. The patients and a normative community sample (N = 437) all filled in the Narcissistic Personality Inventory questionnaire (NPI-29). Results: The NPI total and subscales scores showed considerable gender differences. Among men only the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale showed significant group differences, with inpatients showing higher mean score than the two other groups. Among women three factors, Leadership/Power, Superiority/Arrogance, and Uniqueness/Entitlement, showed significant differences between the different levels of psychopathology. The outpatient female group regularly had the lowest group mean scores. The NPI-29 scores of the normative group showed weak internal consistencies. Conclusion: Our hypothesis of a significant association between mean levels of total narcissism and subscale scores and severity of psychopathology was not supported.

• Community sample, Inpatients, Narcissism, Outpatients, Psychopathology, Self-report.

Ingrid Olsson, MD, PhD, DPS Elverum-Hamar, Skolegaten 32, N-2318 Hamar, Norway, E-mail: ingrid.olsson@sykehuset-innlandet.no; Accepted 29 May 2015.

Narcissism is a personality trait associated with both psychological health and resilience as well as with aggression and interpersonal problems (1). According to how narcissistic traits are perceived by others, the research literature has made a distinction between grandiose and vulnerable dimensions of narcissism. Grandiose narcissism is described by externalising traits such as arrogant attitudes, inflated self-esteem, self-admiration, entitlement, and exhibitionism. Vulnerable narcissism is reflected in internalizing traits such as interpersonal vulnerability, rejection sensitivity, self-protection, and shyness (2).

Empirical research on narcissism has mostly been done by self-rating instruments, measuring mostly the vulnerable (Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale) (2), the grandiose (Narcissistic Grandiosity Scale (3), Narcissistic Personality Inventory (4)), or both dimensions of narcissism (Pathological Narcissism Inventory (5), Five-Factor Narcissism Questionnaire (6), Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (7)).

The original version of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) was developed by Raskin & Hall (4), had 40 items (NPI-40), and was derived from the description of the DSM-III Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). However, it is well established that NPD emphasize the grandiose dimension of narcissism rather than the vulnerable one. In addition to grandiose narcissism, the NPI total score seem to capture an amalgam of socially positive elements such as a sense of psychological resilience and leadership abilities (8).

Cain et al. (9) also noted that the NPI contains a “confusing mix of adaptive and maladaptive content” (p. 643), and Ackermann et al. (1) reinforce that the NPI is a multi-dimensional instrument and that reliance on the NPI total score leads to an imprecise understanding of the concept of narcissism. Despite these limitations the NPI is still the most used instrument for measurement of grandiose narcissism. Lately Miller et al. demonstrated that among other instruments the NPI provided the strongest match to expert
ratings of grandiose narcissism (10) and DSM-5-based narcissistic personality disorder (11).

Several shorter versions of the NPI-40 have been introduced, and we have tested the NPI-29 developed by Swedish colleagues in a Norwegian translation (12, 13). In addition to a NPI-29 total score, four factor scores were identified: Leadership/Power (factor 1), Exhibition/Self-admiration (factor 2), Superiority/Arrogance (factor 3) and Uniqueness/Entitlement (factor 4).

The relationship between the NPI total score and traditional kinds of psychopathology has been exposed to limited empirical research. The NPI scores are negatively related to neuroticism, depression and anxiety, and positively related to well-being and positive affects (14, 15), psychopathy and the traits of disagreeableness, immoody, greed, and insincerity. Disagreeableness is a potant personality trait which correlates with antisocial behaviour, aggression, risky sexual behaviour, and substance use. Cain et al. (9) stated: “Unfortunately there are currently no studies that compare clinical and normal populations on the NPI to support the view that it assesses subclinical narcissism. It remains unclear whether the empirical associations found for NPI scores would extend to a clinical population.” Newer research (16) indicates that the NPI total score is a valid indicator of NPD only if one controls for patients’ self-esteem.

Aims
Against this background our study related severity of psychopathology to both the NPI-29 total and factor scores. Inpatients, outpatients and individuals from the general population represented groups with three different severity levels of psychopathology. Our hypothesis was that a positive association would be observed between the three degrees of psychopathology and the mean levels of the NPI-29 total and the factor 2, 3 and 4 scores in these groups. As for the NPI-29, factor 1 (adaptive narcissism), we hypothesized a negative association with severity of psychopathology. Since the NPI-29 ratings show significant gender differences, the ratings on the tests of psychopathology were stratified on gender.

