

Two Faces of Narcissism

Paul Wink

Institute of Personality Assessment and Research
University of California, Berkeley

The present study examines the lack of strong correlations among existing self-report measures of narcissism. A principal-components analysis of 6 MMPI narcissism scales resulted in 2 orthogonal factors, 1 implying Vulnerability-Sensitivity and the other Grandiosity-Exhibitionism. Although unrelated to each other, these 2 factors were associated with such core features of narcissism as conceit, self-indulgence, and disregard of others. Despite this common core, however, Vulnerability-Sensitivity was associated with introversion, defensiveness, anxiety, and vulnerability to life's traumas, whereas Grandiosity-Exhibitionism was related to extraversion, self-assurance, exhibitionism, and aggression. Three alternative interpretations of these results are considered, and an argument for the distinction between covert and overt narcissism is made.

The recent resurgence of interest in narcissism has led to the proliferation of self-report measures of the construct. Several of the newly developed narcissism scales, including the most widely researched Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979, 1981), have shown high intercorrelations. Surprisingly, however, the NPI does not correlate with the Narcissistic Personality Disorder Scale (NPDS; Ashby, Lee, & Duke, 1979), another widely used measure of the construct (Emmons, 1987; Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984).

The NPI, and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI) narcissism scales of Morey, Waugh, and Blashfield (1985) and Wink and Gough (1990), were all derived from the third edition of the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (DSM-III)*; American Psychiatric Association, 1980) criteria for narcissistic personality disorder and were developed using the internal consistency method of test construction. These three highly intercorrelated scales (Wink & Gough, 1990) share inventory correlates indicative of self-aggrandizement, rebelliousness, outgoingness, and impulsivity. In a survey of empirical findings for the NPI, Raskin and Novacek (1989) concluded that high scorers are highly energetic, extraverted, experience-seeking, self-confident, tend to assume leadership roles, and are characterized by an open expression of grandiosity, conceit, and egotistical tendencies. In summary, the three *DSM-III*-based narcissism scales emphasize the narcissistic characteristics of openly displayed grandeur and exhibitionism.

I thank Oliver John, Ravenna Helson, and Jonathan Cheek for their help in preparing this article.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Paul Wink, who is now at the Department of Psychology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1346.

The NPDS (Ashby et al., 1979) is the only narcissism scale developed empirically by contrasting item endorsement rates of diagnosed narcissists in treatment with control groups of other patients and individuals not in treatment. Wink and Gough (1990) have shown that the NPDS correlates positively with Serkownek's (1975) narcissism-hypersensitivity and with Pepper and Strong's (1958) ego-sensitivity scales, two measures of narcissism derived from MMPI's (Hathaway & McKinley, 1940) Masculinity-Femininity scale.

In contrast to the NPI, however, the correlates of the NPDS indicate diminished self-esteem and depression (Watson, Taylor, & Morris, 1987), inadequacy, unhappiness, and worry (Mullins & Kopelman, 1988), and shyness (Cheek & Wink, 1990). The NPDS has also been associated with lack of empathy (Watson et al., 1987), involvement in unsatisfactory love relationships (Solomon, 1982), and the Exploitativeness-Entitlement factor on the NPI (Emmons, 1987; Watson et al., 1984).

High scores on Serkownek's (1975) narcissism-hypersensitivity scale are indicative of self-centeredness and a lack of self-confidence, concern with appearance, and extreme sensitivity to hurt (Graham, 1987). Similar themes can be discerned in the items of Pepper and Strong's (1958) Ego-Sensitivity scale (Dahlstrom & Welsh, 1960). In summary, the NPDS and the MMPI narcissism scales developed by Serkownek and by Pepper and Strong reflect the themes of vulnerability and sensitivity.

The lack of correlation between the NPDS and the NPI is well documented (e.g., Emmons, 1987; Mullins & Kopelman, 1988; Watson et al., 1984; Wink & Gough, 1990). One explanation of why the NPI and the NPDS are unrelated draws on the NPDS's correlation with Exploitativeness-Entitlement, an NPI factor related to suspiciousness, anxiety, and neuroticism. Both Emmons (1987) and Watson et al. (1987) have interpreted this association to mean that the NPDS anchors the maladaptive

pole and the NPI the more healthy pole of a narcissistic continuum.

An alternative explanation is that the NPDS is not a measure of narcissism at all, but rather provides a general index of maladjustment not specific or unique to any syndrome of psychopathology. The correlation between the NPDS and unhappiness, inadequacy, anxiety, and depression can be construed as supportive of this second hypothesis.

