

SEX DIFFERENCES IN NARCISSISM: EXPRESSION OF AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE
EXPLOITATIVENESS/ENTITLEMENT FACTOR

A thesis presented to the faculty of the Graduate School of Western Carolina University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts in Psychology.

By

Ashton Caroline Southard

Director: Dr. Millicent H. Abel
Professor of Psychology
Psychology Department

March 2010

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to give special thanks to my committee director, Dr. Millie Abel, not only for her guidance throughout the process of my thesis, but also for being a wonderful teacher, an inspiring role model, and above all a great friend.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
List of Tables	v
Abstract	vi
Introduction.....	1
Literature Review	2
Narcissism.....	2
Hypersensitivity	6
Aggression	8
Jealousy	11
Influence Tactics	15
Purpose of the Study.....	19
Method	22
Participants	22
Measures	22
Demographics Questionnaire	22
Narcissistic Personality Inventory	22
Multidimensional Jealousy Scale	23
Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale	24
Influence Strategy Questionnaire.....	24
Aggression Questionnaire.....	25
Procedure.....	25
Results	26
Discussion	37
Limitations/Future Directions	42
Conclusions.....	43
References	45
Appendices	54
Appendix A – Demographic Questionnaire.....	55
Appendix B – Narcissistic Personality Inventory.....	56
Appendix C – Multidimensional Jealousy Scale	61
Appendix D – Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale	64
Appendix E – Influence Questionnaire.....	65
Appendix F – Aggression Questionnaire	68
Appendix G – Consent Form	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Means and standard deviations on all measures for men and women	26-27
2. Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, and influence tactics in men and women.....	28
3. Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, total aggression, and subscales of aggression in men and women.....	29
4. Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, total aggression, and cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy in men and women.....	31

ABSTRACT

SEX DIFFERENCES IN NARCISSISM: EXPRESSION OF AND RELATIONSHIPS WITH THE EXPLOITATIVENESS/ENTITLEMENT FACTOR

Ashton C. Southard, M. A.

Western Carolina University (March 2010)

Director: Dr. Millicent H. Abel

The exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism has been characterized as representing maladaptive characteristics such as anxiety (Watson & Biderman, 1993), suspiciousness, lack of empathy (Emmons, 1984), and hostility toward others (Ruiz, Smith, & Rhodewalt, 2001). The hypersensitivity aspect of covert narcissism has also been associated with exploitativeness/entitlement (Ryan et al., 2008). Interestingly, exploitativeness/entitlement has been found to relate to measures of aggression in women only (Emmons, 1984; Ryan et al., 2008). Given that exploitativeness/entitlement is associated with tendencies toward manipulation of others (Emmons, 1984), one focus of this study was to examine how the factor relates to different types of influence tactics. Further, research suggests that men and women may differ in their outward expressions of narcissism (Mort & Rhodewalt, 2001), thus, possible sex differences were also investigated.

Jealousy has been a topic of much research and examined as separate cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions, with cognitive jealousy reflecting jealous and suspicious thoughts, emotional jealousy reflecting negative feelings due to a partner's infidelity, and behavioral jealousy reflecting jealous actions and behaviors such as going through a partner's personal belongings (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Given the maladaptive nature associated with exploitativeness/entitlement, it is possible this factor relates to the three dimensions of jealousy. To date, no research has examined how the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism relates to the three dimensions of jealousy. The current study thus explored relationships between the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism and hypersensitivity to threat, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, as well as tendencies toward aggression and influence tactics; further, possible sex differences in these relationships were examined.

A convenience sample of college students (N = 120) gave informed consent and subsequently completed a packet of questionnaires which included the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin

& Hall, 1979), the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin & Cheek, 1997), the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (AQ; Buss & Perry, 1992), the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989) which evaluates cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, as well as six categories of influence tactics taken from Howard et al. (1986) which included manipulation, supplication, bullying, autocracy, disengagement, and bargaining.

Results supported previous findings suggesting that men and women may differ in their expressions of narcissism in that, while exploitativeness/entitlement was associated with the influence tactic autocracy in both men and women, sex differences emerged in that exploitativeness/entitlement in men was also related to the influence tactics of manipulation, disengagement, and bargaining, whereas women's exploitativeness/entitlement was also related to the influence tactics of supplication and bullying. These results also support previous research suggesting that women's exploitativeness/entitlement may be related to more coercive types of influence tactics (Ryan et al., 2008). Further, relationships were found between women's exploitativeness/entitlement and overall aggression, as well as the specific aggression subfactors of anger and physical aggression, supporting previous research revealing a relationship between exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression measures in women (Emmons, 1984; Ryan et al., 2008).

The current results revealed a relationship between women's hypersensitivity and exploitativeness/entitlement, as well as the influence tactics of supplication, bullying, and disengagement. However no relationships were found between hypersensitivity and exploitativeness/entitlement or any influence tactic in men. These findings may indicate that exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity are more a factor in preference for specific influence tactics in women than in men.

Regarding jealousy, results revealed that aggression was a significant predictor in both men and women of cognitive, as well as behavioral jealousy. This finding may indicate that aggression plays a central role in jealous thoughts as well as the tendency to act on those thoughts. Exploitativeness/entitlement was found to predict emotional and cognitive jealousy in women; in contrast, exploitativeness/entitlement failed to significantly predict any dimension of men's jealousy. This finding may indicate that exploitativeness/entitlement is more of a component of jealous thoughts and feelings in women, while less central to jealousy in men. Further, hypersensitivity, along with aggression, was found

to predict men's behavioral jealousy, which may indicate that, for men, hypersensitivity to threat, as well as tendencies toward aggression are central to their jealous actions and behaviors.

Examinations of overall levels of exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, aggression, dimensions of jealousy, and the six influence tactics revealed minimal differences between men and women; however, the current study does suggest that, although overall levels of these characteristics and tendencies may not differ between men and women, differences may exist in how they relate to each other.

The current study was limited in several ways including the low reliability of the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale of the NPI, and the inability to account for sexual orientation and gender role orientation. Future research should examine the possible effects of gender role and sexual orientation in the relationships between jealousy, influence tactics, maladaptive narcissism, aggression, and hypersensitivity. Future studies should also continue to examine the role of hypersensitivity in men's and women's aggressive tendencies, as well as dimensions of jealousy. Further, research should focus on developing a more valid and reliable measure of the negative and maladaptive aspects of narcissism.

Introduction

Narcissism has been a topic of numerous research studies in psychology and was the focus of this study. Narcissism involves a positive and inflated view of the self, and is “described as a normally-distributed personality characteristic” (Ryan, Weikel, Sprechini, 2008, p. 803). Lower levels of narcissism can be healthy and beneficial, however, higher levels on the specific Exploitativeness/Entitlement subscale can be maladaptive (Emmons, 1984, 1987). Exploitativeness/Entitlement is a subfactor of narcissism and is described in the literature as being the most maladaptive with characteristics including aggression and hypersensitivity. Jealousy is also a topic of much research and has been related to aggressive tendencies. Studies have produced contrasting results concerning sex differences in both the Exploitativeness/Entitlement narcissism factor and jealousy. Although there are existing bodies of research on Exploitativeness/Entitlement, as well as jealousy, the two have not been examined together. The purpose of this study is to examine differences in men and women with regard to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism as it relates to jealousy, and also to evaluate specific traits, such as hypersensitivity, aggression, and preferred influence tactics, that may play a role in this relationship.

Literature Review

Narcissism

Narcissism is described as a “normally-distributed personality” trait (Ryan et al., 2008, p. 803) which has both adaptive and maladaptive characteristics (Emmons, 1984, 1987). Narcissism includes a positive and amplified view of self (Campbell, Reeder, Sedikides, & Elliot, 2000; John & Robins, 1994); narcissistic individuals often give off a sense of superiority, expect favors from others without giving compensation, and are willing to take advantage of others to benefit themselves (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Sturman, 2000). Individuals high in narcissism tend to be more sensitive to criticism or threats to the self than individuals low in narcissism; when faced with criticism, narcissistic individuals often respond in a combative fashion which can involve acting aggressively, attempting to discredit the source of criticism, and feelings of extreme anger (Kernberg, 1975; Rhodewalt, Madrian, & Cheney, 1998; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Widiger & Trull, 1993). Individuals high in narcissism, as compared to individuals low in narcissism, also tend to react to feedback with exaggerated emotion and credit themselves more for positive feedback while blaming negative feedback on outside factors (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998). Narcissists’ emotional reactions are linked to information gained through interactions with others, with information interpreted as negative feedback provoking hostile reactions, angry feelings, and aggressive behavior (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998).

Narcissism received a considerable amount of attention in research beginning in the 1970’s, with most of the early research focusing on the development of an instrument to measure narcissism (Raskin & Novacek, 1989). The emerging instrument, the 54 item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI), was developed by Raskin and Hall (1979) and evaluated individual differences in levels of narcissism in nonclinical populations. Each item on the NPI contains two sentences, a narcissistic sentence and a nonnarcissistic sentence and participants must choose which sentence most describes them. Several studies were conducted validating the NPI, including Auerbach (1984) who found the NPI highly correlated with the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory (MCMI) in a sample of undergraduate students (Millon, 1982); the MCMI is an instrument used to assess narcissism in clinical populations. Prifitera and

Ryan (1984) also found the MCMI to be correlated with the NPI in a population of clinically diagnosed narcissistic individuals. Many other studies validating the NPI as a measure of narcissism were also conducted (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Raskin & Hall, 1981; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Watson, Grisham, Trotter, & Biderman, 1984). These studies find individuals scoring high on the NPI as people who tend to report high levels of self-esteem and display a “need for attention and admiration” (Emmons, 1984, p. 298) and are usually perceived by others to be “assertive, rude, ambitious, and self-centered” (Raskin & Terry, 1988, p. 896). They are “highly energetic, active, extraverted, and aggressive” (Raskin & Novacek, 1989, p. 76); and also tend to display a high level of self interest in their relationships, and demonstrate a lack of empathy for others (Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Watson et al., 1984).

Emmons (1984, 1987) identified a structure of subfactors underlying general narcissism measured by the NPI. Using two samples of college students, four subfactors of narcissism emerged: Leadership/Authority, Self-Absorption/Self-Admiration, Superiority/Arrogance, and Exploitativeness/Entitlement. The Leadership/Authority factor reflects characteristics such as enjoying being a leader and being seen as a source of authority. The Self-Absorption/Self-Admiration factor includes narcissistic tendencies such as enjoying looking at oneself in the mirror; Superiority/Arrogance is characterized by core feelings of superiority and grandiosity. Finally, the factor Exploitativeness/Entitlement represents a strong tendency toward manipulation and exploitation of others, and expecting favors from others (Emmons, 1984, p. 292). In the same study, Emmons (1984) found achievement to be highly correlated with Exploitativeness/Entitlement, and suggested this indicates a competitive nature in individuals who score high in this factor; dominance was highly correlated with the full scale NPI as well as the Leadership/Authority subfactor, and succorance (tendency to give help to others) was negatively correlated with Superiority/Arrogance (Emmons, 1984, p. 294). Further, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was found to have positive relationships with “suspiciousness, anxiety, and neuroticism,” which suggests that the factor is reflective of the more negative and maladaptive characteristics of narcissism (Emmons, 1984, p. 295). General narcissism, as well as the three subfactors Leadership/Authority, Self-Absorption/Self-Admiration, and Superiority/Arrogance appear to be positively related to self-esteem; Exploitativeness/Entitlement, however, appears to be the only factor of

narcissism unrelated to self-esteem, which suggests a maladaptive nature of the factor (Emmons, 1984; Watson & Biderman, 1993).

Exploitativeness/Entitlement has been associated with a number of maladaptive characteristics (Ryan et al., 2008), including depression, anxiety (Watson & Biderman, 1993), hostility towards others (Ruiz, Smith, & Rhodewalt, 2001) and a lack of empathy (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Watson et al., 1984), that reflects both a deficit in ability to understand the emotions of others and difficulty in understanding the point of view of others (Watson et al., 1984). Further, Exploitativeness/Entitlement has been found to be highly correlated with a lack of forgiveness (Exline, Baumeister, Bushman, Campbell, & Finkel, 2004), interpersonal aggression, neuroticism (Ruiz et al., 2001), and perception of interpersonal transgressions, such that individuals high in Exploitativeness/Entitlement tend to interpret ambiguous social situations as directed at them (McCullough, Emmons, Kilpatrick, & Money, 2003).

Morf and Rhodewalt (2001) suggest that men and women may differ in their outward expression of narcissism as a result of traditional sex roles that are learned in childhood. Traditional sex roles for men such as being dominant and acting in their own personal interest, make it more socially acceptable for them to express their narcissism in direct dominant ways; whereas sex roles for women such as acting in a way that benefits others, make directly expressing their narcissism less socially acceptable (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001, p. 191). "Females presumably are forced to meet their narcissistic goals through more subtle, indirect, and affiliative means that conform with expectations of their sex role" (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001, p. 191).

In support of Morf and Rhodewalt's (2001) suggestions, Richman and Flaherty (1990) found no sex differences in overall scores on the Narcissistic Traits Scale, a measure of general narcissism created by the authors to reflect the diagnostic criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder; however, men and women differed on specific items. Men endorsed items representing "interpersonal exploitativeness, sense of uniqueness, entitlement and lack of empathy" significantly more than women (Richman & Flaherty, 1990, p. 93). The authors suggested that these results reflect the male sex role of individualism. Other studies produced contrasting results with regard to sex differences in exploitativeness and entitlement. Tschanz, Morf, and Turner (1998) examined sex differences in the relationships between the

four subfactors of narcissism identified by Emmons (1984, 1987) and found that Exploitativeness/Entitlement was significantly less related to the other three factors Leadership/Authority, Self-Absorption/Self-admiration, and Superiority/Arrogance in women than in men. The authors suggest that these findings indicate that “exploitive tendencies and feelings of entitlement are less central to the construct of narcissism among females than they are among males” (Tschanz et al., 1998, p. 863). This is supported by research indicating that women who are exploitative and express entitlement may be more likely than men to be socially criticized as violating traditional sex roles because women should “engage in such positive social behavior as being tender, compassionate, warm, sympathetic, sensitive, and understanding” (Tschanz et al., 1998, p. 864). Regardless, Simmons, Lehmann, Cobb, and Fowler (2005) found that among men and women arrested for violence against an intimate partner, female offenders tended to show significantly higher levels of narcissism, and were significantly more likely to have levels of narcissism high enough to indicate a clinical disorder than were male offenders.

