



City Research Online

City St George's, University of London

Citation: Green, A., MacLean, R. & Charles, K. (2020). Unmasking gender differences in narcissism within intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 167, 110247. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2020.110247

This is the accepted version of the paper.

This version of the publication may differ from the final published version. To cite this item please consult the publisher's version.

Permanent repository link: <https://openaccess.city.ac.uk/id/eprint/24591/>

Link to published version: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110247>

Copyright and Reuse: Copyright and Moral Rights remain with the author(s) and/or copyright holders. Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for-profit purposes without prior permission or charge, unless otherwise indicated, provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way. For full details of reuse please refer to [City Research Online policy](#).

Unmasking Gender Differences in Narcissism within Intimate Partner Violence

This manuscript has been published in *Personality and Individual Differences*. Please cite the paper as Green, A., MacLean, R., and Charles, K. (2020). Unmasking gender differences in narcissism within intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 167, 1-6.

DOI: [10.1016/j.paid.2020.110247](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110247)

Abstract

Theoretical understanding of gender differences in narcissistic presentation is underdeveloped due to an overrepresentation of males in the narcissism literature. This study investigated gender differences in manifestations of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism within the context of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). Participants ($N= 328$; 176 females) recruited from the normal population completed scales for grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, and physical/sexual and psychological abuse. Multivariate regression analyses were conducted to investigate gender differences in narcissism and predictions for perpetration of IPV in each gender. Results showed that females scored significantly higher on vulnerable narcissism than males, but no gender differences were found for grandiose narcissism. In males, vulnerable narcissism was a significant positive predictor of physical/sexual abuse perpetration, and grandiose narcissism was a significant positive predictor of psychological abuse. For females, only vulnerable narcissism emerged as a significant positive predictor of physical/sexual and psychological abuse perpetration. Findings provide novel insights into how gender is expressed differently in the presentation of narcissism, and how these differences are related to partner violence outcomes. Theoretical implications of these findings are discussed and suggestions for future research are made.

Key words: Narcissism, gender, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, partner violence

1. Introduction

Narcissism is a clinical disorder (as defined by the DSM-5) and a normative personality trait (as defined in the empirical literature) that encompasses traits including overt grandiosity, entitlement, exhibitionism and inflated self-esteem (American Psychiatric Association, 2013; Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008). Research consistently finds evidence for two subtypes of narcissism: grandiose narcissism, captured by the DSM-5 and the most widely used measurement of trait narcissism (Narcissistic Personality Inventory; NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988); and vulnerable narcissism, characterised by overt shyness, shame, hypersensitivity and low self-esteem (Miller et al., 2011). Vulnerable narcissism is overshadowed by the grandiose subtype, with over 75% of the empirical literature relying on the NPI as the main assessment indicator of trait narcissism (Cain et al., 2008).

An overreliance on grandiose features may have implications for gender differences in narcissism. Indeed, common depictions of narcissism (DSM/NPI) embody a personality construct closely resembling masculine stereotypes in society, including physical expressions of aggression, an authoritarian character, entitled exploitation, and an excessive need for power (Corry, Merritt, Mrug, & Pamp, 2008). This is further evident in meta-analytic reviews demonstrating that males are up to 75% more likely to be diagnosed with narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) and report significantly higher scores on the NPI, compared to females (Grijalva et al., 2014). However, prior theoretical and empirical discussions in the literature have implicitly assumed that gender differences in narcissism can be broadly categorised according to grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Research has consistently found the vulnerable narcissism component to be either gender neutral (Besser & Priel, 2009;

Miller et al., 2010), or with a higher female preponderance (Onofrei, 2009; Pincus et al., 2009; Wright, Lukowitsky, Pincus & Conroy, 2010). It has been theorised that these observed gender differences in grandiose and vulnerable narcissism may be attributed to gender-related norms associated with masculinity and femininity, respectively (see Grijalva et al., 2014, for an overview).