A third interpretation can be derived from the clinical perspective, and involves the distinction between overt and covert forms of narcissism. Psychoanalysts have attributed narcissism to parental insensitivity, which results in the child's defensive grandiosity (Kernberg, 1975), or, alternatively, prevents the transformation of infantile feelings of grandeur into a healthy sense of self-esteem (Kohut, 1971, 1977). The presence of grandeur is accompanied by feelings of inferiority, which reflect the child's natural and nondefensive response to faulty and insensitive parenting. Through the use of the defense mechanism of splitting (Kernberg, 1975; Klein, 1957), the narcissist manages to keep the two conflicting feelings about the self away from conscious awareness.

The contradictory sense of narcissistic self-esteem in conjunction with the use of splitting has led dynamic researchers (Kernberg, 1975, 1986; Kohut, 1977) to postulate the presence of two forms of narcissism. When it is overt, narcissistic grandiosity leads to a direct expression of exhibitionism, self-importance, and preoccupation with receiving attention and admiration from others. This overt form of narcissism is reflected in the *DSM-III* criteria, which also acknowledge the contradictory nature of narcissistic self-esteem. Similarly, Reich's (1949) notion of *phallic* narcissism stresses arrogant self-assurance, blatant self-confidence, and flagrant display of superiority.

The second form of narcissism, covert narcissism, is marked by largely unconscious feelings of grandeur and openly displayed lack of self-confidence and initiative, vague feelings of depression, and an absence of zest for work (narcissistic deficiency). Covertly narcissistic individuals appear to be hypersensitive, anxious, timid, and insecure, but on close contact surprise observers with their grandiose fantasies (Kernberg, 1986). Moreover, they share with the overt narcissists those narcissistic characteristics, such as exploitativeness and a sense of entitlement, whose expression does not depend on interpersonal style.

In the present study, six MMPI narcissism scales were used to study the relationship between those narcissism measures that emphasize grandeur and exhibitionism and those that focus on vulnerability and sensitivity. The first group of scales includes Raskin and Novacek's (1989) narcissism scale,¹ and the narcissism scales developed by Morey et al. (1985) and Wink and Gough (1990). The second group consists of the NPDS (Ashby et al., 1979), Serkownek's (1975) narcissism-hypersensitivity scale, and Pepper and Strong's (1958) ego-sensitivity scale.

In presenting our data, we first analyzed the six narcissism scales, using a principal-components analysis, with the expectation that two relatively independent factors will emerge. We then compared the resulting component scores on conceptually relevant scales from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI; Gough 1957, 1987) and the Adjective Check List (ACL; Gough & Heilbrun, 1983). To assess the generalizability of the

findings to data sources outside the self-report domain, we related the two narcissism factors to ACL ratings obtained from the subjects' spouses, to narcissism prototype scores, and to subscale scores derived from independent observer ratings on the California Q-Set (CAQ; Block, 1961/1978).

If both factors are measures of narcissism, then they should share those characteristics that do not depend for their expression on social poise and expressiveness. In particular, one would expect both factors to correlate positively with the observer-based CAQ narcissism prototype and negatively with CPI measures of normative control of impulses. Low scorers on the "Norm-favoring" cluster of CPI scales are characterized by undercontrol of impulses, disregard of others, rebelliousness, and self-indulgence indicative of entitlement and exploitativeness. Spouses who know the subjects well should be particularly sensitive to these narcissistic qualities.

Second, if the factor related to vulnerability and sensitivity measures covert narcissism, then it should be related to the hypersensitivity subscale of the CAQ prototype. Moreover, spouse ratings and inventory correlates should reflect introversion, anxiety, and lack of social poise and self-assurance. In contrast, if the second factor is related to grandiosity and exhibitionism, it should correlate with the CAQ willfulness subscale; moreover, spouse ratings and inventory correlates should indicate extraversion, aggression, exhibitionism, and self-confidence.

Finally, if one of the factors anchors a pathological end of the narcissistic continuum, then it should be related negatively to measures of psychological health and adjustment. In contrast, healthy levels of narcissism should be associated with effective functioning, fulfillment, and psychological integration.

Method

Sample

Participants were 350 individuals, 175 men and 175 women, who had taken part in extensive assessments at the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR). Of these, 152 (76 married couples) were San Francisco Bay Area residents with a mean age of 37 ($SD = 10.22$). The other 198 (99 of each sex) were University of California (UC) at Berkeley sophomores, nearly all of whom were between 19 and 21 years of age. Of the subjects, 280 were seen in weekend assessments, where they took part in a variety of procedures, including interviews and observational methods. The 70 remaining participants were interviewed by two staff psychologists.

All subjects took the MMPI, the CPI, and the ACL. In addition each of the 280 subjects who were assessed was described by a panel of from five to seven observers on Block's (1961/1978) California Q-Set (CAQ). The 70 participants seen only in interviews were described by two observers on the CAQ items. The CAQ descriptions of each subject were composited and the items were rearranged into the prescribed frequencies.