Ryan et al. (2008) concluded that an individual’s sex was a key element in understanding narcissism and its relationships by finding that Exploitativeness/Entitlement significantly correlated with other maladaptive aspects of general narcissism including women’s sexual coercion (p. 809). Consequently, these findings suggest that Exploitativeness/Entitlement may be a central part of general narcissism in women in contrast to what was suggested by Tschanz et al. (1998). Further, Ryan et al. (2008) suggested that exploitative and entitled women may employ different influence strategies, including coercion, to manipulate and control their partners based on the significant correlations between the women’s self-reported Exploitativeness/Entitlement aspect of narcissism and their level of self-reported sexual coercion tactics used against their partner. In contrast, Ryan et al. (2008) obtained no significant correlations for men between their self-reported Exploitativeness/Entitlement scores and sexual coercion. However, Ryan et al. (2008) did find a significant relationship between the men’s level of covert narcissism as measured by hypersensitivity (i.e. being overly sensitive to threat or slight in interpersonal relationships; Hendin & Cheek, 1997) and physical assault as a measure of aggression suggesting that men who are more hypersensitive may tend to be more aggressive than men with a lower level of hypersensitivity.

In sum, “narcissism can be described as a normally-distributed personality characteristic” (Ryan et al., 2008, p. 803) which involves both adaptive and maladaptive traits (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Raskin & Terry, 1988). Narcissism is described as a positive and exaggerated view of self (Campbell et al., 2000; John & Robins, 1994); individuals high in narcissism tend to convey superiority and display a need for attention, as well as a sense of entitlement. Narcissistic individuals are willing to take advantage of others (Emmons, 1984; John & Robbins, 1994; Raskin & Terry, 1988; Sturman, 2000), and tend to react with more intense emotion to self-relevant information/feedback, which can result in feelings of anger and hostility (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995). Emmons (1984, 1987) identified four subfactors of narcissism which include the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor.

Exploitativeness/Entitlement is described as a tendency toward strong interpersonal manipulation and exploitation of others, and an expectation of favors (Emmons, 1984, p. 292). Further, Exploitativeness/Entitlement has been characterized as the most maladaptive factor of narcissism (Emmons, 1984; Raskin & Novacek, 1989; Watson et al., 1984), and associated with multiple negative traits (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Ruiz et al., 2001; Ryan et al., 2008; Watson & Biderman, 1993; Watson et al., 1984). Finally, as discussed earlier, research concerning sex differences in narcissism has produced mixed results (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Richman & Flaherty, 1990; Ryan et al., 2008; Simmons et al., 2005; Tschanz et al., 1998).

Hypersensitivity

In past research, narcissism has been differentiated into two forms (Kernberg, 1975, 1986; Kohut, 1977). The first form, overt narcissism, is associated with an upfront display of grandiosity and superiority with an underlying sense of shame; while the second form, covert narcissism, is characterized by the opposite, an underlying sense of grandiosity and superiority with an upfront outward display of shame (Wright, O’Leary, & Balkin, 1989, p. 223). Wink (1991) found support for these two separate forms, and described covert narcissism as an outward expression of low self-esteem, anxiety, and hypersensitivity, in addition to an underlying attitude of superiority expressed in grandiose fantasies and self-expectations (p. 596). Covert narcissists tend to be hypersensitive, anxious, defensive, and arrogant in their interpersonal relationships and also are adamant about getting their way (Wink, 1991, p. 596). Covert narcissism is positively related to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism (Hendin & Cheek, 1997), and

hostility (Rathvon & Holmstrom, 1996). Studies have found that interpersonal hypersensitivity to threat is a central component of covert narcissism (Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Wink, 1991). Hendin and Cheek (1997) developed the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS) to reflect the hypersensitivity and vulnerability research associated (e.g. Wink, 1991) with covert narcissism (p. 593). Hendin and Cheek (1997) found that the HSNS was unrelated to the overall NPI or general narcissism and yet, positively related to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subscale in both men and women, which supports previous findings that exploitative and entitled narcissists tend to react with strong emotion (Emmons, 1987). Finally, Ryan et al. (2008) also found hypersensitivity (HSNS) that they used as a measure of covert narcissism was positively correlated with the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subscale for both men and women.

Sex differences were also been found in the relationships between hypersensitivity, the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism, and measures of aggression (Ryan et al., 2008). Ryan's et al. (2008) study on intimate partner violence revealed that hypersensitivity was unrelated to aggression in women as measured by frequency of physical assault. In contrast, for men, hypersensitivity was positively correlated with frequency of physical assault, such that more hypersensitive men actually reported greater physical assault toward their partners than their partners' actually reported. The authors also found Exploitativeness/Entitlement was unrelated to aggression measures in men however, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was significantly related to hypersensitivity in both men and women, as well as aggression in women as measured by their level of sexual coercion. Thus, hypersensitivity could possibly mediate the relationship between Exploitativeness/Entitlement and aggressive tendencies for men. Ryan et al. (2008) suggested that men high in hypersensitivity and aggressive tendencies may be prone to a host of other negative characteristics including "a sense of entitlement and the willingness to exploit their dating partners" (p. 809). Further, concerning their findings for women, Ryan et al. suggest the following:

Exploitative and entitled women may feel that they are better than others, that their needs are more important than others, and that other people should fulfill their needs. This may

lead these women to think that it is acceptable to use coercion to manipulate and control their partners and to be hypersensitive to their partner's perceived coercion. (p.810)

In sum, covert narcissism has been identified as “a pattern where shame feelings are more conscious and narcissistic feelings are dissociated” (Wright et al., 1989, p. 223). Hypersensitivity appears to be a central component of covert narcissism (Kernberg, 1986), and related to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism in both men and women (Emmons, 1987; Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Ryan et al., 2008), as well as aggressive tendencies in men (Ryan et al. 2008). Ryan et al. (2008) suggest that hypersensitivity in more aggressive men could be associated with “a sense of entitlement and a willingness to exploit their romantic partners” (p. 809).

Aggression

There are two primary self-report methods used to assess aggressive acts and proneness to aggression. The first method is a trait measure of aggression that assesses an individual's tendencies toward aggression; the second method measures an individual's frequency of specific aggressive acts (Archer & Webb, 2006, p. 464). A popular trait measure, The Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (BPAQ; Buss & Perry, 1992), divides aggression into four subfactors: physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility. Buss and Perry (1992) explain that physical and verbal aggression both involve “hurting or harming” another person and represent the active element of aggressive behavior. “Anger, involves the physiological arousal and preparation for aggression,” representing the “emotional or affective” element of aggressive behavior. Hostility is comprised of “feelings of ill will and injustice,” representing the cognitive part of aggressive behavior (Buss & Perry, 1992, p. 457). Aggression can also be measured by how frequently an individual engages in specific aggressive acts; these aggressive acts can be described in terms of direct and indirect forms (Archer & Webb, 2006, p. 464). Direct aggression is described as physical or verbal in nature; the person engaging in direct aggression is easily recognized, therefore, the target of direct aggression can retaliate. Indirect aggression is typically verbal in nature and the person engaging in indirect aggression is often concealed, therefore, the target of the aggression is not able to retaliate (Archer & Coyne, 2005).

Several theories have been generated about the relationship between self-esteem and aggression. One theory of the relationship, reviewed by Bushman and Baumeister (1998), suggests that aggression occurs when an individual doubts or dislikes him/herself and thus serves to build the self-esteem of these individuals. However, an alternate theory on aggression was proposed by Baumeister, Smart, and Boden (1996). This theory proposes that aggression stems from threats to a very positive view of the self; and aggression is a negative response when someone rejects an evaluation that is threatening his/her high self-esteem. In addition to this theory, Kernis, Grannemann, and Barclay's (1989) study indicated that stability of self-esteem also plays a role in aggression. According to their study, people with high, unstable self-esteem are more prone to experiencing anger and acting in a hostile manner, in contrast, people with high, stable self-esteem are less likely to experience anger and act in a hostile manner. Further, Rhodewalt et al. (1998) found general narcissism was related to a high and unstable sense of self-esteem.

Numerous studies reveal a positive relationship between general narcissism and aggression (Paulhus, Robins, Trzesniewski, & Tracy, 2004; Raskin, Novacek, & Hogan, 1991; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Wink, 1991) and particularly between narcissism and direct aggression (Barry, Chaplin, & Grafeman, 2006; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Raskin et al. (1991) found that while hostility and self-esteem were not directly related, they were significantly correlated when grandiosity, narcissism, and dominance were also measured; which suggests that more hostile individuals tend toward higher self-esteem when exhibiting grandiose, narcissistic and domineering characteristics as well. Narcissists appear to be extraordinarily sensitive to slight insults or criticisms and tend to react with hostility (Baumeister et al., 1996). Bushman and Baumeister (1998) provided evidence for a relationship between narcissism and direct aggression with a pair of experiments in which participants were presented with faulty negative feedback on an essay. After receiving the negative feedback, participants were given the opportunity to inflict pain on the individual who had insulted them by blasting the person with loud white noise. Narcissists were much more willing than nonnarcissists to inflict pain on the person they believed had insulted them. These findings suggest that individuals high in narcissism are more likely to react with aggression and hostility when presented with negative feedback, regardless of level of self-esteem.

Narcissism is also linked to displaced aggression or aggression toward someone who was completely uninvolved in the original incident (Martinez, Zeichner, Reidy, & Miller, 2007). Martinez et al. found narcissistic individuals were significantly more likely to act aggressively towards an innocent person, especially when there was uncertainty concerning the potential damage to their ego. Additional evidence also finds that narcissists experience significantly more anger, and more aggressive behavior than nonnarcissists following social rejection (Twenge & Campbell, 2003). Bushman and Baumeister (2002) also concluded that narcissism is a significant predictor of violent and aggressive behavior. Finally, aggression has been related to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor of narcissism. Rhodewalt and Morf (1995) found that Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to a composite measure of hostility. Ruiz et al. (2001) found interpersonal hostility, physical and verbal aggression, as well as anger to be positively correlated with the total NPI and the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor of narcissism. Given that individuals possessing both a high and unstable view of self, such as narcissists, show more tendencies toward aggression, the relationship between the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor of narcissism and aggression is explored in this study.

There is research to support sex differences in aggression with men reporting more hostility, verbal, and physical aggression than women (Buss & Perry, 1992). O'Leary, Smith Slep, and O'Leary (2007) explored factors relevant to partner aggression in men and women. Their results revealed that dominance, jealousy, marital adjustment, and depressive symptoms predicted partner aggression in men as well as women. Further, the authors found the only predictor of aggression specific to women was a past history of aggressive behavior; and predictors of aggression for men included having been exposed to "aggression in one's family of origin," "anger expression," and also the reported amount of support given by friends (p. 761). Emmons (1984), in his factor analysis of the NPI, found that general narcissism positively correlated with aggression in both men and women; but, more specifically, the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subscale was correlated with aggression in only women (p. 294). More recently, Ryan et al. (2008) conducted a study supporting a positive relationship between the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor of narcissism and aggression, as measured by degree of sexual coercion toward a partner, in women, but not in men. In the same study, a positive relationship was

discovered between aggression, as measured by frequency of physical assault, and hypersensitivity in men, but not women.

In sum, aggression is generally presumed to be a multidimensional construct, with Buss and Perry (1992) identifying four subfactors of aggression including physical aggression, verbal aggression, anger, and hostility (p. 475). Aggression has been studied in two primary ways: frequency of aggressive acts (both direct and indirect) and proneness to aggression (Archer & Webb, 2006). For many years, research supported the notion that low self-esteem was related to aggression (Kirschner, 1992; Long, 1990; Oates & Forrest, 1985; Schoenfeld, 1988; Wiehe, 1991). However, Baumeister et al. (1996) proposed an alternative theory in which protecting one's high self-esteem is related to aggression. Further, general narcissism has been associated with measures of aggression (Barry et al., 2006; Bushman & Baumeister, 1998; Bushman & Baumeister, 2002; Martinez et al., 2007; Paulhus et al., 2004; Raskin et al., 1991; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Twenge & Campbell, 2003; Wink, 1991), as well as the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor of general narcissism (Emmons, 1984; Ruiz et al., 2001). Research has traditionally found sex differences in aggression (Archer, 2004; Archer & Webb, 2006; Buss & Perry, 1992; O'Leary et al., 2007) with men more likely to engage in aggressive behavior. Furthermore, Emmons (1984) study indicated that aggression was related to general narcissism in both men and women, but, the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subfactor was related to aggression in women only.

Jealousy

Romantic jealousy is described by Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) as a multidimensional construct involving emotional, behavioral, and cognitive experiences that usually occur when the existence and/or quality of an individual's primary relationship is threatened by another person, but can also occur when there is no rational perceived threat (p. 183). The experience of jealousy can emerge via individual's rational or irrational perception of a real or imaginary threat (Pfeifer & Wong, 1989, p. 183). These perceived threats to the relationship can undermine one's self-esteem and invoke feelings of insecurity, fear, anger, sadness, and resent (Buunk & Bringle, 1987, p. 124). Further, jealousy can involve very negative responses including threatening a partner and violent behavior (Guerrero, Andersen, Jorgensen, Spitzberg, & Eloy, 1995).