Given their inherently vulnerable state and antagonistic interpersonal styles, narcissistic individuals are particularly prone to experience ‘injury’ to any real or imagined threat, with attributes such as entitlement, envy, need for attention, arrogance and extreme sensitivity in response to criticisms creating discord in intimate relationships (Miller et al., 2007). The literature has consistently found evidence to suggest that those high in narcissism, versus those low in narcissistic traits, are more likely to perpetrate abuse upon an intimate partner (Fields, 2012). The research on narcissism and Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) has, however, been dominated by the grandiose component as the main assessment of narcissism, which may not accurately capture narcissistic traits in females. Such studies link narcissism to perpetration of psychological abuse (Gormley & Lopez, 2010), verbal abuse (Lamkin, Lavner & Shaffer, 2017), and sexual and physical abuse (Blinkhorn, Lyons, & Almond, 2015). The aforementioned studies also fail to represent the whole spectrum of IPV (i.e., psychological, physical and sexual abuse), and thus may not accurately depict the complex nature of IPV. Some studies exclude female participants entirely on the grounds that males exhibit higher levels of narcissism and aggression (e.g., Buck et al., 2014; Meier, 2004; Rinker, 2009; Talbot et al., 2015).

Further adding to these limitations, other research fail to specify the gender of the perpetrator versus the victim (e.g., Carton & Egan, 2017; Peterson & Dehart, 2014). Given the widespread assumption that males are overrepresented as IPV perpetrators in general, and in narcissism research in particular (Gormley & Lopez, 2010), the failure to differentiate the

gender of the perpetrator can have particularly problematic implications if these are to assume males are perpetrators and females are victims. Despite these issues, through initial observations in the existing literature on narcissism (as assessed by the NPI) and IPV, it can be tentatively suggested that male violence is characterised as more overt and grandiose in nature, the result of responding to perceived threats to an inflated self-esteem (Ryan et al., 2008; Southard, 2010). Female violence, on the other hand, has been typified as indirect and subtle in nature (Ryan et al., 2008; Southard, 2010), and linked to a low self-esteem in response to aggressive behaviour (Barnett & Powell, 2016). These diverging outcomes in intimate violence may be a consequence of differential self-regulatory strategies among females and males in attaining their narcissistic goals, where males are more likely to express overt/grandiose narcissism, and females may use more discreet and indirect ways to obtain their self-worth (Campbell & Miller, 2012; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Green, Charles, & MacLean, 2019).

Nevertheless, caution must be exercised when interpreting the existing gender characteristics, as the aforementioned studies arguably do not recognise the multidimensionality of narcissism (i.e., the inclusion of vulnerable narcissism) and the gender expressions that may give rise to IPV perpetration in its full entirety. The apparent gender differences in narcissism found in previous research arguably underlines the need to measure narcissism as a two-dimensional conceptualisation to more accurately capture narcissistic features in males and females within IPV.

1.1 The present study

In the absence of a thorough understanding of how gendered expressions in narcissism impact partner violence, this study takes an exploratory approach to examine gender differences in grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, within all attributes of IPV

(physical, sexual and psychological abuse). Given that such interactive influence remains uninvestigated empirically, the association between gender and narcissism was explored along with its potential to predict partner violence behaviours, in the normal population via self-report instruments.

The research set out to address three key questions:

1. Are there gender differences in self-reported grandiose and vulnerable narcissism?
2. To what extent do self-reported narcissism in females predict IPV?
3. To what extent do self-reported narcissism in males predict IPV?

2. Method

2.1 Design

This study utilised a between-subjects, quasi-experimental design, with gender as the independent variable containing two separate groups (males and females). Other independent variables were narcissism (grandiose versus vulnerable components). The dependent variables were physical/sexual and psychological abuse perpetration.