MMPI Narcissism Scales

Raskin and Novacek Narcissism Scale. This scale (Raskin & Novacek, 1989) consists of 42 items selected from the MMPI item pool,

¹ This scale was devised to permit measuring the NPI-defined construct using the MMPI item pool. It correlates highly with the 40-item full scale NPI.

using the NPI (Raskin & Hall, 1981) as an empirical criterion. In the derivation sample of 173 undergraduates, this scale correlated .79 with the 40-item full-scale NPI (for a review of research findings for the NPI, see Raskin & Terry, 1988 and Raskin & Novacek, 1989).

Morey, Waugh, and Blashfield Narcissism Scale. This scale (Morey, Waugh & Blashfield, 1985) is one of 11 scales developed to measure personality disorders as represented in the *DSM-III*. The 22-item scale was developed using a combined rational-empirical strategy in a sample of 475 psychiatric patients.

Wink and Gough Narcissism Scale. This 39-item scale (Wink & Gough, 1990) was developed using a combination of rational and internal consistency methods in a sample of 350 adults assessed at IPAR. For the purpose of initial item selection, narcissism was conceptualized according to the *DSM-III* criteria for the disorder. Independent construct validation studies have shown considerable validity against direct narcissism ratings by clinically trained observers and CAQ-derived narcissism judgments.

Narcissistic Personality Disorder Scale. This scale (NPDS; Ashby, Lee, & Duke, 1979) consists of 19 items that discriminated between the criterion group of 20 diagnosed narcissists in individual psychotherapy and two control groups (the control groups consisted of therapy patients not diagnosed as narcissists and individuals not in treatment). Validation data on the NPDS are provided by Solomon (1982) and Mullins and Kopelman (1988).

Ego-Sensitivity Scale. This 15-item scale (Pepper & Strong, 1958) was derived from analyses of the MMPI Masculinity-Femininity (MF) scale. The ego-sensitivity scale was formed judgmentally as part of a larger project to characterize the content areas of the MF scale.

Narcissism-Hypersensitivity Scale. This 20-item scale (Serkownek, 1975) was derived from a factor analysis of the MMPI MF items in a mixed sample of 422 psychiatric inpatients, outpatients, and people not in treatment (Graham, Schroeder, & Lilly, 1971). According to Graham (1987), high scores on this scale are indicative of an individual who is self-centered, concerned with physical appearance, extremely sensitive to hurt, lacking in self-confidence, preoccupied with sexual matters, and resentful towards his or her family.

Inventory Measures of Personality

To minimize the possibility of chance findings, CPI and ACL scales conceptually relevant to narcissism were grouped into three categories.

Normative control of impulse. The second CPI factor (control) is defined by the scales for responsibility, socialization, self-control, good impression, tolerance, well-being, and achievement via conformance. Individuals with low scores on these scales present themselves as rebellious, impulsive, risk-seeking, and self-indulgent (Gough, 1987). The present study includes four out of the five scales with highest loadings on this CPI factor: self-control, good impression, socialization, and responsibility; the fifth scale—achievement via conformance—was not included because it is not directly relevant to narcissism.

Social poise and assurance. Scales with high loadings on the first CPI factor measure stable dispositions toward extraversion, social poise, and self-assurance. The present study includes the four scales with highest loadings on this factor: dominance, sociability, social presence, and self-acceptance. In addition, ACL aggression and exhibition scales were included as measures of narcissistic arrogance and the need to elicit immediate attention from others.

Psychological health and adjustment. The CPI well-being scale measures subjective sense of physical and emotional health and optimism about the future. The CPI realization vector (V-3) scale, one of CPI's higher order structural scales, measures self-fulfillment, level of effective functioning, and psychological integration. Similarly, high scores on the ACL personal adjustment scale are associated with a

positive attitude toward life and the capacity to implement one's life goals.

Observer-Based Measures of Narcissism

Narcissism ratings. IPAR staff ratings on narcissism were available for a subset of subjects ($n = 57$). The definition of narcissism used for these ratings was based on the *DSM-III* and reads: "self-admiration that is characterized by tendencies toward grandiose ideas, fantasized talents, exhibitionism, and defensiveness in response to criticism; and by interpersonal relations that are characterized by feelings of entitlement, exploitativeness, and lack of empathy."

The CAQ narcissism prototype. As described by Wink (in press-a), nine judges sorted the 100 CAQ (Block, 1961/1978) items to describe a prototypical narcissist. The judges were instructed to use their own understanding of the construct in generating the prototype. *DSM-III* criteria for the narcissistic personality disorder were also provided. The mean intercorrelation among the prototypic sorts of the nine judges was .53 and the alpha reliability of the aggregated sorts of the nine judges was .91. Prototype scores for each of the 350 subjects were generated by correlating the prototypic sort with an aggregated CAQ-sort of each subject's personality by the IPAR staff. A factor analysis of the top 13 indicative items produced three orthogonal factors labeled Hypersensitivity, Willfulness, and Autonomy.