Current research regards the experience of romantic jealousy as multidimensional in nature with Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) separating overall jealousy into cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components (p. 188). Cognitive jealousy refers to the experience of suspicion or worry regarding a partner's infidelity. Emotional jealousy is characterized by the intensity of the combination of negative feelings associated with reaction to jealousy in a relationship. Behavioral jealousy describes an individual's tendency to engage in "detective/protective" jealous actions when a threat is perceived, such as looking through a partner's purse or pockets or unexpectedly calling a partner to check up on him or her (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989, p. 183). Research suggests that the three types of jealousy have differing relationships with other aspects of romantic relationships. Pfeiffer and Wong (1989) found a negative relationship between cognitive jealousy and love, in contrast emotional jealousy was positively related to love; also, behavioral and emotional jealousy had negative relationships with overall happiness, while cognitive jealousy showed no relationship with happiness. Marital satisfaction has been negatively associated with all three components of jealousy however it appears to have the strongest relationship with lower levels of cognitive jealousy (Guerrero & Eloy, 1992).

Sex differences were acknowledged by Guerrero and Andersen (1998) in their comprehensive theory of jealousy experience and expression. However, empirical studies provide mixed results concerning sex differences in the experience of jealousy (Aylor & Dainton, 2001). Buunk and Bringle (1987) suggested that men's experience of jealousy is not related to the same factors, such as relationship security, as women's jealousy experience. Mathes and Severa's (1981) study supported Buunk and Bringle (1987), such that men's jealousy experience was unrelated to relationship security, and they also found that men were more jealous overall than women. However, Guerrero and Reiter (1998) found that women tend to experience more jealous emotion than men. Sex differences in jealousy experience were found by Buss, Larsen, Westen, and Semmelroth (1992) in a series of three studies with men experiencing more jealousy in response to perceived sexual infidelity and women experiencing more jealousy in response to perceived emotional infidelity (e.g., falling in love with someone else). Further, the authors found that men experienced significantly higher levels of distress and physiological arousal in response to sexual infidelity, as opposed to emotional infidelity, with opposite results for women. Interestingly, Buss et al. also found evidence suggesting that men's sexual jealousy was even greater

when they had experienced a committed, exclusive sexual relationship. Finally, Aylor and Dainton (2001) found that men were more likely to experience cognitive jealousy than women.

Research also suggests that men and women tend to differ in jealousy expression. Guerrero and Reiter (1998) reported that men were more likely to respond to jealousy by contacting rivals, restricting their partner's access to rivals, and purchasing gifts for their partner; whereas, women tended to express negative affect (acting nervous, appearing hurt) and enhance their appearance in response to jealousy (p. 341). The authors also found that women reported expressing their jealous emotion more than men, in both direct ways, such as openly discussing feelings with a partner, and nonverbal ways, such as acting anxious (p. 342). Another study by Carson and Cupach (2000) suggested the only significant sex difference in jealousy expression was that women were more likely to use an "integrative" communication style (e.g. disclosure of feelings, asking for explanations, and rational discussion with the partner) in response to their jealousy than men (p. 320). Further, Aylor and Dainton (2001) found that women were significantly more likely than men to respond to their jealousy in two positive ways, which were openly expressing their jealous feelings and directly discussing their jealousy with their partner. However, the authors found that women were also more likely than men to respond to jealousy in three negative ways including expressing their jealousy in an indirect and aggressive fashion, threatening or becoming physically violent with their partner, and trying to make their partner feel guilty or jealous.

Jealousy has been explored in its relationship to aggression. Anger and hostility have been identified as central emotions involved in the jealousy experience (Sharpsteen, 1991; Smith, Kim, & Parrot, 1988; White & Mullen, 1989) and these emotions were also identified as main factors underlying overall aggression (Buss & Perry, 1992). O'Leary et al. (2007) identified jealousy, among other factors, to be a strong predictor of romantic partner aggression in men, as well as women. The authors also found that jealousy was positively related, in both men and women, to a personal history of violence, experiencing and expressing higher levels of anger, and more approving attitudes of physical partner aggression in general (p. 758). Sexual jealousy, or jealousy over a partner's possible infidelity, has been found to generate aggression and in some cases domestic violence and even spousal homicide (Daly & Wilson, 1988). Buss (2000) asserts that jealousy is one of, if not the main cause of spousal and dating

violence. Buss also notes that violence as a result of jealousy can range from lesser forms, such as pushing or kicking, to attacks with intent to take their partner's life. Further, violent acts, including physical, emotional, and sexual abuse, are perceived, by an uninvolved individual, as significantly more understandable, justifiable, and acceptable reactions when jealousy is the cause of the violent act (Puente & Cohen, 2003, p. 455).

The Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism may well be related to jealousy. Guerrero and Afifi (1999) found that individuals who report intense emotional experiences in response to their jealousy were more likely to react in more maladaptive ways, including direct, aggressive communication such as accusing their partner, being sarcastic, rude, yelling, and arguing with their partner (p. 234). Given the research suggesting that individuals high in narcissism tend to react with more intense emotion (Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998) as well as research indicating that Exploitativeness/Entitlement represents the most maladaptive characteristics of narcissism (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Exline et al., 2004; Ruiz et al., 2001; Watson et al., 1984) such as anxiety, suspiciousness, neuroticism, lack of empathy, hostility, and lack of willingness to forgive, it is possible that levels of Exploitativeness/Entitlement may be related to the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy, as well as hypersensitivity. Research reveals that individuals high in Exploitativeness/Entitlement tend to be interpersonally hypersensitive (Emmons, 1987; Ryan et al., 2008; Watson et al., 1984); thus, hypersensitivity should also be related to jealousy.

In sum, romantic jealousy is characterized as multidimensional including emotional, behavioral, and cognitive components (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989, p. 188). Jealousy usually occurs when the quality of an individual's relationship is threatened by another person and this threat can be real or imagined (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989, p. 183). Research indicates that these components differentially relate to aspects of relationships and relational outcomes (Guerrero & Eloy, 1992; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Studies have produced mixed results with regard to sex differences in jealousy experience (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Buunk & Bringle, 1987; Buss et al., 1992; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998; Guerrero & Eloy, 1992; Mathes & Severa, 1981), and jealousy expression (Aylor & Dainton, 2001; Carson & Cupach, 2000; Guerrero & Reiter, 1998). Given current research (Buss, 2000; Buss & Perry, 1992; Daly & Wilson, 1988; Guerrero &

Andersen, 1998; O'Leary et al., 2007; Puente & Cohen, 2003; Sharpsteen, 1991; Smith et al., 1988; White & Mullen, 1989), it is possible that aggression, as well as the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism and hypersensitivity (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Exline et al., 2004; Guerrero & Affi, 1999; Kernis & Sun, 1994; Rhodewalt & Morf, 1998; Ruiz et al., 2001; Ryan et al., 2008; Watson et al., 1984) may play different roles in overall jealousy and its cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components for men and women.

Influence Tactics

Influence tactics in romantic relationships have been defined as the techniques individuals employ in order to get what they want from their partner (Howard, Blumstein, & Schwartz, 1986). Empirical studies have found categories of influence tactics to be multidimensional (Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, & Mauch, 1976; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Marwell and Schmitt (1967) identified 16 influence tactics and categorized them in five dimensions: rewarding activity (manipulating the target's environment in a positive way), punishing activity (manipulating the target's environment in a negative way), expertise (identifying the logical positive or negative results of compliance), activation of impersonal commitments (identifying what should morally be done), and activation of personal commitments (convincing compliance because of the personal relationship between the target and individual attempting to influence the target) (p. 360). Falbo and Peplau (1980) proposed another theory of categorizing influence tactics through their analysis of 200 essays written by undergraduates on the techniques they typically use to get their way from their romantic partner. Thirteen strategies identified most frequently were evaluated on two dimensions, bilateral/unilateral and direct/indirect. Direct strategies are characterized by individuals telling their partner what they want and include tactics such as talking, asking, or telling; indirect strategies are characterized by individuals implicitly attempting to influence their partner and include pouting, hinting, and withdrawing from the partner (Falbo & Peplau, p. 622). Bilateral strategies require partners to interact with each other and include reasoning and bargaining; whereas unilateral strategies do not require partners to interact, but rather involve a partner acting independently, these tactics include withdrawing and telling a partner what is wanted (Falbo & Peplau, p. 622).

Another set of dimensions of influence tactics were identified in a study conducted by Kipnis, Castell, Gergen, and Mauch (1976). Kipnis et al. examined influence strategies in a sample of married couples and identified five separate categories. These categories included one characterized as strong and labeled "authoritative," two categories described as weak and labeled "accommodative," and "dependency," as well as two strategies described as neither strong or weak and labeled "last resort" and "give up" (p. 132). The authoritative influence tactics include projecting superior knowledge on a subject, and claiming a right to demand compliance. Accommodative influence tactics include objective talks and discussions, as well as compromises. Dependency influence tactics involve appealing to a partner's love and affection, and attempting to show a partner that his/her stand on an issue is hurtful by crying, pouting, and sulking. Last resort tactics involve demanding angrily that a partner comply, and threatening physical force. Additionally, give up influence tactics include giving in on other issues to gain compliance, and giving up quickly because a partner's compliance is believed to be impossible (p. 130). The authors suggest the strength of these categories is associated with how successful the individual perceives them to be in eliciting the compliance of the spouse. This strength indicated by individuals who report using strong tactics also report believing they are in control of decision making in the relationship and individuals reporting using weak tactics more often report lack of control over decision making.

Research has been conducted on sex differences in preferred influence tactics. Instone, Major and Bunker (1983) conducted a study investigating the preferred influence strategies of men and women in positions of equal power. The results revealed that women made less attempts at influence overall than did men and also tended to use a smaller range of tactics than did men. The authors also found that women used fewer rewarding strategies, and used more coercive tactics than men. In the same study, levels of self-confidence in men and women were also examined revealing that women displayed relatively less self-confidence than men in a position of equal power. This difference in self-confidence between men and women was an important mediator of sex differences in the frequency of attempts to influence and the use of coercive tactics; the authors suggest that self-confidence can explain the differences between men and women in use of influence tactics.

Howard et al. (1986) investigated the influence tactics of 235 couples in long-term relationships, using six separate categories of influence tactics. The first, manipulation, consists of tactics such as dropping hints, flattering, behaving in a seductive manner, and reminding one's partner of past favors. The second category, supplication, is characterized by tactics such as pleading, crying, and acting ill or helpless. Category three, bullying, consists of making threats, insulting, becoming violent, and ridiculing one's partner. Autocracy includes tactics such as insisting, claiming greater knowledge on the topic at hand, and asserting authority over one's partner. Disengagement consists of behaviors such as sulking, imposing guilt on one's partner, and leaving the scene of the discussion. The last category, bargaining, includes reasoning, offering to compromise, and offering to trade-off with one's partner (Howard et al., 1986, p. 104). The authors note that the full set of six factors can be described by the strong/weak dimensions identified by Kipnis et al. (1976), such that manipulation and supplication are characterized as weak tactics, and bullying and autocracy are characterized as strong tactics (Howard et al., 1986, p. 104). The sample in their study was composed of relatively equal numbers of female homosexuals, male homosexuals, and heterosexual couples. The results of the study showed that partners of men tend to use manipulation and supplication tactics; Howard et al. suggests that partners of men seem to use more weak influence tactics. Evidence for sex differences in strong influence tactics however, was not found.

Fairhurst (1985) suggested, in a review of communication research, there is evidence that men tend to use assertive and direct influence strategies and women tend to use more indirect and submissive tactics (p. 103). Additionally, Falbo and Peplau (1980) found that in heterosexual dating relationships, men reported the use of direct and bilateral strategies more frequently than women, and women reported employing indirect and unilateral strategies more frequently than men (p. 672). However, these results were not replicated for married couples in studies by Weigel, Bennett, and Ballard-Reisch (2006) and Aida and Falbo (1991), both of which found no difference between husbands and wives in the types of strategies they employed (Aida & Falbo, 1991, p. 51; Weigel et al., 2006, p. 85). Weigel et al. (2006) suggest these contradictory results concerning sex differences and preferred influence tactics could be explained by differences in the samples, such that studies finding sex differences (Fairhurst, 1985; Falbo & Peplau, 1980) used samples of college students, and studies finding no sex differences (Aida & Falbo, 1991; Weigel et al., 2006) used samples of married couples. Weigel et al. suggested that the tendency of

individuals in long-term relationships to accommodate to each other's styles over time may be the reason for no sex differences in married couples. Further, the authors suggest, the very premise of a close, long-term relationship or marriage is a commonality in communication skills shared by partners that facilitate their attraction to one another, allowing them to share pleasant and enjoyable interactions (see also Burleson & Denton, 1992; Sunnafrank, 1991).

Ryan et al. (2008) found a positive relationship between women's level of Exploitativeness/Entitlement and sexual coercion, as well as hypersensitivity (as measured by covert narcissism). Ryan et al. suggest these findings indicate that exploitative and entitled women may tend to be more coercive in their relationships. The authors also found that men's level of Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to their level of hypersensitivity (as measured by covert narcissism); hypersensitivity was also the only correlate of physical assault in men. Ryan et al. suggest this finding indicates that hypersensitivity to criticism in men could possibly lead to more violence in their relationships. Further, given the finding that hypersensitivity was related to Exploitativeness/Entitlement in men and women, the authors suggest these two characteristics of narcissism should be explored as they relate to preferred influence tactics in men and women.

Finally, the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism is characterized by a tendency toward strong interpersonal manipulation and exploitation of others (Emmons, 1984, 1987), and has been associated with interpersonal hostility, neuroticism (Ruiz et al., 2001) and hypersensitivity (Hendin & Cheek, 1997). This may lead individuals scoring high on the factor to employ different influence tactics, such as bullying and manipulation, than individuals scoring lower on the factor.