2.2 Participants

Power analysis (G*Power 3.1.9.2; Faul et al., 2007) determined a minimum sample size of 107 to detect a moderate effect size ($f^2=0.15$) using multiple regression with two predictor variables ($\alpha = .05$, power = .95). The sample comprised 328 participants (176 females) aged 18-64 years ($M = 27.93$ years, $SD = 9.09$). The age range for males was 18-63 ($M = 28.45$, $SD = 9.52$) and the age range for females was 18-64 ($M = 27.46$, $SD = 8.70$). Participants were recruited through advertisements on social media, flyers, and psychology research participation websites. The sample was predominantly Caucasian ($n = 262$), with 16

South or East Asian, 12 Hispanic or Latino, 10 African, and five Middle Eastern; the remaining 23 participants chose ‘mixed’ or ‘other’ for ethnic status. Participants all had had experience of being in a relationship. Table 1 shows the relationship status and duration, and stated sexuality.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

2.3 Materials and Procedure

2.3.1 *Pathological Narcissism Inventory*

The Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI; Pincus et al., 2009) is a 52-item self-report measure of pathological narcissism assessing both vulnerable (34 items) and grandiose (18 items) features. Responses for the 52-items are made on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from 0 (not at all like me) to 5 (very much like me). Three sub-scales load on to the Narcissistic Grandiosity scale: Exploitativeness, Grandiose Fantasy, and Self-Sacrificing Self-Enhancement; four sub-scales load on to the Narcissistic Vulnerability scale: Contingent Self-esteem, Hiding the Self, Devaluing, and Entitlement Rage. The following are examples of questions in the PNI: “I often fantasize about having a huge impact on the world around me” and “When others don’t notice me, I start to feel worthless”. The PNI manifests good internal consistency, with coefficient alphas for all scales ranging from .78 to .93 (Pincus et al., 2009). Pincus et al. (2009) found the pattern of correlations on the PNI to also support good convergent validity (correlated at .36 with NPI E/E) and divergent validity (correlated with total NPI at .13). Subsequent studies have provided further support for the psychometric properties of the PNI (see Thomas, Wright, Lukowitsky, Donnellan & Hopwood, 2012; Wright et al., 2010). In this study, Cronbach’s alpha was high (grandiose scale: $\alpha = 0.87$; vulnerable scale: $\alpha = 0.95$).

2.3.2 *Conflict Tactics Scale short form*

The Conflict Tactics Scale short form (CTS2S; Straus & Douglas, 2004) is a revised 20-item measure of IPV adapted from the longer 39-item measure version of the CTS2 (Straus et al., 1996). The CTS2S focuses on tactics (e.g., Sexual Coercion, Physical Assault and Injury) used during conflict in intimate relationships, and measures the frequency a particular aspect of IPV is said to have occurred within a relationship, instigated by either the participant or their partner. In this study, participants were asked to report the occurrence of any violence (perpetrated or subjected to) during their relationship on a 8-point scale ranging from 1 (once in the past) to 8 (this has never happened). The following are examples of questions in the CTS2S: “I/My partner pushed, shoved, or slapped the other partner” and “I/My partner went to see a doctor (M.D.) or needed to see a doctor because of a fight”. The CTS2S demonstrates good construct and concurrent validity with the CTS2, with alpha coefficients ranging from .65 to .94 (Straus & Douglas, 2004). In their paper, Straus and Douglas (2004) state that the reliability of the CTS2S cannot be calculated due to their method of scoring. Subsequent research scored the CTS2S and found internal reliabilities for perpetration were $\alpha = 0.59$, and $\alpha = 0.67$ for victimisation (Sachetti & Lefler, 2014). In this study, perpetrator reliability was $\alpha = 0.69$ and victim reliability was $\alpha = 0.71$.