CAQ Narcissism subscales. Wink (in press-b) developed three observer-based CAQ narcissism scales from scores based on the aforementioned factor analysis of the CAQ narcissism prototype. Each of the three scales (willfulness, hypersensitivity, and autonomy) correlated with observer and self-report narcissism measures in both a derivation and a cross-validation sample. The scales showed adequate reliabilities, and their intercorrelations ranged from a low of $-.17$ to a high of $.28$.

The Willfulness scale includes CAQ items such as "Is power oriented," "Is self-indulgent," "Shows condescending behavior," "Creates and exploits dependency," and "Is self-dramatizing." Examples of items included in the Hypersensitivity scale are "Has hostility," "Is thin skinned," "Tends to be self-defensive," "Irritable," "Concerned with own adequacy," and "Is sensitive to demands." The Autonomy scale measures healthy narcissism and includes such items as "Values own independence," "Has high self-aspirations," "Has a wide range of interests," and "Thinks in unusual ways."

Spouse ACL Ratings

Spouse ratings were available for 152 subjects. The men in the 76 couples were described on the ACL by their female partners, and the women were described on the ACL by their male partners.

Results

Alpha Reliabilities, Intercorrelations, and Item Overlap

As shown in Table 1, the internal consistency coefficient (alpha) for the six MMPI narcissism scales ranged from a low of .60 for the NPDS to a high of .73 for Wink and Gough's (1990) scale.²

The intercorrelations among the narcissism scales of Raskin and Novacek (1989), Morey et al. (1985), and Wink and Gough (1990) ranged from a low of .54 to a high of .81, and those for the

² All the analyses were initially performed separately for the 175 men and 175 women. The two genders were combined because no sex differences were observed.

Table 1
Intercorrelations, Alpha Reliabilities, and Item Overlap for Six MMPI Narcissism Scales

MMPI narcissism scale	α	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Raskin & Novacek (1989) Correlation	.72	—	.81**	.61**	-.18**	-.08	-.24**
No. overlapping items			12	9	0	0	0
2. Morey, Waugh, & Blashfield (1985) Correlation	.65	.64**	—	.54**	-.26**	-.13*	-.28**
No. overlapping items				7	0	0	0
3. Wink & Gough (1990) Correlation	.73	.42**	.43**	—	.17**	.29**	.06
No. overlapping items					3	1	0
4. Ashby, Lee, & Duke (1979) Correlation	.60	-.17**	-.23**	.15**	—	.57**	.54**
No. overlapping items						0	0
5. Serkownek (1975) Correlation	.72	-.06	-.06	.24**	.50**	—	.83**
No. overlapping items							11
6. Pepper & Strong (1958) Correlation	.63	-.24**	-.35**	-.02	.45**	.49**	—

Note. $N = 350$ (175 of each sex). Above the diagonal are correlations among scales with overlapping items included. Below the diagonal are correlations among scales with overlapping items excluded. MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

NPDS, Serkownek's (1975) scale, and Pepper and Strong's (1958) scale ranged from .54 to .83 (see Table 1). Only Wink and Gough's scale correlated positively with both (a) Raskin and Novacek's ($r = .61$) and Morey et al.'s ($r = .54$) scales and (b) the NPDS ($r = .17$) and Serkownek's scale ($r = .24$).

Because all six scales have been developed within the same MMPI item pool, there was some item overlap among the scales. The two scales with highest item overlap were Raskin and Novacek's and Morey et al.'s, which shared 12 items in common. The two scales with lowest item overlap were the NPDS and Wink and Gough's scale, which had only one item in common.

When overlapping items were removed, the average inter-scale correlation for the first set of three scales dropped from .65 to .49, and for the second set it dropped from .64 to .48; otherwise the pattern of results remained unchanged (see Table 1).

Principal-Components Analysis

The six MMPI narcissism scales were subjected to principal components analyses with varimax rotation. In both instances, when overlapping items were permitted and removed, two orthogonal factors were extracted on the basis of Kaiser's eigenvalue criterion, plus inspection of the scree plot of eigenvalues (see Table 2).³ The total variance accounted for by the two factors was 80% for the overlapping scales; it was reduced slightly to 69% when nonoverlapping scales were used in the analysis. Moreover, the correlation between the sum of the three scales with high loadings on the first factor and the sum of three scales with high loadings on the second factor was $-.06$ and $-.09$ for overlapping and nonoverlapping scales, respectively, indicating that the two factors were unipolar rather than bipolar.