METHODS
Participants and procedure
The inpatient group (N = 186) comprised of consecutively voluntary (47%) and involuntary (53%) admitted patients to the two closed units at the Department of Psychiatry, Aalesund Hospital, between 1 March 2005 and 15 October 2006. Exclusion criteria were dementia or organically based confusion, manic or hypomanic states, re-admittance during the sampling period, poor ability to speak Norwegian, or discharge within 48 h. Eligible patients were interviewed and completed the NPI-29 within three days after admission, except for a minority who were examined later within the first week due to the severity of their mental state on admission. Further information about the sample and procedures is given elsewhere (17). The inpatient sample consisted of 41% women and 59% men, and their mean age was 40.2 (SD 5.9) years.

The outpatient group (N = 144) consisted of patients referred for assessment and eventual treatment at the Hamar Psychiatric Outpatient Clinic (POC) between 1 February 2009 and 15 May 2010. Exclusion criteria were age < 20 years, clinically assessed cognitive impairment, psychosis, depression with severe suicidality, severe somatic illness, or problems regarding Norwegian language. Referred patients with alcohol or drug dependence as main diagnoses were handled by another department of the POC. Further information is given elsewhere (18). The outpatient sample consisted of 61% women and 39% men, and their mean age was 37.8 (SD 11.7) years.

The population-based sample (NORMs) was recruited from the general population of Hedmark County (Norway) in May 2008. A random sample of 1500 young adults was mailed a questionnaire containing a set of mental health scales inviting them to complete and return them anonymously. With no reminder 29% (N = 437) participated, 62% of them were women and 38% men, and their mean age was 40.2 (SD 5.9) years. Further information on the sampling and procedures is given elsewhere (19).

Ratings completed by all three samples
Demographic measures were dichotomized: relationship status into paired and non-paired relationship, and basic level of education into ≤ 12 years of education (low level) and > 12 years (high level). Work status was dichotomized as “in paid work” versus “not in paid work”. Individuals employed full time, part time or being self-employed belonged to the former category, while others belonged to the latter.

The Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI-29) originally consisted of 40 dichotomous statements, among which one is considered to confirm an attitude of narcissism, and the other is not. Based on Emmons’ (20, 21) presentation of a four-factor model of the NPI, Kansi (12) developed NPI-29 in Swedish. Svindseth et al. (13) reported satisfying psychometric properties of this four-factor model of the Norwegian translation. In addition to a total score (0–29), four factor scores can be calculated: Leadership/Power (factor 1), Exhibition/Self-admiration (factor 2), Superiority/Arrogance (factor 3) and Uniqueness/Entitlement (factor 4). Seven out of eight items comprising factor 1 (Leadership/Power) correspond to the adaptive factor “Leadership/Authority” in the structure model proposed by Ackerman (1), and factor 1 thus corresponds to the normal/adaptive narcissism in the NPI-29.

The NPI-29 was completed by all three samples, and the internal consistency of the total NPI-29 was Cronbach’s coefficient alpha 0.84 among inpatients, 0.83 among outpatients, 0.60 among NORMs, and 0.74 for the total
sample. For the inpatients the alphas for subscales ranged from 0.56 to 0.73, for outpatients from 0.53 to 0.70, for NORMs from 0.26 to 0.48, and for the total sample from 0.45 to 0.58.

Ratings performed in the patient samples only
Diagnostic evaluations of inpatients were performed clinically by psychiatrists according to ICD-10 (22) at index hospitalization discharge. Only the main diagnosis was noted, and the diagnostic distribution was substance abuse/dependence 21%, schizophrenia 26%, mood disorders 29%, anxiety disorders 14%, and personality disorders 10%.

The outpatient sample was diagnosed with the MINI International Neuro-psychiatric Interview (MINI) for Axis I disorders (23) and the SCID-II interview for Axis II disorders. (24). One main diagnosis was noted with a distribution of personality disorders 50%, mood disorders 37%, and anxiety disorders 13%, when personality disorders pre-empted mood and anxiety disorders.

The Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) is a commonly used rating scale for assessing patients’ overall mental symptoms and their level of functioning (25). The GAF-Split version was used in this study, assessing symptom and function scores separately (26). The inpatient and outpatient samples were rated on the GAF by their therapists.

Ratings completed by the outpatients and the NORMs
No diagnostic examinations were performed on the NORMs, but we presume that this group had a lower proportion of mental disorders than observed in the inpatient and outpatient groups (see above). The Experiences in Close Relationships (ECR) has 36 statements describing the individual’s typical feelings in close relationships. Eighteen items assess the avoidance and 18 the anxiety dimensions (27). The mean dimensional scores go from 1.0 to 7.0 with higher scores indicating more avoidance and anxiety. The reliability and validity data of the ECR in English have considerable support (28) which also was the case for the outpatient compared to the inpatient group. The inpatient group significantly more men than the two other groups, which frequently had higher education than both patient groups, and anxiety disorders 13%, when personality disorders pre-empted mood and anxiety disorders.

The Global Assessment of Functioning (GAF) is a commonly used rating scale for assessing patients’ overall mental symptoms and their level of functioning (25). The GAF-Split version was used in this study, assessing symptom and function scores separately (26). The inpatient and outpatient samples were rated on the GAF by their therapists.

Statistics
The internal consistency of scales and subscale were evaluated with Cronbach’s coefficient alpha. Differences on continuous variables were examined by t-tests and one way ANOVA, and categorical variables by chi-squared tests. In case of skewed distributions non-parametric tests were applied. Since relationship status, level of education, and work status differed significantly between the three groups, all comparisons on psychiatric measures between the groups were adjusted for these potentially confounding variables. In the same way adjustment for self-rated health and life satisfaction were added when the outpatient and the NORMs groups were compared. In contrast, comparisons between inpatients and outpatients were only adjusted for differences in relationship status. Adjustments were done using multivariate linear and logistic regression analyses.

All significance tests were two-tailed, and p<0.05 were reported as significant. The analyses were computed on PASW version 18.0 (Chicago, IL) for PCs.

Ethics
The study of inpatients was approved by the Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics of the Central Region of Norway, while the outpatient study was approved by the Committee for Medical and Health Research Ethics of the South East Region of Norway. All patients gave written informed consent. Since the NORM sample responded anonymously, they did not have to give written informed consent according to Norwegian legislation.

Results
Demography of the groups
Compared to the patient groups the NORMs were significantly older and more often held paid work (Table 1). The NORMs more often lived in paired relationships and more frequently had higher education than both patient groups, which also was the case for the outpatient compared to the inpatient group. The inpatient group consisted of significantly more men than the two other groups.
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Table 1. Characteristics of the three samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Inpatients (I)</th>
<th>Outpatients (O)</th>
<th>NORMs (N)</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, mean (SD)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N (%)</td>
<td>37.3 (13.4)</td>
<td>37.8 (11.7)</td>
<td>40.2 (5.9)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 N vs I, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>110 (59)</td>
<td>56 (39)</td>
<td>165 (38)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 I vs N, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>76 (41)</td>
<td>89 (61)</td>
<td>272 (62)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paired</td>
<td>50 (27)</td>
<td>62 (44)</td>
<td>326 (75)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 N vs I, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-paired</td>
<td>136 (73)</td>
<td>80 (56)</td>
<td>109 (25)</td>
<td>0.002 I vs O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 12 years</td>
<td>28 (15)</td>
<td>35 (24)</td>
<td>157 (36)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 I vs N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≤ 12 years</td>
<td>158 (85)</td>
<td>110 (76)</td>
<td>279 (64)</td>
<td>0.008 N vs O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work</td>
<td>50 (27)</td>
<td>35 (24)</td>
<td>335 (78)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 N vs I, O</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not in paid work</td>
<td>136 (73)</td>
<td>109 (76)</td>
<td>95 (22)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General health</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good health</td>
<td>34 (24)</td>
<td>338 (78)</td>
<td>95 (22)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor health</td>
<td>110 (76)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied</td>
<td>30 (21)</td>
<td>353 (81)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
<td>113 (79)</td>
<td>84 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICD 10 diagnoses</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse</td>
<td>40 (22)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia</td>
<td>48 (26)</td>
<td>0 (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mood disorders</td>
<td>54 (29)</td>
<td>53 (37)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety disorders</td>
<td>26 (14)</td>
<td>19 (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality disorders</td>
<td>18 (10)</td>
<td>72 (50)</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Personality disorders pre-empt mood and anxiety disorders as main diagnosis.