2.3.3 *Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse*

The Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse (MMEA; Murphy & Hoover, 1999) is a 28-item scale specifically measuring emotionally abusive aspects of IPV. Subscales were: Restrictive Engulfment, Denigration, Hostile Withdrawal and Dominance Intimidation. The MMEA measures the frequency a particular aspect of emotional abuse

occurs within a relationship, instigated by either the participant or their partner. In this study, participants were asked to report the occurrence of any violence (perpetrated or subjected to) during their relationship on a 8-point scale ranging from 1 (once in the past) to 8 (this has never happened). The following are examples of questions used in the MMEA: “You/Your partner called the other partner worthless” and “You/Your partner acted cold or distant to the other partner when angry”. The psychometric properties of the MMEA have been tested in a sample of college students and in a sample of aggressive men in treatment, with alpha coefficients ranging from .83 to .94 (Murphy & Hoover, 1999). Subsequent research supports the MMEA as a statistically valid indicator of psychological aggression, demonstrating adequate convergent validity ranging from .62 to .69 when compared to other measures of psychological aggression (Ro & Lawrence, 2007). In this study, internal reliabilities for perpetration were $\alpha = 0.89$ and $\alpha = 0.91$ for victimisation.

2.3.4 *Procedure*

Participants were presented with demographic questions and then continued to complete the PNI, CTS2S, MMEA, PCS and PBI questionnaires, which were presented in that order for each participant. Finally, participants had the option to enter a prize draw for a £50 Amazon voucher. Ethical approval was granted by Edinburgh Napier University School of Applied Sciences Research Integrity Committee.

2.3.5 *Data analysis*

Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure all variables under investigation met the assumptions of parametric tests (ANOVA, t-tests, bivariate correlations, and multiple regression models). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism variables were normally distributed, as determined through measuring skewness and kurtosis (scores were within the acceptable

range of -1 to +1). The CTS2S perpetration variable exceeded the acceptable range of kurtosis and skewness in both males and females, as did the MMEA perpetration variable in males. Although the current data set consisted of both parametric and non-parametric data, Field (2009) suggests that values of kurtosis and skewness should have no upper criterion applied in sample sizes >200. Therefore, assumptions of normality were assumed given the sample size of the current study.

Further, regression models were tested to confirm assumptions were met. There was no evidence of multicollinearity as assessed by the variance inflation factor (VIF), ensuring scores were <10 and tolerance scores were >0.2. Independence of residuals was assessed using the Durbin-Watson statistics, with values for each model were close to 2, indicating independence of residuals (Field, 2009). There was linearity as assessed through plotting standardised residuals against the predicted values. There was also evidence of homoscedasticity through visual inspection of P-P plots (Wilson & MacLean, 2006). All assumptions of regression were therefore satisfied. Data were analysed using SPSS software version 23.

3. Results

3.1 Gender differences in Narcissism

To test the hypothesis for gender differences in grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, a 2 x 2 mixed design ANOVA with narcissism type as within-subjects factor and gender as between-subjects factor was conducted. There was a significant main effect of narcissism score, $F(1, 326) = 92.687, p < .001, \eta^2 = .221$, such that overall participants scored higher on grandiose narcissism ($M = 2.7, SD = .83$) than vulnerable narcissism ($M = 2.3, SD = 1.0$). There was also a significant main effect of gender, $F(1, 326) = 14.939, p < .001, \eta^2 = .044$, such that females ($M = 2.7, SD = 1.9$) scored significantly higher on overall narcissism score

compared to males ($M = 2.4, SD = 1.6$). A significant interaction was found between gender and narcissism type, $F(1, 326) = 120.904, p < .001, \eta^2 = .271$. To explore this interaction further, post-hoc t -tests were conducted. Independent samples t -tests revealed gender differences in vulnerable narcissism (females higher than males), but not in grandiose narcissism (see Table 2). Paired samples t -tests showed higher grandiose narcissism scores than vulnerable narcissism for males, $t(151) = 13.5, p < .001, d = 1.09$; but no difference for females, $t(175) = -1.0, p = .298, d = -0.07$.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

3.2 Relationships between narcissism and IPV

Correlations between narcissism and IPV variables are summarised in Table 3. For both males and females, grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were significantly positively correlated with perpetration of physical/sexual and psychological abuse, except for grandiose narcissism and perpetration of physical/sexual abuse in males. Fisher's r to z transformation revealed that there were no significant differences between the magnitude of correlation coefficients for males and females.