As shown in Table 2, the NPDS and the narcissism scales of Serkownek and Pepper and Strong loaded on the first factor, and the narcissism scales of Raskin and Novacek, Morey et al., and Wink and Gough loaded on the second factor. The first factor was tentatively labeled as Vulnerability-Sensitivity and the second one as Grandiosity-Exhibitionism. In the following sections, scores for Vulnerability-Sensitivity and Grandiosity-Exhibitionism are based on the principal-components analysis of nonoverlapping scales.

Correlations With Inventory Measures

Impulse control and nurturance. As shown in Table 3, the Vulnerability-Sensitivity and Grandiosity-Exhibitionism factor scores correlated $-.50$ and $-.52$, respectively, with the CPI self-control scale, indicating that a self-indulgent, risk-taking, and impulsive disposition to life (Gough, 1987) is characteristic of high scorers on both narcissism factors. In addition, negative correlations with CPI responsibility, socialization, and good impression scales suggested a general tendency toward under-control of aggressive and erotic impulses, unconventional and rebelliousness, and insistence on self-expression, even at the expense of others (Gough, 1987; McAllister, 1986).

Social poise and self-assurance. The Vulnerability-Sensitivity factor correlated *negatively* with CPI dominance, sociability, social presence, and self-acceptance scales. High scorers on this narcissism factor tend to be private and socially reticent individuals who characteristically avoid leadership roles and lack confidence in social settings (McAllister, 1986). In contrast, Gran-

³ The six scales were also analyzed using factor analysis, which resulted in the same grouping of scales.

Table 2
Principal-Components Analyses of the Six MMPI Scales According to Item Overlap

MMPI scale	Overlapping scales		Nonoverlapping scales	
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 1	Factor 2
Serkownek (1975)	.93	.08	.83	.13
Pepper & Strong (1958)	.89	-.14	.76	-.26
Ashby, Lee, & Duke (1979)	.78	-.07	.80	-.06
Raskin & Novacek (1989)	-.17	.92	-.17	.82
Morey, Waugh, & Blasfield (1985)	-.24	.88	-.24	.84
Wink & Gough (1990)	.29	.83	.30	.77

Note. $N = 350$. MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. Highest factor loadings are in boldface.

diosity–Exhibitionism correlated *positively* ($r_s > .45$) with the CPI dominance, sociability, social presence, and self-acceptance scales and with the ACL exhibition and aggression scales. High scorers on this narcissism factor are outgoing, socially poised, and self-assured individuals. They also tend to be forceful and arrogant, and need admiration from others.

Psychological health and adjustment. The Vulnerability–Sensitivity factor had negative correlations with CPI well-being and realization and ACL personal adjustment scales. These correlations suggest that high scorers on this factor are at odds with themselves, vulnerable to life's traumas, and lacking in

fulfillment and effective functioning. The Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factor correlated slightly positively ($r = .12$) with the ACL personal adjustment scale, slightly negatively ($r = -.15$) with the CPI realization scale, and zero with the CPI well-being scale. In spite of their social poise and assurance, high scorers on the Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factor do not report feeling fulfilled, integrated, and optimistic about the future.

Observer-Based Measures of Narcissism

Can the pattern of similarities and differences obtained for the two narcissism factors using inventory measures be replicated in other data sources? As shown in Table 4, the Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factor was positively correlated with observer ratings of narcissism, whereas the Vulnerability–Sensitivity factor was not. This suggests that observers who use *DSM-III* criteria of the construct tend to associate narcissism with observable displays of self-admiration, grandiosity, and exhibitionism. It may also be true that the narcissistic features underlying high scores on the Vulnerability–Sensitivity factor are less likely to be expressed in overt behavior in the unfamiliar setting of an assessment center.

Both narcissism factors, however, correlated significantly with scores on the overall CAQ narcissism criterion, a measure

Table 3
Correlations of the Two MMPI Narcissism Factors With Conceptually Relevant CPI and ACL Scales

Scale	MMPI narcissism factors	
	Vulnerability–Sensitivity	Grandiosity–Exhibitionism
Normative control of impulse		
CPI Responsibility	-.29**	-.29**
CPI Socialization	-.35**	-.24**
CPI Self-Control	-.50**	-.52**
CPI Good Impression	-.55**	-.23**
Social poise & self-assurance		
CPI Dominance	-.28**	.56**
CPI Sociability	-.33**	.57**
CPI Social Presence	-.30**	.62**
CPI Self-Acceptance	-.15**	.55**
ACL Exhibition	-.10	.52**
ACL Aggression	.06	.39**
Psychological health & adjustment		
CPI Well-Being	-.67**	.02
CPI Realization (Vector 3)	-.49**	-.15**
ACL Personal Adjustment	-.33**	.12*

Note. $N = 350$. MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. CPI = California Psychological Inventory. ACL = Adjective Check List.