Comparison of the inpatient and outpatient groups
The diagnostic distribution differed significantly between the two groups with severe diagnoses of schizophrenia and substance abuse in 46% of the inpatients in contrast to none among the outpatients (Table 1). The mean GAF-F and GAF-S scores were significantly lower in the inpatients versus the outpatient group for both genders after adjustments (Table 2).

Comparisons of the outpatient group and NORMs
A significantly higher proportion of the NORMs reported good self-rated health and satisfaction with life compared to the outpatient group (Table 1). Both women and men of the outpatient group reported a significantly higher mean score on the personality disorder screening (IPDS), and a significantly higher proportion of women of that group reported insecure attachment versus NORMs after adjustment, while no significant group difference was observed for men (Table 2).

Findings on the NPI-29 total and subscale scores
The NPI-29 total and subscale scores showed considerable gender differences Table 2). Among men only the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale (factor 4) showed significant group differences with inpatients showing higher mean score than the outpatient and NORMS groups with similar scores. In contrast, among women the Leadership/Power (factor 1), Superiority/Arrogance (factor 3), and Uniqueness/Entitlement (factor 4), showed significant differences between the levels of psychopathology, and so was closely the case for the Exhibitionism/Self-admiration (factor 2) and the NPI-29 total mean scores. The outpatient female group regularly had the lowest mean scores between the groups.

Discussion
Summary of main findings
Although examined and compared with different measures, we have considerable evidence for a gradient of psychopathology between the three groups with the highest levels of psychopathology among inpatients, the outpatients in between, and with lowest level of psychopathology among the NORMs. Our hypothesis of a positive association of the NPI-29 total and subscales scores with levels of psychopathology was not supported in either gender. The outpatient group had a lower mean score on all aspects of narcissism among women except for the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale (factor 4) and for factors 1 and 3 this finding was highly significant. The inpatient group showed the significantly highest mean score on the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale (factor 4) in both genders.
Global functioning
Uniqueness/Entitlement
Superiority/Arrogance
Leadership/Power

NPI-29 total 6.2 (4.7) 4.5 (3.8) 6.5 (3.0)

Adjusted for age, relationship status, level of education and work status;
**Adjusted for relationship status;
***Adjusted for age, relationship status, level of education, work status, general health, and life satisfaction.

**Contribution of new knowledge**
To our knowledge this is the first time that a NPI instrument has been investigated in samples with different severity levels of psychopathology and with an opportunity to stratify on gender and adjust for demographic variables.

A major surprise to us, which disturbed our hypothesis, was the low levels of mean NPI total and factor 1–3 scores in the female outpatient group compared to the two other groups. The female outpatient group diagnostically consisted of 51% personality disorders and half of them belonged to cluster C in DSM-IV (18). If we assume that cluster C personality disorders are more characterized by narcissistic vulnerability rather than narcissistic grandiosity, the low NPI-29 scores among the female outpatients might be explained. With such a presumption the NPI instrument’s main focus on grandiose narcissism must be regarded as a limitation since vulnerable narcissism becomes undetected.

An alternative interpretation is that the female outpatient group has higher scores on neuroticism, depression and anxiety which have shown negative correlations and thereby lower scores on the NPI-29 total and factors 1–3.

We expected our NORM sample to represent normal levels of narcissism among young adults. After adjustment for confounders both the inpatient and outpatient groups’ mean scores on NPI-29 total and Exhibition/Self-admiration (Factor 2) did not differ significantly from the NORM group in either gender. This similarity in narcissism scores between different levels of psychopathology could be interpreted as support for the criticism of heterogeneity of the NPI scale raised by Cain et al. (9) and Ackerman et al. (1) as quoted in the introduction.