In sum, influence tactics in romantic relationships are described as the techniques that individuals use to get what they want from their partner (Howard et al., 1986). Research suggests separate categories, as well as separate dimensions of influence tactics (Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Kipnis et al., 1976; Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Mixed results have been found concerning sex differences in preferred influence tactics (Aida & Falbo, 1991; Fairhurst, 1985; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard et al., 1986; Instone et al. 1983; Weigel et al., 2006); however, most contradictions in results have been found in samples that differ in nature (college students in short-term relationships and married couples in long-

term relationships). To this effect, the tendency of individuals in long-term relationships to accommodate each other's styles over time and the possibility that long-term relationships based on similarities in social, cognitive, and communication skills (Burlison & Denton, 1992) have been offered as possible explanations (see Weigel et al., 2006). Ryan et al. (2008) suggest that preferred influence tactics should be explored as they relate to the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism and hypersensitivity. Further, due to the characteristics associated with high levels of the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism, individuals scoring higher on the factor may employ different influence tactics than individuals scoring lower on the factor.

Purpose of the Study

In the research discussed above, differences between men and women in the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism have been explored, as well as how the factor relates to a number of maladaptive traits (e.g. Raskin & Novacek, 1989). Emmons (1984) found that, in women, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to a trait measure of aggression (p. 294). Ryan et al. (2008) found that Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to hypersensitivity as measured by covert narcissism in both men and women, however, the hypersensitivity aspect of covert narcissism appears to play a different role in men's and women's narcissism. In women, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to both hypersensitivity and measures of aggression such as sexual coercion toward a partner. In men, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was related to hypersensitivity, but not to measures of aggression; however, relationships did exist between hypersensitivity and aggression as measured by number of physical assaults on a partner (Ryan et al., 2008). Ryan et al. (2008) found differing relationships for men and women between the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism, hypersensitivity, and aggression measured by sexual coercion and number of physical assaults against a partner; Emmons (1984) found a trait measure of aggression was related to Exploitativeness/Entitlement in women, and did not measure hypersensitivity. The current study seeks to examine hypersensitivity as it may possibly play different roles for men and women, in the relationship between Exploitativeness/Entitlement and a trait measure of aggressive tendencies. Per Ryan et al. (2008), hypersensitivity may mediate the relationship between Exploitativeness/Entitlement and aggression for men but not for women.

The characteristics associated with high levels of the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism, such as tendencies toward interpersonal manipulation, exploitation, and lack of empathy (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Ruiz et al., 2001; Watson et al., 1984), could contribute to preference for different types of influence tactics in individuals high in the factor, as opposed to individuals low in the factor. The current study seeks to examine preferred influence tactics for individuals who report higher versus lower levels of Exploitativeness/Entitlement. Research has yielded contrasting results regarding differences between men and women in preferred influence tactics (e.g. Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Weigel et al., 2006); however, it is important to note the differences in samples where contrasting results have been found. Studies finding the existence of sex differences have generally been obtained from samples consisting of college students, or couples in short-term relationships, whereas studies finding no sex differences have generally used samples of married couples or couples in more long-term relationships. The sample for this study will consist of undergraduate students who would most likely be in short-term relationships. Therefore differences between men and women are expected in preferred influence tactics, however the level of Exploitativeness/Entitlement is also expected to have some bearing on these differences.

Jealousy has been examined in numerous research studies, and cognitive, emotional, and behavioral subfactors have been identified (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989, p. 188). Jealousy has been associated with aggression towards romantic partners in men, as well as women (O'Leary et al., 2007). Also, individuals who experience intense emotion tend to respond to jealousy in more maladaptive ways (Guerrero & Afifi, 1999). Given research indicating that individuals high in narcissism tend to react with more intense emotion (Morf & Rhodewalt, 1998), as well as research indicating that Exploitativeness/Entitlement represents the most maladaptive characteristics of narcissism (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Exline et al., 2004; Ruiz et al., 2001; Watson et al., 1984), it is possible that individuals higher in Exploitativeness/Entitlement will report higher levels of jealousy than individuals scoring lower on the factor. No existing research has explored the relationships between Exploitativeness/Entitlement, hypersensitivity, and jealousy. Hence, the current study examines relationships between aspects of jealousy, and Exploitativeness/Entitlement, hypersensitivity, and aggressive tendencies as well as potential sex differences embedded in these relationships.

Based on the previously mentioned research, the current study tests the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1. Scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism will be positively related to manipulation, bullying, and autocracy influence strategies in both men and women.

Hypothesis 2. Scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism will be positively related to hypersensitivity in both men and women.

Hypothesis 3. For women, higher scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism will be directly related to higher scores in aggression.

Hypothesis 4. For men, higher scores on the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism will be indirectly related to higher scores on aggression via hypersensitivity. That is, hypersensitivity will mediate the relationship between the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism and aggression.

Hypothesis 5. The linear combination of Exploitativeness/Entitlement and aggression controlling for level of hypersensitivity will be significant predictors of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy in men.

Hypothesis 6. The linear combination of Exploitativeness/Entitlement and aggression will be significant predictors of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy in women.

Exploratory Analyses

Sex differences in the Exploitativeness/Entitlement factor of narcissism, hypersensitivity, aggression, influence strategies, and jealousy components will also be explored.

Method

Participants

Participants were 120 (47 men, 73 women) undergraduate students voluntarily recruited from introductory psychology classes at a southeastern regional university. Participants ranged in age from 17 to 39 years, with an average age of 19.91 ($SD = 3.23$) years. Participants reported their year in school, 59 (49.2%) identified as freshmen, 19 (15.8%) as sophomores, 19 (15.8%) as juniors, 18 (15.0%) as seniors, 4 (3.3%) identified as other, and 1 (0.8%) did not report their year in school. For ethnicity, 111 (92.5%) were Caucasian, 4 (3.3%) were African American, 1 (0.8%) Hispanic/Latino, 1 (0.8%) Non-U.S. Resident, and 3 (2.5%) reported a different ethnicity. The majority of participants ($n = 116$, 96.7%) reported their marital status as single, 0.8% ($n = 1$) reported being married, and 2.5% ($n = 3$) reported being divorced. Participants' average number of past relationships was 2.19 ($SD = 1.62$), average length of past relationships as 13.56 ($SD = 14.77$) months; 59 (49.2%) participants reported not currently being in a relationship, 61 (50.8%) reported currently being in a relationship, and the average length of current relationship was 15.22 ($SD = 15.75$) months.

Measures

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants completed a demographics questionnaire that included information regarding to sex, age, ethnicity, academic year, number of previous relationships, and current relationship status. (See Appendix A.)

Narcissistic Personality Inventory. Exploitativeness/Entitlement was measured by summing the 11 items identified by Emmons (1984) from the 54-item Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall 1979). (See Appendix B.) This version was selected for the current study because of its relatively good subscale reliabilities. Emmons (1984) reported internal consistencies for each subscale to be .86 for Exploitativeness/Entitlement, .74 for Leadership/Authority, .79 for Superiority/Arrogance, and .69 for Self-absorption/Self-admiration. The NPI was created in order to evaluate normal levels of narcissism in the general population, and validated in numerous studies (e.g. Raskin & Terry, 1988; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002; Watson & Biderman, 1993). Items on the NPI are forced-choice based on DSM-III

(APA, 1980) criteria for Narcissistic Personality Disorder. Each item on the NPI is a pair of statements, one representing narcissistic traits and the other representing nonnarcissistic traits. Participant's number of narcissistic responses were summed to indicate participant's level of the Exploitativeness/Entitlement trait, scores can range from 0 (no indication of the factor) to 11 (highest level of indication of the factor). Items on the NPI assessing the Exploitation/Entitlement factor include: "I find it easy to manipulate people," "I am more capable than other people," and "I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve." Emmons (1984, 1987) reported internal consistency coefficient for the Exploitativeness/Entitlement subscale to be .86 and .70. More recently, Ryan et al. (2008), McCullough et al. (2003), and Sturman (2000), reported Cronbach alphas of .65, .57, and .50, respectively, in samples of college students. The Cronbach alpha of the exploitativeness/entitlement scale obtained in the present study was .64, supporting the internal reliability found in more current studies using college students. Further, the reliability of the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale was analyzed separately for men and women, revealing Cronbach's alpha of .62 for men and .70 for women.

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale. Jealousy was measured using the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). (See Appendix C.) This scale differentiates between cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy that identify various aspects of jealousy reported by each participant. Cognitive and behavioral components are each measured by eight items on a 7-point scale (1 = never to 7 = always). The emotional component of jealousy was measured by eight items on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 = very pleased to 7 = very upset (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Levels of jealousy were determined by summing participant's responses on each of the three scales individually, scores on each subscale range from 1 (lowest) to 7 (highest). Participants were told to think of a current romantic relationship or to think of a past romantic relationship when completing the questionnaire items. Reliabilities for the three subscales were originally reported as .92 for the cognitive subscale, .85 for the emotional subscale, and .89 for the behavioral subscale (Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989). Russell and Harton (2005) reported coefficients of .82 for the cognitive subscale, .90 for the emotional subscale, and .81 for the behavioral subscale, in a sample of 142 introductory psychology students. The scale was also found to have good concurrent validity when compared to the White Relationship Jealousy Scale (Pfeiffer &

Wong). Cronbach alpha levels of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral subscales of jealousy in the present study were .92, .78, and .87 respectively.

Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale. The Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin & Cheek, 1997) was used to assess levels of hypersensitivity in participants. (See Appendix D.) The HSNS consists of 10 items with responses rated on a 5-point scale (1 = very uncharacteristic of me to 5 = very characteristic of me). Hypersensitivity was determined by summing all responses. Scores on the HSNS can range from 10 (lowest level of hypersensitivity) to 50 (highest level of hypersensitivity). The HSNS was derived by correlating H.A. Murray's (1938) Narcissism Scale with a composite measure of covert narcissism based on the MMPI (Wink, 1991). Items on the HSNS include: "I often interpret the remarks of others in a personal way," "My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or the slighting remarks of others," "I feel that I am temperamentally different from most people." The HSNS was originally found to have reliabilities of .90 and .85, in two samples of college students (Hendin & Cheek, 1997). In the same study, the HSNS was also highly correlated with a composite MMPI-based measure of covert narcissism (Sample 1, $r = .63, p < .01$; Sample 2, $r = .61, p < .01$). Internal reliability estimates have been above .70 in multiple samples including Ryan et al. (2008) who reported a Cronbach alpha of .75. Cronbach alpha level of the HSNS in the present study was .75.

Influence Strategy Questionnaire. Six categories taken from Howard et al. (1986) were used to measure influence strategies. (See Appendix E.) The six categories consist of: manipulation, supplication, and bullying, each measured by 4 items, and autocracy, disengagement, and bargaining each measured by 3 items. Participants were asked to indicate how often they use each influence strategy to get a partner to do something he/she does not want to do. Each category was measured by summing responses to questions indicating frequency of behaviors that are indicative of each category of strategy. Responses were provided on a nine-point scale ranging from 1 (always) to 9 (never). Scores for all categories can range from 1 (uses the tactic at the highest frequency) to 9 (never uses the tactic). Prior to analysis, responses were reverse coded to ensure higher scores represented higher use of an influence strategy. Internal reliability for each scale was reported to be .61 for manipulation, .71 for supplication, .82 for bullying, .72 for autocracy, .75 for disengagement, and .55 for bargaining (Howard et

al., 1986). In the present study, Cronbach alpha levels for the six categories of influence tactics were .73 for manipulation, .77 for supplication, .89 for bullying, .77 for autocracy, .75 for disengagement, and .86 for bargaining.

Aggression Questionnaire. Aggression was measured using the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (AQ; Buss & Perry, 1992). (See Appendix F.) Participants responded to the 29 items AQ items on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (extremely uncharacteristic of me) to 5 (extremely characteristic of me). Scores on the AQ can range from 29 (lowest level of aggression) to 145 (highest level of aggression). The AQ consists of 4 subscales: Anger (7 items), Hostility (8 items), Verbal Aggression (5 items), and Physical Aggression (9 items). Participant's responses to items were summed for each subscale and then totaled to create an overall aggression index. Buss and Perry (1992) originally reported internal consistency of the overall scale to be .89; alphas for the subscales were reported as .85 for Physical Aggression, .72 for Verbal Aggression, .83 for Anger, and .77 for Hostility. The authors also examined the reliability of the scale using a sample of 372 subjects tested twice over a 9 week interval, the test-retest correlation for the overall scale was reported to be .80, test-retest correlations for the subscales were reported to be .80 for Physical Aggression, .76 for Verbal Aggression, .72 for Anger, and .72 for Hostility. Ruiz et al. (2001) reported internal consistency of the overall AQ to be .91, and reported alphas for the subscales Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, and Hostility to be .82, .73, .72, and .81 respectively. Locke (2009) reported an internal consistency for the overall AQ to be .89. Archer and Webb (2006) reported alphas for the subscales Physical Aggression, Verbal Aggression, Anger, and Hostility to be .82, .75, .85, and .80 respectively. Cronbach alphas achieved in the present study were .78 for the Anger subscale, .80 for the Hostility subscale, .74 for the Verbal Aggression subscale, .83 for the Physical Aggression subscale, and .88 for the total AQ.

Procedure

Undergraduate students were voluntarily recruited to participate in this study. Participants read and signed an informed consent form (See Appendix G) and then completed the demographic form. Participants subsequently completed a packet of questionnaires which included the NPI, the Multidimensional Jealousy Scale, the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale, the measurement of influence

strategies, and the Aggression Questionnaire. Questionnaires were randomly ordered to control for order effects. The participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.

Results

Descriptive statistics were computed for all measures for men and women. These statistics are displayed in Table 1.

Table 1

Means and standard deviations on all measures for men and women.