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 4
Correlations of the Two MMPI Narcissism Factors With Five Observer-Based Measures of Narcissism

Measure	MMPI narcissism factors	
	Vulnerability–Sensitivity	Grandiosity–Exhibitionism
Direct ratings of narcissism	-.06	.40**
CAQ narcissism measure		
Overall prototype score	.23**	.24**
Willfulness subscale	.05	.39**
Hypersensitivity subscale	.23**	-.12
Autonomy subscale	.08	.18*

Note. $N = 350$, with the exception of direct ratings of narcissism where $n = 57$ (29 men and 28 women).

* $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

Table 5

Spouse ACL Correlates of the Two MMPI Narcissism Factors

Adjective	Vulnerability-Sensitivity (V-S)	Grandiosity-Exhibitionism (G-E)
Adjective common to both factors		
Bossy	.27**	.27**
Intolerant	.34**	.20*
Cruel	.26**	.24**
Argumentative	.24**	.25**
Honest	-.17*	-.30**
Opportunistic	.29**	.18**
Rebellious	.26**	.21**
Conceited	.18*	.28**
Arrogant	.23**	.22**
Demanding	.23**	.22**
Temperamental	.26**	.19*
Loud	.19*	.24**
Adjective characteristic of V-S only		
Worrying	.33**	.05
Emotional	.31**	-.02
Defensive	.31**	.12
Anxious	.30**	-.01
Bitter	.30**	.12
Tense	.28**	.07
Complaining	.27**	.12
Mature	-.26**	-.15
Dependent	-.25**	-.11
Contented	-.24**	-.13
Dissatisfied	.24**	-.05
Moody	.23**	.15
Adjective characteristic of G-E only		
Aggressive	.10	.31**
Hardheaded	.07	.31**
Modest	.01	-.27**
Outspoken	.13	.26**
Restless	.12	.26**
Show-off	.00	.25**
Assertive	-.05	.25**
Egotistical	.01	.24**
Determined	-.03	.22**
Evasive	.06	.22**
Impulsive	.11	.22**
Self-centered	.10	.22**

Note. $n = 152$ (76 male and 76 female spouses). ACL = Adjective Check List; MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory. * $p < .05$, two-tailed. ** $p < .01$, two-tailed.

of the construct that places equal emphasis on narcissistic sensitivity and grandeur. With respect to the three subscales, as expected, only Vulnerability-Sensitivity correlated with the CAQ hypersensitivity scale (Wink, in press-b), which emphasizes narcissistic self-absorption, defensiveness, hostility, and concern with self-adequacy. The positive correlation of Grandiosity-Exhibitionism with the CAQ willfulness and autonomy scales indicates an openly displayed power orientation, condescension, and self-indulgence as well as independence, and a wide range of interests.

Spouse Ratings

The correlations between the two factor scores and the spouse ratings on the ACL are summarized in Table 5. These

correlations are presented in three groups: correlates that are common to both the Vulnerability-Sensitivity and Grandiosity-Exhibitionism factors, and those correlated significantly with one factor but not the other. The set of "common" correlations were selected so that both factors had approximately equal correlations. In the two other groups, the adjectives are presented in descending order of their correlations.

Spouse ACL descriptions of high scorers on both narcissism factors included bossy and demanding, intolerant and argumentative, conceited, arrogant, and cruel. The Vulnerability-Sensitivity, but not the Grandiosity-Exhibitionism factor, was associated with the spouse descriptors of worrying, anxious and moody, defensive, bitter, and not mature and contented. Adjectives associated only with Grandiosity-Exhibitionism included aggressive, outspoken, show-off, egotistical, assertive, and not modest. In summary, the spouse ACL ratings associated with the two narcissism factors closely mirror the pattern of inventory findings.

Discussion

The present study used six MMPI narcissism measures to first confirm, and then try to explain, the lack of correlation between those narcissism scales that emphasize narcissistic grandiosity and exhibitionism (e.g., Raskin & Novacek, 1989) and those that stress vulnerability and sensitivity (e.g., the NPDS; Ashby et al., 1979). The three alternative interpretations presented for this lack of correlations were (a) that one set of scales measures narcissism whereas the other measures general pathology and maladjustment, (b) that the two sets of scales reflect two different manifestations of the construct, and (c) that the two sets represent opposite (healthy vs. unhealthy) ends of a narcissistic continuum. We will examine these three interpretations in turn.

Are There Two Kinds of Measures of Narcissism?

As expected, the three *DSM-III*-based narcissism scales developed by Raskin and Novacek (1989), by Morey et al. (1985), and by Wink and Gough (1990) were highly intercorrelated ($r_s > .54$), as were the NPDS (Ashby et al. 1979), the narcissism-hypersensitivity scale (Serkownek, 1975) and the ego-sensitivity scale (Pepper & Strong, 1958) ($r_s > .54$). However, the correlation between the sum of the first three scales and the sum of the second three scales was close to zero, and they loaded on two separate unipolar factors labeled as Grandiosity-Exhibitionism and Vulnerability-Sensitivity. It is important to note that these results cannot be attributed to item overlap, as the findings were replicated when item overlap was eliminated.