INSERT TABLE 3 HERE

3.3 Narcissism in Predicting IPV

Since the present study is exploratory, several simultaneous multiple regression analyses were performed with grandiose and vulnerable narcissism as the predictor variables entered into the equation in one step, as this technique allows for the unique variance explained by each predictor. These regression models were ran separately for each outcome

variable (physical/sexual abuse and psychological abuse perpetration), as shown in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4 summarises the multiple regression for predicting physical/sexual perpetration. In males, this regression model was statistically significant ($F(2,148) = 3.681$, $p = .028$, $\text{adj. } R^2 = .047$), with one significant positive predictor (as indicated by beta values) being vulnerable narcissism. In females, the regression was statistically significant ($F(2,173) = 15.839$, $p < .001$, $\text{adj. } R^2 = .155$), with vulnerable narcissism being the only significant predictor.

INSERT TABLE 4 HERE

Table 5 summarises the multiple regression for predicting psychological abuse. In males, this regression model was statistically significant ($F(2,148) = 11.711$, $p < .001$, $\text{adj. } R^2 = .137$), with one significant positive predictor being grandiose narcissism. In females, the regression test was statistically significant ($F(2,170) = 23.882$, $p < .001$, $\text{adj. } R^2 = .219$), with vulnerable narcissism being the only significant predictor.

INSERT TABLE 5 HERE

4. Discussion

This study aimed to enhance theoretical knowledge regarding gender differences in the expression of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, and the extent to which these variables predict partner violence outcomes.

In concordance with previous research, current results show that females exhibited significantly higher scores on vulnerable narcissism than males (Pincus et al., 2009; Onofrei,

2009; Wright et al., 2010). The marked gender difference may resemble prior theorisations regarding the influences of gendered socialisation and gender role expectations associated with masculinity and femininity (Grijalva et al., 2014). In contrast to longstanding gender differences in grandiose narcissism, this study did not find gender differences on the PNI grandiosity scale. However, these findings need to be interpreted cautiously as it has been argued that the PNI grandiosity scale may not adequately capture narcissistic grandiosity as effectively as other measures (see Miller et al., 2014; Miller, Campbell & Lynam, 2016) as it does not contain NPI traits such as entitlement, leadership, authority and exhibitionism: traits that have been found to consistently favour male gender qualities (Grijalva et al., 2014). Although this critique has been rebutted by other research arguing that the PNI grandiosity does capture the central elements of grandiose narcissism (Edershile, Simms & Wright, 2018), more research is needed to replicate the current findings.

The association between narcissism and IPV in males and females showed comparable patterns. The result suggest that females who display higher levels of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were more likely to engage in perpetration of physical/sexual and psychological abuse on a partner. These findings contradict previous research suggesting that female violence is expressed as indirect and subtle in nature (Ryan et al., 2008; Southard, 2010). Similar to females, males who exhibit higher levels of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism were more likely to perpetrate psychological abuse on a partner, and males who exhibited higher levels of vulnerable narcissism were more likely to perpetrate physical/sexual abuse on a partner. These findings add to the previous research which has focused specifically on exploring grandiose narcissism (or a subcomponent of the measurement) in relation to specific types of abusive behaviour across gender (Blinkhorn et al., 2015; Carton & Egan, 2017; Fields, 2012; Gormley & Lopez, 2010; Lamkin et al., 2017; Peterson & Dehart, 2014; Ryan et al., 2008; Southard, 2010).

Moreover, in contrast to previous research (Meier, 2005; Rinker, 2009), no significant relationship was found between grandiose narcissism and perpetration of physical/sexual abuse in males. Although this unexpected finding may be reflective of the specific context and sample that this current assessment of grandiose narcissism focused on, it is nevertheless a finding that merits replication.