	Men (n = 47)	Women (n = 73)	Total (n = 120)
Exploitativeness/Entitlement	3.05 (2.21)	2.63 (2.30)	2.78 (2.27)
Hypersensitivity	27.61 (6.67)	26.64 (6.05)	27.01 (6.28)
Cognitive Jealousy	19.38 (8.31)	19.86 (10.16)	19.67 (9.42)
Emotional Jealousy	40.96 (4.58)	41.97 (5.92)	41.56 (5.42)
Behavioral Jealousy	16.26 (6.38)	18.19 (8.34)	17.41 (8.34)
Anger	16.09 (5.25)	16.38 (4.95)	16.27 (5.05)
Hostility	21.07 (5.01)	21.61 (6.64)	21.40 (6.05)
Verbal Aggression	15.80 _a (3.63)	13.45 _b (3.95)	14.35 (3.98)
Physical Aggression	24.43 _c (7.68)	19.68 _d (6.56)	21.50 (7.35)

Note. Means with different subscripts within rows are significantly different at less than $p < .01$

Table 1 (continued)

Means and standard deviations on all measures for men and women

	Men (n = 47)	Women (n = 73)	Total (n = 120)
Total Aggression	77.39 (16.60)	71.11 (18.35)	73.51 (17.89)
Manipulation	20.43 (6.65)	21.95 (6.03)	21.20 (6.32)
Supplication	9.70 _e (5.44)	12.71 _f (6.26)	11.53 (6.11)
Bullying	5.98 (5.24)	7.47 (5.88)	6.88 (5.66)
Autocracy	10.04 (5.47)	10.75 (5.76)	10.48 (5.63)
Disengagement	9.06 (5.56)	11.30 (5.44)	10.43 (5.57)
Bargaining	19.12 (6.39)	20.60 (4.28)	20.02 (5.24)
Manipulation	20.43 (6.65)	21.95 (6.03)	21.20 (6.32)

Note. Means with different subscripts within rows are significantly different at less than $p < .01$

Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1. It was predicted that scores on the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism would be positively related to the influence tactics manipulation, bullying, and autocracy in men and women. Pearson correlations were performed for men and women separately in order to examine the relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and the influence tactics of manipulation, bullying, and autocracy. Results revealed that for men exploitativeness/entitlement was positively related to both

manipulation, $r = .32, p = .035$, and autocracy, $r = .37, p = .013$, in support of hypothesis one; however, the relationship between exploitativeness/entitlement and bullying was not significant, $p = .183$. For women, a weak correlation was found between exploitativeness/entitlement and autocracy, $r = .25, p = .035$, and the relationship between exploitativeness/entitlement and bullying approached significance, $r = .227, p = .055$. No relationship existed between exploitativeness/entitlement and manipulation, $p = .111$. Thus, hypothesis one was only partially supported. Additional relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and other influence strategies were found. For men, exploitativeness/entitlement was related to disengagement, $r = .39, p = .009$, and bargaining $r = .31, p = .041$; for women, the relationship between exploitativeness/entitlement and supplication approached significance, $r = .231, p = .051$. (See Table 2.)

Table 2

Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, and influence tactics in men and women.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. Exp./Ent.	--	.254	.319*	.192	.205	.373*	.392**	.310*
2. Hypersen.	.304**	--	.047	.012	.155	.126	.217	.139
3. Manipul.	.190	.098	--	.400**	.095	.381*	.384*	.570**
4. Supplication	.231	.327**	.248*	--	.641**	.703**	.558**	.208
5. Bullying	.227	.261*	.133	.590**	--	.665**	.622**	.028
6. Autocracy	.249*	.190	.327**	.443**	.625**	--	.800**	.426**
7. Disengage.	.113	.240*	.287*	.496**	.532**	.555**	--	.445**
8. Bargaining	-.061	.006	.231	-.079	-.053	.111	.013	--

Note. Correlations for men ($n=44$) on upper diagonal; correlations for women ($n=72$) on lower diagonal. Exp./Ent. = exploitativeness/entitlement; Hypersen. = hypersensitivity; Manipul. = manipulation; Disengage. = disengagement.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 2. Scores on the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism were predicted to be positively related to hypersensitivity scores in both men and women. Pearson correlations were conducted for men and women separately in order to examine the relationships between

exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity. Results revealed that, for men, there was no significant relationship between hypersensitivity and exploitativeness/entitlement, $r = .25$, $p = .097$; however, for women, hypersensitivity was significantly related to exploitativeness/entitlement, $r = .30$, $p = .010$, albeit at a low to moderate level. Thus, hypothesis two was partially supported.

Hypothesis 3. It was predicted that, for women, higher scores on the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism would be directly related to higher aggression scores. Pearson correlations were performed in order to examine the relationships between women's exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression. Results revealed a small positive correlation between exploitativeness/entitlement and total aggression, $r = .25$, $p = .035$, supporting hypothesis three. Additionally, exploitativeness/entitlement was also related to the anger subscale, $r = .28$, $p = .019$, and the physical aggression subscale, $r = .26$, $p = .031$, in women. (See Table 3.)

Table 3

Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, total aggression, and subscales of aggression in men and women

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Exploit./Entitle.	--	.236	.245	-.017	.012	.265	.195
2. Hypersensitivity	.310**	--	.391**	.380*	-.038	.144	.294
3. Anger	.280*	.584**	--	.609**	.448**	.616**	.875**
4. Hostility	.163	.652**	.709**	--	.342*	.449**	.771**
5. Verbal Aggression	.123	.339**	.589**	.494**	--	.180	.543**
6. Physical Aggression	.258*	.310**	.585**	.562**	.534**	--	.824**
7. Total Aggression	.253*	.577**	.861**	.859**	.743**	.833**	--

Note. Correlations for men ($n=43$) on upper diagonal; correlations for women ($n=70$) on lower diagonal. Exploit./Entitle. = exploitativeness/entitlement.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Additional analyses for men revealed that no significant relationships existed between exploitativeness/entitlement and overall aggression ($p = .211$), the Anger subscale ($p = .114$), the Hostility subscale ($p = .914$), or the Verbal Aggression subscale ($p = .940$), however, the correlation with the

Physical Aggression subscale approached significance, $r = .265$, $p = .086$. Also, hypersensitivity was significantly correlated with measures of anger, $r = .39$, $p = .010$, and hostility, $r = .38$, $p = .012$ in men; and hypersensitivity was more strongly related to all measures of aggression in women. (See Table 3.)

Hypothesis 4. It was predicted that, for men, higher scores on the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism would be indirectly related to higher total aggression scores via hypersensitivity. That is, hypersensitivity would mediate the relationship between the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism and aggression. A Sobel test (Preacher & Hayes, 2004) was conducted to investigate this possible mediation effect in men; results revealed no significant mediation effect of hypersensitivity in men ($n = 43$) between exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression, $z = 1.05$, $p = .292$, (95% C.I. = $-.40$, 1.34). Thus, hypothesis four was not supported.

Initial bivariate Pearson correlations were conducted with the exploitativeness/entitlement factor, hypersensitivity, total aggression, and the 3 components of jealousy separately in men and women prior to testing Hypotheses 5 and 6. The exploitativeness/entitlement factor was not significantly correlated with any of the variables in men and yet, Exploitativeness/Entitlement was positively correlated with all the variables in women. In contrast, hypersensitivity was positively correlated with cognitive and behavioral jealousy in both men and women. (See Table 4.)

Table 4

Correlations between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, total aggression, and cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy in men and women

	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Exploit./Entitle.	--	.236	.195	.254	-.053	.222
2. Hypersens.	.338**	--	.294	.302*	-.213	.423**
3. Total Agg.	.254*	.579**	--	.628**	.117	.438**
4. Cog. Jealousy	.346*	.490**	.350**	--	.080	.728**
5. Emo. Jealousy	.242*	.154	-.013	.102	--	-.094
6. Beh. Jealousy	.297*	.488**	.359**	.558**	.219	--

Note. Correlations for men (n=43) on upper diagonal; correlations for women (n=67) on lower diagonal. Exploit./Entitle. = exploitativeness/entitlement; Hypersens. = hypersensitivity; Total Agg. = overall aggression; Cog. Jealousy = cognitive jealousy; Emo. Jealousy = emotional jealousy; Beh. Jealousy = behavioral jealousy.

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.

Hypothesis 5. It was predicted that the linear combination of exploitativeness/entitlement and total aggression, controlling for level of hypersensitivity, would be significant predictors of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy in men. Three separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses were performed to investigate the ability of exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression to predict cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, controlling for level of hypersensitivity. In the first regression analysis, cognitive jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Hypersensitivity was entered in Step 1, explaining 9.1% of the variance in cognitive jealousy, $F(1, 41) = 4.12$, $p = .049$. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered in Step 2. These two variables accounted for a significant amount of additional variance in cognitive jealousy, $R^2 = .33$, $F(2, 39) = 11.16$, $p = .000$. The model as a whole was significant, $F(3, 39) = 9.49$, $p = .000$, and the total variance in cognitive jealousy explained by the model was 42.2%. In the final model, only total aggression was significant ($\beta = .574$, $t(39) = 4.47$, $p = .000$), with both hypersensitivity ($p = .42$) and

exploitativeness/entitlement failing to reach statistical significance ($p = .36$), partially supporting hypothesis five and suggested by the initial bivariate correlations.

In the second regression analysis, emotional jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Hypersensitivity was entered in Step 1, explaining 4.5% of the variance in emotional jealousy, however it was not significant, $R^2 = .045$, $F(1, 41) = 1.95$, $p = .170$. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered in Step 2. These two variables did not account for a significant amount of additional variance in emotional jealousy, $R^2 = .036$, $F(2, 39) = .76$, $p = .474$. The model as a whole was not significant, $F(3, 39) = 1.15$, $p = .341$, and in the final model hypersensitivity ($p = .114$), aggression ($p = .224$), and exploitativeness/entitlement ($p = .854$) all failed to reach significance, not supporting hypothesis five and revealed by the initial bivariate correlations.

In the third regression analysis, behavioral jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Hypersensitivity was entered in Step 1, explaining 17.9% of the variance in behavioral jealousy, $R^2 = .179$, $F(1, 41) = 8.92$, $p = .005$. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered in Step 2. The additional variance in behavioral jealousy accounted for by these two variables approached significance, $R^2 = .114$, $F(2, 39) = 3.16$, $p = .054$. The model as a whole was significant, $F(3, 39) = 5.39$, $p = .003$, and the total variance in behavioral jealousy explained by the model was 29.3%. In the final model, aggression ($\beta = .331$, $t(39) = 2.33$, $p = .025$) and hypersensitivity ($\beta = .305$, $t(39) = 2.13$, $p = .040$) were both significant; however, exploitativeness/entitlement failed to reach significance ($p = .542$). Hypothesis five was partially supported and reflected by the initial bivariate correlations.

In sum, results from the three separate hierarchical multiple regression analyses revealed partial support for hypothesis five. In the first regression analysis, hypersensitivity and exploitativeness/entitlement both failed to reach significance in the final model, leaving total aggression as the only significant predictor of men's cognitive jealousy. Results from the second regression analyses revealed that hypersensitivity, exploitativeness/entitlement, and total aggression all failed to reach significance, indicating that none of these factors were significant predictors of men's emotional jealousy. Results from the third regression analysis revealed that both aggression and hypersensitivity were significant predictors of men's behavioral jealousy, while exploitativeness/entitlement failed to reach

significance in the final model. Thus, results from the three separate hierarchical regression analyses revealed only partial support for hypothesis five.

Hypothesis 6. It was predicted that the linear combination of exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression would be significant predictors of the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components of jealousy in women. Three separate multiple regression analyses were performed to investigate the ability of exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression to predict cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy in women. In the first regression analysis, cognitive jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered as simultaneous predictors. The model was significant and accounted for 19.3% of the variance in cognitive jealousy, $R^2 = .193$, $F(2, 64) = 7.67$, $p = .001$. Aggression ($\beta = .281$, $t(64) = 2.42$, $p = .018$) and exploitativeness/entitlement ($\beta = .275$, $t(64) = 2.37$, $p = .021$) were both significant in the model. Thus, the results support the original relationships indicated by the initial bivariate correlations and also support the predictions of hypothesis six.

In the second regression analysis, emotional jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered as simultaneous predictors. The model was significant and explained 9.2% of the variance in emotional jealousy, $R^2 = .092$, $F(2, 66) = 3.35$, $p = .04$. Exploitativeness/entitlement was significant in the model ($\beta = .316$, $t(66) = 2.59$, $p = .021$), however, aggression failed to reach significance ($p = .513$), partially supporting hypothesis six. Results thus suggest that when controlling for level of aggression, the exploitativeness/entitlement measure was a significant predictor of emotional jealousy in women.

In the third regression analysis, behavioral jealousy was used as the criterion variable. Exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were entered as simultaneous predictors. The model was significant and accounted for 17% of the variance in behavioral jealousy, $R^2 = .170$, $F(2, 66) = 6.77$, $p = .002$. Aggression was significant in the model ($\beta = .305$, $t(66) = 2.61$, $p = .011$), however, exploitativeness/entitlement failed to reach significance ($p = .084$), partially supporting hypothesis six. The results thus indicate that aggression is a more significant predictor of behavioral jealousy in women than exploitativeness/entitlement.

In sum, results from the three multiple regression analyses revealed partial support for hypothesis six. In the first regression analysis, both exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression were significant predictors of women's cognitive jealousy. In the second regression analysis, exploitativeness/entitlement was a significant predictor of women's emotional jealousy, while aggression failed to reach significance in the final model. Results of the third regression analysis indicated that aggression was a significant predictor of women's behavioral jealousy, exploitativeness/entitlement, however, failed to reach significance in the final model.

Exploratory Analyses

Exploratory analyses were performed in order to examine differences between men and women on levels of exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, the six types of influence tactics, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, as well as anger, hostility, physical, verbal, and total aggression. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate sex differences in exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity. Results indicated no significant overall difference between men and women on the combined variables, $F(2, 113) = .619, p = .540, \text{Wilks' Lambda} = .99, \eta^2 = .011$. Thus, no significant differences between men and women on levels of exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity existed. (See Table 1.)

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to examine sex differences in cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy. Results indicated that there were no overall significant differences between men and women on the combined dependent variables, $F(3, 113) = .980, p = .405, \text{Wilks' Lambda} = .975, \eta^2 = .025$. Thus, there were no significant differences between men and women on cognitive, emotional, or behavioral jealousy.