Do Both Sets of Scales Share Narcissistic Characteristics in Common?

Both the Vulnerability-Sensitivity and Grandiosity-Exhibitionism factors correlated with the observer-based CAQ narcissism prototype, a measure of the construct that includes both components of sensitivity and grandeur. Only Grandiosity-Exhibitionism, however, correlated with *DSM-III*-based ratings of

narcissism that equate narcissism with a demonstrable display of self-admiration, grandiosity, and entitlement.

Evidence for narcissistic core features common to both sets of scales was also found in the ACL spouse ratings. High scorers on both narcissism factors were described by their spouses as bossy and argumentative, arrogant, intolerant, and conceited. Similarly, in the inventory scale analyses, negative correlations with CPI measures of normative control of impulse indicated rebelliousness, craving for excitement, undercontrol of aggressive and erotic impulses, insistence on self-expression, and self-indulgence.

In summary, high scorers on the Vulnerability–Sensitivity and Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factors shared a variety of characteristics that express key narcissistic themes, such as conceit and arrogance, and the tendency to give in to one's own needs and disregard others.

Are There Two Forms of Narcissism?

In spite of their considerable similarities, the two narcissism factors differed in several of their correlates. Only the Vulnerability–Sensitivity factor correlated with the observer-based CAQ measure of narcissistic hypersensitivity indicative of defensiveness, hostility, sensitivity to slight, and concern with one's own adequacy. Spouse ACL adjectives associated with high scores on this narcissism factor included defensive, anxious, emotional and moody, bitter, and discontented. Negative correlations with CPI measures of social poise and assurance suggested introversion, discomfort in leadership roles, and lack of self-confidence in social settings. It is important to note that these CPI findings imply stable and enduring dispositions towards introversion and internality, rather than a transient and state-dependent loss of confidence and social withdrawal.

In marked contrast to Vulnerability–Sensitivity, the correlations of Grandiosity–Exhibitionism with the CAQ willfulness and autonomy scales indicated an openly expressed power orientation, manipulativeness, self-dramatization, independence, and broad interests. Spouse descriptors associated with this narcissism factor included aggressive, show-off, egotistical, assertive, and self-centered. The Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factor had substantial positive correlations with all four CPI measures of social poise and assurance and the ACL scales for exhibition and aggression. In summary, high scorers on this narcissism factor impress others, although not always favorably, with their outgoingness, self-assurance, forcefulness, and need to be admired.

When considered as a whole, the pattern of similarities and differences for the Vulnerability–Sensitivity and Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factors supports Kernberg's (1975, 1986) and Kohut's (1977) clinically based distinction between covert and overt narcissism. Like covert narcissists, high scorers on Vulnerability–Sensitivity appeared to be defensive, hypersensitive, anxious, and socially reticent individuals whose personal relations, however, were marked by self-indulgence, conceit and arrogance, and an insistence on having their own way. High scorers on Grandiosity–Exhibitionism, similar to overt narcissists, showed a consistent behavioral pattern of self-assured-

ness, aggressiveness, exhibitionism, self-indulgence, and disrespect for the needs of others.

Do the Narcissism Scales Differ on Pathology?

The negative correlations of the Vulnerability–Sensitivity factor with CPI and ACL measures of psychological health and adjustment indicated that these individuals were characterized by worry, problems in effective functioning, a lack of fulfillment, and vulnerability to life's traumas. As already discussed, similar themes prevailed in spouse ACL ratings, emphasizing anxiety, emotionality, pessimism, and discontentment. These pathological implications of Vulnerability–Sensitivity reinforce Emmon's (1987) and Watson et al.'s (1987) findings for the NPDS.

The Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factor did not show consistent correlations with measures of psychological health and adjustment. That is, in spite of their outgoingness, self-assurance, and desire to be admired, high scorers on Grandiosity–Exhibitionism did not report feeling fulfilled, integrated, and emotionally healthy. One possible explanation for this relative lack of effective functioning may be the detrimental effect that exhibitionism and aggressiveness have on interpersonal relations. After all, subjects scoring high on this narcissism factor were described by their spouses as more cruel, intolerant, immodest, and bossy than subjects scoring low. Similarly, in a longitudinal study of adult women, overt narcissism (as measured by the CAQ Willfulness scale) was found to be associated with pathology, troubled interpersonal relations, and a lack of personality growth from early to middle adulthood (Wink, in press-a, in press-c).