We expected the inpatients group to show the highest levels of narcissism due to the severity of their psychopathology. However, such was the case in both genders only on the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale (factor 4), and this may be the only NPI-29 factor tapping the narcissistic grandiosity of the observed inpatients with psychosis or substance abuse, diagnoses not observed in the outpatient and the NORM groups.

On the Leadership/Power (factor 1), the Exhibition/Self-admiration (factor 2), and the Superiority/Arrogance (factor 3) subscales the inpatient group and the NORMs showed similar mean scores in both genders. So in the most ill group these types of narcissism hardly seem affected by the severity of the psychopathology compared to NORMs.

The pattern of results suggests that only the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale assesses pathology. The other three subscales are not related to Uniqueness/Entitlement and generally they behave in a different manner, suggesting they assess adaptive efforts rather than pathology. This pattern of differences helps to understand our results.

**Relation to previous findings**
Our findings support the criticism raised by Cain et al. (9) and Ackerman et al. (1) concerning the heterogeneity
of the NPI total score and the criticism for lack of items covering vulnerable narcissism raised by several authors.

Issues related to the Leadership/Power (factor 1)
The viewpoint that the Leadership/Power (factor 1) subscale is not considered as part of grandiose narcissism but rather a resource has raised the question whether this factor is of clinical importance (1). Surprisingly we observed that the female outpatient group had a significantly lower mean score on factor 1, while the inpatients had a mean score similar to NORMs. We find it difficult to explain why the outpatients should show less of this resource factor than the inpatient group. However, by means of item response theory analyses Ackerman et al. (32) have demonstrated that among students, those with lower levels of “narcissism” were more likely to confirm items reflecting potential for Leadership/Power. The same association was observed among our outpatients. According to Table 2, the mean score of the Leadership/Power subscale represents approximately one third of the mean NPI-29 total score for all groups. This means that independent of the level of total narcissism, the factor 1 mean score represents a fixed proportion of the total score.

Due to its reflection of resources rather than pathology, a proposal of omission of factor 1 from the NPI has been raised (1). However, the NPI is widely used, and removing one factor may have a dramatic impact on the instrument and its properties. Given the widespread use of the NPI, researchers will probably be reluctant to take such a drastic step. Sedikides et al. (15) found positive correlations between the subscale of Leadership/Power (factor 1) and self-esteem, and a reduced propensity towards internalizing psychopathology on the other. These correlations together with our finding that the outpatient group had a significantly lower mean level of Superiority/Arrogance than the other two groups may indicate that patients attending POCs have internalizing problems of clinical significance.

Limitations of the study
The findings of our study have to be considered in the light of some limitations. Lack of consistent diagnostic practice in the inpatient and outpatient groups as well as no diagnostic practice in the NORMs is a limitation, which cast some doubt on our three defined levels of psychopathology. However, to diagnose these three groups with the same procedure is a considerable challenge.

The context of hospitalization in a locked psychiatric unit might be perceived as a threat to patients’ self-esteem, and in order to compensate patients may have exaggerated some of the items in the NPI-29 (33). The ability of very ill patients to complete questionnaires has been raised, but has mostly been refuted (17).

Psychopathology as defined by us could also be considered as so a wide concept that associations with the narcissism measures become minimal, only showing for the inpatient group on the Uniqueness/Entitlement subscale (factor 4).

In spite of good psychometrics, any abridged version of the NPI like the Norwegian version of NPI-29 can be considered as a limitation due to lack of sufficient psychometric documentation. Low internal consistencies of the NPI-29 subscales among NORMs (alpha 0.26–0.48), but not among the inpatients and outpatients are noteworthy. A likely explanation is the greater heterogeneity of the NORM sample compared to the two samples of psychiatric patients in treatment.

Conclusions
Our hypothesis of a significant association between narcissism as measured by the NPI-29 and the three groups of psychopathology was not supported. One of the reasons may be that “vulnerable narcissist” is not included in the various versions of the NPI scales, and another that neuroticism, depression and anxiety were most prominent in the outpatient group as these factors are negatively associated with narcissism.
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