An initial analysis of variance was performed to investigate sex differences in total aggression. Results revealed no significant differences between men and women in total aggression, $F(1, 113) = 3.41, p = .067, \eta^2 = .029$. A multivariate analysis of variance was subsequently performed to investigate sex differences in the different types of aggression: anger, hostility, physical, and verbal aggression. Results indicated an overall significant difference between men and women on the combined dependent

variables, $F(4, 110) = 8.52, p = .000$, Wilks' Lambda = .764, $\eta^2 = .236$. When results for dependent variables were considered separately, the only differences to reach significance, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .01, were verbal aggression, $F(1, 113) = 10.20, p = .002, \eta^2 = .083$, and physical aggression, $F(1, 113) = 12.52, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$, with anger ($p = .767$) and hostility ($p = .646$) failing to reach significance. An inspection of the means indicated that men ($M = 15.80, SD = 3.63$) reported significantly higher levels of verbal aggression than women ($M = 13.45, SD = 3.95$), and men ($M = 24.43, SD = 7.68$) also reported higher levels of physical aggression than women ($M = 19.68, SD = 6.56$). (See Table 1.)

A multivariate analysis of variance was performed to investigate sex differences in the six types of influence tactics: Manipulation, supplication, bullying, autocracy, disengagement, and bargaining. Results revealed that there was an overall significant difference between men and women on combined dependent variables, $F(6, 113) = 2.24, p = .044$, Wilks' Lambda = .894, $\eta^2 = .106$. When results for dependent variables were considered separately, using a Bonferroni adjusted alpha level of .008, the only difference to reach significance was supplication, $F(1, 118) = 7.31, p = .008, \eta^2 = .058$. An inspection of the means indicated that women ($M = 12.71, SD = 6.26$) reported using supplication more often than did men ($M = 9.70, SD = 5.44$). The difference between men and women on disengagement approached significance, $F(1, 118) = 4.76, p = .031, \eta^2 = .039$, with women ($M = 11.30, SD = 5.44$) reporting using disengagement more often than men ($M = 9.06, SD = 5.56$), and differences between manipulation ($p = .108$), bullying ($p = .161$), autocracy ($p = .502$), and bargaining ($p = .127$) all failed to reach significance. (See Table 1.)

In sum, exploratory analyses were conducted to examine differences between men and women on exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, the six types of influence tactics, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, as well as anger, hostility, verbal, physical, and total aggression. Results from these analyses indicated that men reported significantly higher levels of verbal and physical aggression than did women; also, results revealed that women reported using the influence tactic supplication more often than did men. No sex differences existed on levels of exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, anger, hostility, total aggression, cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, or the influence tactics

manipulation, bullying, autocracy, disengagement, and bargaining, although the difference between men and women on disengagement approached significance.

Discussion

Exploitativeness/entitlement has been described in past literature as representing the most maladaptive aspects of narcissism (Emmons, 1984) and research has linked exploitativeness/entitlement with a number of negative traits (Raskin & Novacek, 1989). While the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism has been the topic of much research, its relationship to jealousy has not previously been investigated. Given the maladaptive nature of exploitativeness/entitlement, as well as research associating the factor with tendencies toward interpersonal manipulation, exploitation, and a lack of empathy (Emmons, 1984, 1987; Ruiz et al., 2001; Watson et al., 1984) the current study sought to examine how exploitativeness/entitlement may relate differently to men's and women's preferred influence tactics, hypersensitivity, the cognitive, emotional, and behavioral dimensions of jealousy, as well as tendencies towards aggression.

The present findings support literature suggesting that men and women may differ in their outward expressions of narcissism (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001), in that, while the exploitativeness/entitlement factor of narcissism was positively related to the influence tactic autocracy in both men and women, exploitativeness/entitlement was also related to the influence tactics of manipulation, disengagement, and bargaining in men, whereas women's exploitativeness/entitlement was also positively related to supplication and bullying. Previous research has suggested that use of certain influence tactics is associated with how successful an individual perceives them to be at gaining compliance of their partner, as well as identified a strong/weak dimension, with strong tactics reflecting an authoritative, direct, and controlling means of influence and weak tactics reflecting a more subordinate and indirect mean of influence (Kipnis et al., 1976). Thus, the finding that women's exploitativeness/entitlement was related to more influence tactics categorized as strong, and men's exploitativeness/entitlement was related to more tactics described as weak or neutral (Howard et al., 1986), may suggest that exploitative and entitled women perceive stronger tactics as more successful in gaining compliance of their partner, while exploitative and entitled men perceive weaker or neutral tactics as more successful. Also, previous research has suggested that individuals who report the use of strong influence tactics also report believing they are in control of decision making in their relationships. In contrast, individuals reporting the use of weak tactics also report feeling that they are not in control of

decision making in their relationships (Kipnis et al., 1976). Therefore, the current findings may suggest that exploitative and entitled women feel more in control of decision making in their relationships and exploitative and entitled men may feel that they have a lack of control over decision making in their relationships. Future research should examine this possibility. Further, the relationship between women's exploitativeness/entitlement and bullying, as well as exploitativeness/entitlement and physical aggression may suggest that exploitative and entitled women tend to use harsher tactics such as making threats, insulting, becoming violent, and ridiculing to get what they want from their partner and also tend to be more physically aggressive overall outside of their romantic relationships.

Also, the suggestion of Ryan et al. (2008) that exploitative and entitled women may tend to be coercive in their relationships was supported in the current study, in that women's exploitativeness/entitlement was related to autocracy and bullying which are stronger influence tactics according to Howard et al. (1986); with no relationships existing between women's exploitativeness/entitlement and the influence tactics of manipulation, disengagement, or bargaining which are considered weaker influence tactics (Howard et al., 1986). It has been suggested that traditional gender roles for women, such as acting in a way that benefits others, make expressing their narcissism less socially acceptable and therefore women express their narcissism in more subtle and indirect ways (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Tschanz et al., 1998). Since measures pertaining to traditional gender roles were not included, it is beyond the scope of the current study to suggest how traditional roles ascribed to men and women may play a role in the relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and influences tactics. However, the current findings, such as the relationship between women's exploitativeness/entitlement and bullying, autocracy, and aggression, may reflect that social acceptability has less of an influence on women's expression of exploitativeness/entitlement. Future research should examine how traditional gender roles relate to the expression of maladaptive narcissism and its relationship to use of specific influence tactics.

Interpersonal hypersensitivity to threat has been identified as a central component in covert narcissism (Hendin & Cheek, 1997; Wink, 1991), which is described as an outward expression of low self-esteem and anxiety, in addition to an underlying attitude of superiority expressed in grandiose fantasies and self-expectations (Wink, 1991, p. 596). Covert narcissists tend to be anxious, hypersensitive,

defensive, and arrogant in their interpersonal relationships and also tend to be adamant about getting their way (Wink, 1991, p. 596). Results of the current study contrast with previous research finding relationships between the exploitativeness/entitlement factor and interpersonal hypersensitivity (to threat) in both men and women (Ryan et al., 2008). The present findings revealed that exploitativeness/entitlement was related to hypersensitivity in only women, with no such relationship existing for men. Further, women's hypersensitivity was also related to the influence tactics of supplication, bullying, and disengagement, with no relationships existing for men between hypersensitivity and use of any influence tactic. Exploitativeness/entitlement and the hypersensitivity component of covert narcissism appear to be more strongly related to the use of specific influence tactics for women than for men.

The current finding that exploitativeness/entitlement was related to overall aggression in women replicates previous findings (Emmons, 1987; Ryan et al., 2008). Women's exploitativeness/entitlement was also related to anger and physical aggression, which supports the previous findings of Ruiz et al. (2001), however, in contrast to Ruiz et al. as well as Rhodewalt and Morf (1995), exploitativeness/entitlement was unrelated to hostility and verbal aggression. Further, no relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and overall aggression, anger, hostility and verbal aggression existed for men in the current study, however, the relationship between men's exploitativeness/entitlement and physical aggression approached significance. It should be noted that previous studies finding relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and measures of aggression have not analyzed samples of men and women separately (Rhodewalt & Morf, 1995; Ruiz et al., 2001). However, previous research that did conduct separate analyses for men and women, found that aggression was related to exploitativeness/entitlement in women only (Emmons, 1987; Ryan et al., 2008). Thus, the current results of this study suggest that previous relationships found between exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression measures in samples where men and women were not analyzed separately, may be due to the stronger influence on these relationships in female participants.

The relationships between men's exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, and aggression remain unclear. No support was found for a mediation effect for hypersensitivity between exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression in men. As discussed earlier, exploitativeness/entitlement

had no significant relationship with aggression measures in men, except for the relationship with physical aggression which approached significance; further, men's exploitativeness/entitlement was related to several types of influence tactics; thus, it is possible that exploitative and entitled men are actually less aggressive and more manipulative in their relationships with others. In contrast, the results for women regarding the relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and overall aggression, anger, bullying, and physical aggression, as well as the lack of strong relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and weak/indirect influence tactics, suggest that exploitative and entitled women may be more aggressive and use less manipulative-type influence tactics on their partners. Also, hypersensitivity was significantly related to both anger and hostility measures in men, thus the role of hypersensitivity in men's aggression, specifically anger and hostility, should be further examined in future research.

Results of this study suggest that aggression may be a factor in the expression of certain types of jealousy, in that overall aggression predicted both cognitive and behavioral jealousy in both men and women. Past research has indicated that anger and hostility are central emotions involved in the jealousy experience (Sharpsteen, 1991; Smith, Kim, & Parrot, 1988; White & Mullen, 1989) and overall jealousy has been found to be a strong predictor of romantic partner aggression in both men and women (O'Leary et al., 2007). The current findings may suggest that aggression plays a role in both jealous thoughts as well as the tendency to act on jealous thoughts. However, although aggression predicted cognitive and behavioral jealousy in both men and women, exploitativeness/entitlement was also found to predict women's cognitive jealousy and hypersensitivity was also found to be a predictor of men's behavioral jealousy. These findings may indicate that while aggression plays a role in cognitive and behavioral jealousy, this role may differ in men and women. Perhaps aggression is more central to jealous actions in women and more central to jealous thoughts in men suggesting a topic for further research.

Interestingly, exploitativeness/entitlement did not significantly predict any dimension of jealousy in men; however, exploitativeness/entitlement, along with aggression, did predict women's cognitive jealousy and exploitativeness/entitlement was the only significant predictor of emotional jealousy in women. These results may indicate that exploitativeness/entitlement is a central part of jealous thoughts and emotions in women.

The current study reveals no support for sex differences in reported levels of exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity. These results contradict previous research indicating that men report more tendencies toward interpersonal exploitativeness and sense of entitlement than do women (Richman & Flaherty, 1990). However, relationships between men's and women's exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity and the types of influence tactics along with the three dimensions of jealousy may indicate that while men and women report similar levels of exploitativeness/entitlement, they may differ in the expression of exploitive and entitled tendencies in intimate relationships.

No support was found for sex differences in reported levels of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy. These results contrast with previous research findings with men reporting more cognitive jealousy than women (Aylor & Dainton, 2001), however, more recent research failed to find sex differences in cognitive jealousy (Southard & Abel, 2010). The current results also contrast with previous research findings that women are more likely to report behavioral jealousy than men (Guerrero, Eloy, Jorgensen, & Andersen, 1993; Southard & Abel, 2010). However, while no evidence in support of sex differences in overall levels of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy was found, results regarding predictors of the dimensions of jealousy suggest that men and women may differ in the factors that contribute to jealousy experience and expression, such as the role of exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity. Exploitativeness/entitlement was found to predict cognitive and emotional jealousy in women; however exploitativeness/entitlement did not significantly predict any of the three dimensions of jealousy in men. Also, hypersensitivity, along with overall aggression, was found to be significant predictors of men's behavioral jealousy, which may suggest that hypersensitivity to threat and tendencies toward aggression are central to jealous behaviors and actions in men. Further, while women's emotional jealousy was predicted by exploitativeness/entitlement, there were no significant predictors of men's emotional jealousy.

Investigations regarding sex differences in reported levels of overall aggression, as well as the subfactors of anger, hostility, physical, and verbal aggression partially supported the previous findings of Buss and Perry (1992). Similar to Buss and Perry (1992), the current study found that men reported higher levels physical and verbal aggression than did women; however, in contrast to Buss and Perry

(1992) who found men reporting higher levels of hostility than women, this study found no sex differences in levels of overall aggression, anger, and hostility. These results, however, do reveal the importance of examining the different aspects of aggression rather than viewing aggression as a single construct.

Regarding sex differences in the six influence tactics of manipulation, supplication, bullying, autocracy, bargaining, and disengagement, no differences between men and women were found except that women reported using supplication more than men. This finding is similar to the results of Howard et al. (1986), who found that partners of men tend to use weaker influence tactics; however, the current study did not account for sexual orientation as did Howard et al.. Therefore, this study could not confirm whether sexual orientation had any effect on the results. The present findings contradict previous research finding sex differences in samples of college dating couples (Falbo & Peplau, 1980), but, interestingly, show a similar pattern to research finding no sex differences in influence tactics in married couples (Aida & Falbo, 1991; Weigel et al., 2006). The current study did not evaluate participants as part of a dyad, thus the current findings may indicate that, on a more general level, men and women do not differ in their preferred types of influence tactics.

Further, the current study does find that there are similarities between men and women in relationships between certain measures. First, exploitativeness/entitlement was similarly related to both men's and women's autocracy. This finding may indicate that, while exploitativeness/entitlement plays differing roles in men's and women's preference for several types of influence tactics, exploitative and entitled men and women similarly prefer types of influence such as insisting, claiming greater knowledge on the topic at hand, and asserting authority over a partner.

Next, the relationship between exploitativeness/entitlement and physical was significant in women, and approached significance in men. This finding may indicate that, while exploitativeness/entitlement plays a larger role for women in over all aggression, as well as anger, the factor may play a similar role in men's and women's tendencies toward acts of physical aggression. Also, similarities emerged between men and women emerged in relationships between hypersensitivity and aggression, in that hypersensitivity was related to anger and hostility in both men and women. This may indicate that being hypersensitive to interpersonal threat plays a similar role in men's and women's tendencies toward anger and hostility.