Taken together, these findings suggest that high scores on either of the two narcissism factors are associated with psychological problems and difficulties in effective functioning. In keeping with the distinction between covert and overt narcissism, the most clearly visible difficulties associated with Vulnerability–Sensitivity include anxiety and pessimism, lack of fulfillment, and vulnerability to life's traumas. In the case of Grandiosity–Exhibitionism, the difficulties center on overconfidence, aggressiveness at the cost of others, and an excessive need for admiration from others.

The findings of this study thus confirm the proposed classification of narcissism scales into two relatively uncorrelated sets. Both the Vulnerability–Sensitivity and Grandiosity–Exhibitionism factors shared in common narcissistic characteristics of conceit, self-indulgence, and disregard for the needs of others. However, whereas Vulnerability–Sensitivity was also associated with introversion, hypersensitivity, defensiveness, anxiety, and vulnerability, Grandiosity–Exhibitionism was related to extraversion, aggressiveness, self-assuredness, and the need to be admired by others. These findings are consistent with the view that there are two distinct (covert and overt) forms of narcissism. Correspondingly, there are also two distinct sets of self-report narcissism scales, none of which capture the full richness of the construct. Nevertheless, as this study indicated, narcissism in general, and covert narcissism in particular, are complex and multifaceted constructs, and many of their characteristics are difficult to measure through self-report or observer

judgment. Further research, therefore, is needed to validate the clinically derived claim that there are two different forms of narcissism.

References

- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-III*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Ashby, H. U., Lee, R. R., & Duke, E. H. (1979, September). *A narcissistic personality disorder MMPI scale*. Paper presented at the 87th Annual Convention of the American Psychological Association, New York, NY.
- Block, J. (1978). *The Q-sort method in personality assessment and psychiatric research*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press. (Original work published 1961)
- Cheek, J., & Wink, P. (1990). *Shyness and narcissism: Are they related?* Unpublished manuscript.
- Dahlstrom, W. G., & Welsh, G. S. (1960). *An MMPI handbook*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 11–17.
- Gough, H. G. (1957). *Manual for the California Psychological Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gough, H. G. (1987). *Administrator's guide for the California Psychological Inventory*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1983). *The Adjective Check List manual: 1980 edition*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Graham, J. R. (1987). *The MMPI handbook*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Graham, J. R., Schroeder, H. E., & Lilly, R. S. (1971). Factor analysis of items on the social introversion and masculinity-femininity scales of the MMPI. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 27, 367–370.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1940). A multiphasic personality schedule (Minnesota): I. Construction of the schedule. *Journal of Psychology*, 10, 249–254.
- Kernberg, O. (1975). *Borderline conditions and pathological narcissism*. New York: Jason Aronson.
- Kernberg, O. (1986). Narcissistic personality disorder. In A. A. Cooper, A. J. Frances, & M. H. Sachs (Eds.), *The personality disorders and neuroses* (Vol. 1, pp. 219–231). New York: Basic Books.
- Klein, M. (1957). Envy and gratitude. In R. Money-Kyrle (Ed.), *Envy and gratitude and other works 1946–1963* (pp. 176–236). New York: Free Press.
- Kohut, H. (1971). *The analysis of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- McAllister, L. (1986). *A practical handbook for CPI interpretation*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Morey, L. C., Waugh, M. H., & Blashfield, R. K. (1985). MMPI scales for DSM-III personality disorders: Their derivation and correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 245–251.
- Mullins, L. S., & Kopelman, R. E. (1988). Toward an assessment of the construct validity of four measures of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 52, 610–625.
- Pepper, L. J., & Strong, P. N. (1958). *Judgmental subscales for the MF scale of the MMPI*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 45, 590.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 45, 159–162.
- Raskin, R., & Novacek, J. (1989). An MMPI description of the narcissistic personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 53, 66–80.
- 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, 890–902.
- Reich, W. (1949). *Character analysis* (3rd ed.). New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Serkownek, K. (1975). *Subscales for scale 5 and 0 of the MMPI*. Unpublished manuscript.
- Solomon, R. S. (1982). Validity of the MMPI narcissistic personality disorder scale. *Psychological Reports*, 50, 463–466.
- Watson, P. J., 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, 301–305.
- Watson, P. J., Taylor, D., & Morris, R. J. (1987). Narcissism, sex roles, and self-functioning. *Sex Roles*, 16, 335–350.
- Wink, P. (in press-a). Self- and object-directedness in adult women. *Journal of Personality*.
- Wink, P. (in press-b). Three narcissism scales for the California Q-Set. *Journal of Personality Assessment*.
- Wink, P. (in press-c). Three types of narcissism in women from college to midlife. *Journal of Personality*.
- Wink, P., & Gough, H. G. (1990). New narcissism scales for the California Psychological Inventory and MMPI. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 54, 446–463.

Received November 17, 1989

Revision received October 26, 1990

Accepted January 27, 1991 ■