Further, overall aggression similarly predicted cognitive and behavioral jealousy in men and women. Although there were differences between men and women in emotional jealousy, and well as the predictive ability of exploitativeness/entitlement for all three dimensions of jealousy, the current findings may indicate that aggression plays a role in tendencies toward jealous and suspicious thoughts and the tendency to act on those thoughts in both men and women. However, this role may be different in men and women, given that women's cognitive jealousy was also predicted by exploitativeness/entitlement and men's behavioral jealousy was also predicted by hypersensitivity.

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study has several limitations, hence caveats are in order. First and foremost, the reliability of the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale of the NPI in the current analyses was relatively low, Cronbach's alpha level of .64. Given the relatively low overall reliability of the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale, as well as previous findings regarding differences between men and women in the relationships between the subscale and other factors, the current study analyzed the reliability of exploitativeness/entitlement subscale separately for men and women. Results revealed that the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale was a more reliable measure in women, Cronbach's alpha of .70, than men, Cronbach's alpha of .62. Thus, findings for men regarding the relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and other factors should be interpreted with caution. Previous authors have questioned the reliability of the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale (Hendin & Cheek, 1997). While the overall reliability achieved in the current study is consistent with reliabilities found in previous research (McCullough et al., 2003; Ryan et al., 2008; Sturman, 2000), additional reliability analyses revealed that the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale was a more reliable measure in women than in men. Thus, a more reliable measure of the maladaptive aspects of narcissism in both men and women could have possibly produced different results. Therefore, future studies would benefit from using a more reliable measure, especially in men, of maladaptive narcissism than the exploitativeness/entitlement scale of the NPI.

Next, the discrepancy between the number of men ($N = 47$) and the number of women ($N = 23$) in the current study could have affected the results. Also, the range of scores on the exploitativeness/entitlement subscale in the current study was less than desirable, thus results of the

current study should be interpreted with a degree of caution. Future research should analyze larger samples which include more comparable numbers of men and women. Further, research should take precautionary steps, such as prescreening participants, in order to ensure a wider range of scores on measures.

Also, the current study only investigated sex differences between men and women, other results may emerge when accounting for gender differences associated with masculinity and femininity, as well as adherence to traditional gender roles. Further, sexual orientation was not accounted for in the current study; past research has investigated influence tactics in “partners of men” and “partners of women” and suggested that partners of men tend to use weaker tactics (Howard et al., 1986, p. 107). Thus, sexual orientation of participants may have influenced the results and future research should account for the possible effects of sexual orientation, as well as the gender role orientation of participants.

Past research on influence tactics (Aida & Falbo, 1991; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Howard et al., 1986; Weigel et al., 2006) analyzed participants as part of a romantic dyad, and accounted for differences in how individuals view themselves and how they are viewed by their partner; the current study only analyzed self-report data and was therefore, unable to account for such discrepancies. Thus, the relationships between variables in the current study only reflect how individuals view themselves and their use of influence tactics in gaining compliance from their partners. Given past research showing that individuals’ perceptions of their behaviors may differ from those of their partner (Ryan et al., 2008), it would be beneficial in future studies to analyze participants as part of a romantic dyad, allowing comparisons to be made between individuals’ perceptions of themselves and the perceptions of their partners.

Last, future research should examine how interpersonal hypersensitivity to threat plays a role in women’s cognitive, emotional, and behavioral jealousy, as well as the specific roles of the subfactors of aggression. Future studies should also examine how individuals scoring high in maladaptive narcissism differ in preferred influences tactics, dimensions of jealousy, and aggressive tendencies from those individuals scoring low in the factor, additionally sex differences in these relationships should also be examined.

Conclusion

In sum, relationships between men's and women's exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity, the three dimensions of jealousy, six influence tactics, and types of aggression support a body of literature indicating that men and women tend to express their narcissism in different ways. The current results regarding the relationships between men's and women's exploitativeness/entitlement and preferred influence tactics may suggest that exploitative and entitled women may perceive the use of strong tactics to be more successful in gaining the compliance of their partners and also perceive themselves as having more control of decision making in their relationships. The current study finds hypersensitivity related to women's exploitativeness/entitlement, but not men's; further, women's hypersensitivity was also related to the influence tactics of supplication, bullying, and disengagement, while no relationships were found between men's level of hypersensitivity and any influence tactic. Exploitativeness/entitlement was related to women's overall aggression, as well as specific types of aggression such as anger and physical aggression, supporting previous research (ex. Emmons, 1984). Hypersensitivity failed to mediate the relationship between men's exploitativeness/entitlement and aggression; thus the relationship between men's exploitativeness/entitlement, aggression, and hypersensitivity remains unclear.

Regarding jealousy, exploitativeness/entitlement appears to play less of a role in men's jealousy than women's. Also, aggression may play a role in both jealous thoughts and the tendency to act on those thoughts in both men and women, however, additional relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement and hypersensitivity suggests that aggression might play a different role in men's and women's jealousy.

Finally, there are numerous questions yet to be answered about relationships between exploitativeness/entitlement, hypersensitivity and other variables when accounting for sexual orientation and gender role orientation. In addition, a major focus for future research should be developing a more valid and reliable measure of exploitativeness/entitlement as a maladaptive component of narcissism in both men and women.

References

- Aida, Y., & Falbo, T. (1991). Relationships between marital satisfaction, resources, and power strategies. *Sex Roles, 24*(1-2), 43-56.
- American Psychiatric Association (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9*(3), 212-230.
- Archer, J., & Webb, I. A. (2006). The relation between scores on the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire and aggressive acts, impulsiveness, competitiveness, dominance, and sexual jealousy. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*(5), 464-473.
- Auerbach, J. S. (1984). Validation of two scales for narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(6), 649-653.
- Aylor, A., & Dainton, M. (2001). Antecedents in romantic jealousy experience, expression, and goals. *Western Journal of Communication, 65*(4), 370-391.
- Barry, C. T., Chaplin, W. F., & Grafeman, S. J. (2006). Aggression following performance feedback: The influences of narcissism, feedback valence, and comparative standard. *Personality and Individual Differences, 41*(1), 177-187.
- Baumeister, R. F., Smart, L., & Boden, J. M. (1996). Relation of threatened egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self esteem. *Psychological Review, 103*(1), 5-33.
- Burleson, B. R., & Denton, W. H. (1992). A new look at similarity and attraction in marriages: Similarities in social-cognition and communication skills as predictors of attraction and satisfaction. *Communication Monographs, 59*(3), 268-287.

- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(1), 219-229.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Research in Personality, 36*(6), 543-545.
- Buss, D. (2000). *The dangerous passion: Why jealousy is as necessary as love and sex*. New York: the Free Press.
- Buss, D. M., Larsen, R. J., Westen, L. D., & Semmelroth, J. (1992). Sex differences in jealousy: Evolution, physiology. *Psychological Science, 3*(4), 251-255.
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Personality Processes and Individual Differences, 63*(3), 452-459.
- Buunk, B., & Bringle, R. (1987). Jealousy in love relationships. *Intimate relationships: Development, dynamics, and deterioration* (pp. 123-147). Thousand Oaks, CA US: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Carson, C. L., & Cupach, W. R. (2000). Fueling the flames of the green-eyed monster: The role of ruminative thought in reaction to perceived relationship threat. *Western Journal of Communication, 64*(3), 308-329.
- Campbell, W. K., Reeder, G. E., Sedikides, C., & Elliot, A. J. (2000). Narcissism and comparative self-enhancement strategies. *Journal of Research in Personality, 34*, 329-347.
- Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. Hawthorne, NY US: Aldine de Gruyter.
- Emmons, R. A. (1984). Factor analysis and construct validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 48*(3), 291-300.
- Emmons, R. A. (1987). Narcissism: Theory and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 11-17.

- Exline, J. J., Baumeister, R. F., Bushman, B. J., Campbell, W. K., & Finkel, E. J. (2004). Too proud to let go: Narcissistic entitlement as a barrier to forgiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 87*(6), 94-912.
- Fairhurst, G. T. (1985). Male-female communication on the job: Literature review and commentary. In M. McLaughlin (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* Vol. 9, pp. 83-115). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*(8), 537-547.
- Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38*(4), 618-628.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Afifi, W. A. (1999). Toward a goal-oriented approach for understanding communicative responses to jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication, 63*(2), 216-248.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Andersen, P. A. (1998). Jealousy experience and expression in romantic relationships. In P. A. Andersen & L. K. Guerrero (Eds.), *Handbook of communication and emotion: Theory, research, applications, and contexts* (pp. 155-188). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Guerrero, L. K., Andersen, P. A., Jorgensen, P. F., Spitzberg, B. H., & Eloy, S. V. (1995). Coping with the green-eyed monster: conceptualizing and measuring communicative responses to romantic jealousy. *Western Journal of Communication, 59*, 270-304.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Eloy, S. V. (1992). Relational satisfaction and jealousy across marital types. *Communication Reports, 5*(1), 23-31.
- Guerrero, L. K., & Reiter, R. L. (1998). Expressing emotion: Sex differences in social skills and communicative responses to anger, sadness, and jealousy. In D. J. Canary & K. Dindia (Eds.), *Sex differences and similarities in communication*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*(4), 588-599.

- Howard, J. A., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1986). Sex, power, and influence tactics in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(1), 102-109.
- Instone, D., Major, B., & Bunker, B. B. (1983). Gender, self-confidence, and social influence strategies: An organizational simulation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(2), 322-333.
- John, O. P., & Robins, R. W. (1994). Accuracy and bias in self-perception: Individual differences in self-enhancement and the role of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(1), 206-219.
- 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* (pp. 219-231). New York: Basic Books.
- Kernis, M. H., Grannemann, B. D., & Barclay, L. C. (1989). Stability and level of self-esteem as predictors of anger arousal and hostility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56(6), 1013-1022.
- Kernis, M. H., & Sun, C. (1994). Narcissism and reactions to interpersonal feedback. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 28(1), 4-13.
- Kipnis, D., Castell, P. J., Gergen, M., & Mauch, D. (1976). Metamorphic effects of power. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(2), 127-135.
- Kirschner, D. (1992). Understanding adoptees who kill: Dissociation, patricide, and the psychodynamics of adoption. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 36(4), 323-333.
- Kohut, H. (1977). *The restoration of the self*. New York: International Universities Press.
- Long, D. E. (1990). *The anatomy of terrorism*. New York: Free Press.

- Martinez, M. A., Zeichner, A., Reidy, D. E., & Miller, J. D. (2007). Narcissism and displaced aggression: Effects of positive, negative, and delayed feedback. *Personality and Individual Differences, 44*(1), 140-149.
- Marwell, G., & Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior; An empirical analysis. *Sociometry, 30*, 350-364.
- Mathes, E. W., & Severa, N. (1981). Jealousy, romantic love, and liking: Theoretical considerations and preliminary scale development. *Psychological Reports, 49*(1), 23-31.
- McCullough, M. E., Emmons, R. A., Kilpatrick, S. D., & Money, C. N. (2003). Narcissists as "victims": The role of Narcissism in the perception of transgressions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(7), 885-893.
- Millon, T. (1982). *Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory Manual* (2nd ed.). Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*(4), 177-196.
- Oates, R. K., & Forrest, D. (1985). Self-esteem and early background of abusive mothers. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 9*(1), 89-93.
- O'Leary, K. D., Smith Slep, A. M., & O'Leary, S. G. (2007). Multivariate models of men's and women's partner aggression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 75*(5), 752-764.
- Paulhus, D. L., Robins, R. W., Trzesniewski, K. H., & Tracy, J. L. (2004). Two replicable suppressor situations in personality research. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 39*(2), 301-326.
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 6*(2), 181-196.
- Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2004). SPSS and SAS procedures for estimating indirect effects in simple mediation models. *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers, 36*, 717-731.

- Prifitera, A., & Ryan, J. J. (1984). Validity of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI) in a psychiatric sample. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 40*(1), 140-142.
- Puente, S., & Cohen, D. (2003). Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(4), 449-460.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1979). A Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*(2), 590.
- Raskin, R. N., & Hall, C. S. (1981). The Narcissistic Personality Inventory: Alternate form reliability and further evidence of construct validity. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 45*(2), 159-162.
- Raskin, R. N., & Novacek, J. (1989) An MMPI description of the narcissistic personality. *Journal of Personality, 53*(1), 66-80.
- Raskin, R. N., Novacek, J., & Hogan, R. (1991). Narcissistic self-esteem management. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(6), 911-918.
- Raskin, R. N., & 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.
- Rathvon, N., & Holmstrom, R. W. (1996). An MMPI-2 portrait of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 66*(1), 1-19.
- Rhodewalt, F., Madrian, J. C., & Cheney, S. (1998). Narcissism, self-knowledge organization, and emotional reactivity: The effect of daily experiences on self-esteem and affect. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(1), 75-87.
- Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1995). Self and interpersonal correlates of the narcissistic personality inventory. *Journal of Research in Personality, 29*(1), 1-23.

- Rhodewalt, F., & Morf, C. C. (1998). On self-aggrandizement and anger: A temporal analysis of narcissism and affective reactions to success and failure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 74*(3), 672-685.
- Richman, J. A., & Flaherty, J. A. (1990). Gender differences in narcissistic styles. In E. M. Plakun (Ed.) *New perspectives on narcissism* (pp. 73-100). Washington DC: American Psychiatric Association.
- Ruiz, J. M., Smith, T. W., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Distinguishing narcissism and hostility: Similarities and differences in interpersonal circumplex and five-factor correlates. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 76*(3), 537-555.
- Ryan, K. M., Weikel, K., Sprechini, G. (2008). Gender differences in narcissism and courtship violence in dating relationships. *Sex Roles, 58*(11-12), 802-813.
- Schoenfeld, C. G. (1988). Blacks and violent crime: A psychoanalytically oriented analysis. *Journal of Psychiatry and Law, 16*(3), 269-301.
- Sharpsteen, D. J. (1991). The organization of jealousy knowledge: Romantic jealousy as a blended emotion. In P. Salovey (Ed.), *The psychology of jealousy and envy* (pp. 31-51). New York: Guilford.
- Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., Cobb, N., & Fowler, C. R. (2005). Personality profiles of women and men arrested for domestic violence: An analysis of similarities and differences. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation, 41*(4), 63-81.
- Smith, R. H., Kim, S. H., & Parrott, W. G. (1988). Envy and jealousy: Semantic problems and experiential distinctions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 14*(2), 401-409.
- Southard, A. C., & Abel, M. H. (2010). Sex differences in romantic jealousy. Evaluating past and present relationship experience. *American Journal of Psychological Research, 6*(1), 41-49.
- Sturman, T. S. (2000). The motivational Foundations and behavioral expression of three narcissistic styles. *Social Behavior and Personality, 28*(4), 393-408.

- Sunnafrank M. (1991). Interpersonal attraction and attitude similarity: A communication-based assessment. In J. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook* (Vol. 14, pp. 451-483). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Tschanz, B. T., Morf, C. C., & Turner, C. W., (1998). Gender differences in the structure of narcissism: a multi-sample analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Sex Roles, 38*(9-10), 863-870.
- Twenge, M. J., Campbell, W. K. (2003). "Isn't it fun to get the respect that we're going to deserve?" Narcissism, social rejection, and aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*(2), 261-272.
- Wallace, H. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2002). The performance of narcissists rises and falls with perceived opportunity for glory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(5), 819-834.
- Watson, P. J., & Biderman, M. D. (1993). Narcissistic Personality Inventory factors, splitting, and self-consciousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 61*(1), 41-57.
- 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*(3), 301-305.
- Weigel, D. J., Bennett, K. K., Ballard-Reisch, D. S. (2006). Influence strategies in marriage: Self and partner links between equity, strategy use, and marital satisfaction and commitment. *The Journal of Family Communication, 6*(1), 77-95.
- White, G. L., & Mullen, P. E. (1989). *Jealousy: Theory, research, and clinical strategies*. New York: Guilford.
- Widiger, T. A., & Trull, T. J. (1993). Borderline and narcissistic personality disorders. In P. B. Sutker, & H. E. Adams (Eds.), *Comprehensive handbook of psychopathology* (2nd ed., pp. 371-394). New York: Plenum Press.

Wiehe, V. R. (1991). *Perilous rivalry: When siblings become abusive*. Lexington, MA: Health/Lexington Books.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, 61(4), 590-597.

Wright, F., O'Leary, J., & Balkin, J. (1989). Shame, guilt, narcissism, and depression: Correlates and sex differences. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, 6(2), 217-230.

Appendices

Appendix B

NPI

This questionnaire consists of a number of pairs of statements that you may or may not identify with. For each pair please choose the statement that you most identify with and circle the letter corresponding to that statement. If you identify with both A and B you should choose the statement that you feel most comfortable identifying yourself with and circle that letter. If you do not identify with either statement, then choose the one that would be the least objectionable for you to identify yourself with and circle that letter.

1. A. I am a fairly sensitive person.
 B. I am more sensitive than most other people.

2. A. I have a natural talent for influencing people.
 B. I am not good at influencing people.

3. A. Modesty doesn't become me.
 B. I am essentially a modest person.

4. A. Superiority is something that you acquire with experience.
 B. Superiority is something you are born with.

5. A. I would do almost anything on a dare.
 B. I tend to be a fairly cautious person.

6. A. I would be willing to describe myself as a strong personality.
 B. I would be reluctant to describe myself as a strong personality.

7. A. When people compliment me I sometimes get embarrassed.
 B. I know that I am good because everybody keeps telling me so.

8. A. The thought of ruling the world frightens the hell out of me.
 B. If I ruled the world it would be a much better place.

9. A. People just naturally gravitate towards me.
 B. Some people like me.

10. A. I can usually talk my way out of anything.
 B. I try to accept the consequences of my behavior.

11. A. When I play a game I don't mind losing once in a while.
B. When I play a game I hate to lose.
12. A. I prefer to blend in with the crowd.
B. I like to be the center of attention.
13. A. I will be a success.
B. I'm not too concerned about success.
14. A. I am no better or no worse than most people.
B. I think I am a special person.
15. A. I am not sure if I would make a good leader.
B. I see myself as a good leader.
16. A. I am assertive.
B. I wish I were more assertive.
17. A. I like having authority over other people.
B. I don't mind following orders.
18. A. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.
B. People can learn a great deal from me.
19. A. I find it easy to manipulate people.
B. I don't like it when I find myself manipulating people.
20. A. I insist upon getting the respect that is due me.
B. I usually get the respect that I deserve.
21. A. I don't particularly like to show off my body.
B. I like to display my body.
22. A. I can read people like a book.
B. People are sometimes hard to understand.
23. A. If I feel competent I am willing to take responsibility for making decisions.
B. I like to take the responsibility for making decisions.

24. A. I am at my best when the situation is at its worst.
B. Sometimes I don't handle difficult situations too well.
25. A. I just want to be reasonably happy.
B. I want to amount to something in the eyes of the world.
26. A. My body is nothing special.
B. I like to look at my body.
27. A. Beauty is in the eyes of the beholder.
B. I have good taste when it comes to beauty.
28. A. I try not to be a show off.
B. I am apt to show off if I get the chance.
29. A. I always know what I am doing.
B. Sometimes I'm not sure of what I am doing.
30. A. I sometimes depend on people to get things done.
B. I rarely depend on anyone else to get things done.
31. A. I'm always in perfect health.
B. Sometimes I get sick.
32. A. Sometimes I tell good stories.
B. Everybody likes to hear my stories.
33. A. I usually dominate any conversation.
B. At times I am capable of dominating a conversation.
34. A. I expect a great deal from other people.
B. I like to do things for other people.
35. A. I will never be satisfied until I get all that I deserve.
B. I take my satisfactions as they come.
36. A. Compliments embarrass me.
B. I like to be complimented.

37. A. My basic responsibility is to be aware of the needs of others.
B. My basic responsibility is to be aware of my own needs.
38. A. I have a strong will to power.
B. Power for its own sake doesn't interest me.
39. A. I don't very much care about new fads and fashions.
B. I like to start new fads and fashion.
40. A. I am envious of other people's good fortune.
B. I enjoying seeing other people have good fortune.
41. A. I am loved because I am lovable.
B. I am loved because I give love.
42. A. I like to look at myself in the mirror.
B. I am not particularly interested in looking at myself in the mirror.
43. A. I am not especially witty or clever.
B. I am witty and clever.
44. A. I really like to be the center of attention.
B. It makes me uncomfortable to be the center of attention.
45. A. I can live my life in any way I want to.
B. People can't always live their lives in terms of what they want.
46. A. Being an authority doesn't mean that much to me.
B. People always seem to recognize my authority.
47. A. I would prefer to be a leader.
B. It makes little difference to me whether I am a leader or not.
48. A. I am going to be a great person.
B. I hope I am going to be successful.
49. A. People sometimes believe what I tell them.
B. I can make anybody believe anything I want them to.

50. A. I am a born leader.
B. Leadership is a quality that takes a long time to develop.
51. A. I wish someone would someday write my biography.
B. I don't like people to pry into my life for any reason.
52. A. I get upset when people don't notice how I look when I go out in public.
B. I don't mind blending into the crowd when I go out in public.
53. A. I am more capable than other people.
B. There is a lot that I can learn from other people.
54. A. I am much like everybody else.
B. I am an extraordinary person.

Appendix C

Multidimensional Jealousy Scale

On the following questions, base your answers on either a current relationship or a significant past relationship.

- A. How frequently have you had the following thoughts when in a relationship? Place an X on the scale corresponding to your answer using the responses below.

1=Never

5=Often

2=Usually not

6=Usually so

3=Sometimes

7=Always

4=Occasionally

1. I suspect that X is secretly seeing someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I am worried that some member of the opposite sex may be chasing after X.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I suspect that X may be attracted to someone else.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I suspect that X may be physically intimate with another member of the opposite sex behind my back.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I think that some members of the opposite sex may be romantically interested in X.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I am worried that someone of the opposite sex is trying to seduce X.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I think that X is secretly developing an intimate relationship with someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I suspect that X is crazy about members of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

- B. How would you react emotionally to the following if you were in a relationship with someone?

Place an X on the scale corresponding to your answer using the responses below.

1=Very Pleased 5=Often upset
 2=Usually pleased 6=Usually upset
 3=Somewhat pleased 7=Very upset
 4=Neither pleased nor upset

1. X comments to you on how great looking a particular member of the opposite sex is.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. X shows a great deal of interest or excitement in talking to someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. X smiles in a friendly manner to someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. A member of the opposite sex is trying to get close to X all the time.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. X is flirting with someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. Someone of the opposite sex is dating X.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. X hugs and kisses someone of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. X works very closely with a member of the opposite sex (in school or office).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

C. How often have you done the following while in a relationship with a significant other?

Place an X on the scale corresponding to your answer using the responses below.

1=Never

5=Often

2=Usually not

6=Usually so

3=Sometimes

7=Always

4=Occasionally

1. I look through X's drawers, hand bag, or pockets.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

2. I call X unexpectedly, just to see if he or she is there.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

3. I question X about previous or present romantic relationships.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

4. I say something nasty about someone of the opposite sex if X shows an interest in that person.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

5. I question X about his or her telephone calls.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

6. I question X about his or her whereabouts.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

7. I join in whenever I see X talking to a member of the opposite sex.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

8. I pay X a surprise visit just to see who is with him or her.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix D

HSNS

Please answer the following questions by deciding to what extent each item is characteristic of your feelings and behavior. Fill in the blank next to each item by choosing a number from the scale printed below.

1 = very uncharacteristic or untrue, strongly disagree

2 = uncharacteristic

3 = neutral

4 = characteristic

5 = very characteristic or true, strongly agree

- _____ 1. I can become entirely absorbed in thinking about my personal affairs, my health, my cares or my relations to others.
- _____ 2. My feelings are easily hurt by ridicule or the slighting remarks of others.
- _____ 3. When I enter a room I often become self-conscious and feel that the eyes of others are upon me.
- _____ 4. I dislike sharing the credit of an achievement with others.
- _____ 5. I feel that I have enough on my hands without worrying about other people's troubles.
- _____ 6. I feel that I am temperamentally different from most people.
- _____ 7. I often interpret the remarks of others in a personal way.
- _____ 8. I easily become wrapped up in my own interests and forget the existence of others.
- _____ 9. I dislike being with a group unless I know that I am appreciated by at least one of those present.
- _____ 10. I am secretly "put out" or annoyed when other people come to me with their troubles, asking me for my time and sympathy.

Appendix F

The Aggression Questionnaire

Please mark an "X" on the line above the number that best represents the extent to which each statement is characteristic of you.

1 = Extremely uncharacteristic of me

2 = Somewhat uncharacteristic of me

3 = Neither characteristic or uncharacteristic of me

4 = Somewhat characteristic of me

5 = Extremely characteristic of me

1. I flare up quickly but get over it quickly.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

2. I am sometimes eaten up with jealousy.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

3. Once in a while I can't control the urge to strike another person.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

4. I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

5. When frustrated, I let my irritation show.

_____	_____	_____	_____	_____
1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

6. At times I feel I have gotten a raw deal out of life.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

7. Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

8. I often find myself disagreeing with people.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

9. I sometimes feel like a powder keg ready to explode.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

10. Other people always seem to get the breaks.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

11. If somebody hits me, I hit back.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

12. When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

13. I am an even-tempered person.

<u>1</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>4</u>	<u>5</u>
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

14. I wonder why sometimes I feel so bitter about things.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

15. I get into fights a little more than the average person.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

16. I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

17. Some of my friends think I'm a hothead.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

18. I know that "friends" talk about me behind my back.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

19. If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

20. My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

21. Sometimes I fly off the handle for no good reason.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

22. I am suspicious of overly friendly strangers.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

23. There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

24. I have trouble controlling my temper.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

25. I sometimes feel that people are laughing at me behind my back.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

26. I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

27. When people are especially nice, I wonder what they want.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

28. I have threatened people I know.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

29. I have become so mad that I have broken things.

1	2	3	4	5
Extremely Uncharacteristic				Extremely Characteristic

Appendix G

Consent Form**What is the purpose of this research?**

The purpose of this research is to examine several personality characteristics and how they relate to each other.

What will be expected of me?

This study will ask you to give some basic background information, and fill out several surveys concerning your personality.

How long will the research take?

Completing the surveys will take approximately 20 to 30 minutes.

Will my answers be anonymous?

Yes. Your name will in no way be used in this study nor will it be on your surveys. Your responses to these questions will be completely anonymous and you will not be asked to follow-up with the study

Can I withdraw from the study if I decide to?

Yes. You are completely free to participate or decline to participate in this study in partial or in its entirety. Also, you may refuse to continue participating at any point in time without penalty. If you do decide to discontinue testing, your responses will not be used in the final results of this study.

Is there any harm that I might experience from taking part in the study?

No. There is no foreseeable harm to you from participating in this study.

How will I benefit from taking part in the research?

You may be given research credit for your participation in this study.

Who should I contact if I have questions or concerns about the research?

You may contact Ashton Southard (acsouthard1@catamount.wcu.edu) or Dr. Millicent Abel, faculty director of the project (abel@email.wcu.edu). If you have any concerns about how you were treated during the experiment, you may contact the office of the IRB, a committee that oversees the ethical dimensions of the research process. The IRB office can be contacted at (828) 227-1377. This research has been approved by the IRB.

If you are willing to participate in this study, please sign below to indicate that you consent to being a participant in this study and that you are at least 18 years of age. Thank you for your cooperation.

Participant Name _____ Date _____

Participant Signature _____

If you wish a copy of the results of the study, please include your email address below.