Regression analyses suggest that different kinds of narcissism and partner violence outcomes are associated with males and females. In males, manifestations of vulnerable narcissism predicted perpetration of physical/sexual abuse in a partner, whereas manifestations of grandiose narcissism predicted perpetration of psychological abuse in a partner. As for the former, men's expressions of vulnerable narcissism, such as entitled rage and fluctuating self-esteem, may create an ambivalent and defensive pattern of self-evaluation, which in turn is overtly projected upon intimate partners in physical and sexual ways. As for the latter, grandiose features in males may cultivate an exaggerated sense of self-worth that, in the desire to maintain fantasies of grandeur, may form compensatory defensive and exploitative actions in the form of psychological abuse.

Interestingly, only vulnerable narcissism predicted physical/sexual and psychological abuse on a partner in women. Women's greater tendency to express vulnerable features of narcissism and perpetrate violence in both covert and overt ways provide implications for theoretical understandings of narcissism and the related literature on IPV. Firstly, compared to males, the current findings suggest that narcissism in females is expressed in more subtle and hidden ways (e.g., devaluing and hiding the self); features which may not be recognised as 'narcissistic' when exploiting partners in overt and covert forms. Second, these results are in line with previous theorisations suggesting that narcissistic females may use more discreet and indirect ways to obtain their self-worth (e.g., Campbell & Miller, 2012; Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001; Green et al., 2019). That is, whereas grandiose features of narcissism may

create an acceptable norm about men being more entitled and exploitative, the same pattern in females may be perceived as unconventional and thereby conceptualised as being beyond what is considered socially normative. These theorisations may be an explanation as to why vulnerable narcissism, and not grandiose narcissism, was a significant predictor in females' perpetration of abuse.

The gender differences found in this study are particularly noteworthy in females, given their more hidden and subtle appearance of narcissism which is currently under-theorised and overlooked by dominant measurements of grandiosity. It is argued here, therefore, that the vast majority of the research on narcissism (NPI) as related to IPV does not apprehend the full picture of narcissism as it is presented in each gender, and is arguably preliminary in the conclusions made (e.g., Blinkhorn et al., 2015; Carton & Egan, 2017; Fields, 2012; Gormley et al., 2014; Peterson & Dehart, 2014). Overall, the results here provide novel insights into how different kinds of narcissism is associated with gender and how these factors are differentially related to partner violence perpetration. These gender differences accentuate the importance of including a multidimensional assessment of narcissism that captures both grandiosity and vulnerability, and the full scope of IPV (physical, sexual, and psychological abuse). Such an approach arguably offers the potential to more comprehensively understand and unmask the gendered manifestations of narcissism as they relate to partner violence outcomes.

4.1 Limitations and future directions

As with any self-reported study, a limitation of the current findings is its reliance on self-reported data which can be biased due to socially desirable responding. It is noteworthy that the current study was carefully planned and adhered to strict ethical guidelines regarding anonymity in an attempt to minimise susceptibility to socially desirable responding. Further,

the anonymity assured in on-line environments may actually result in participants being less likely to respond in socially desirable ways (e.g., Kreuter, Presser, & Tourangeau, 2008). However, despite the careful approach undertaken, it is suggested here that future research include a social desirability scale to further mitigate issues of bias in self-reported data (see Bell & Naugle, 2007). Another limitation pertains to the physical/sexual abuse inventory (CTS2S; Straus & Douglas, 2004) which, for instance, only captures perpetration of sexual behaviour in two items. It is recommended that future research use a more robust measurement that captures these elements in more depth, such as the Postrefusal Sexual Persistence scale (PSP; Struckman-Johnson, Struckman-Johnson, & Anderson, 2003).

The findings of this study are also limited as other-partner data were not collected. The existing research on narcissism in dyadic relationships suggests that a modest degree of homophily exist (Lamkin, Campbell, vanDellen, & Miller, 2015; Lavner et al., 2016): the idea that narcissistic individuals seek partners with similar characteristics. Implications for homophily in narcissism is somewhat concerning, due to the fact that aggressive behaviour perpetrated by narcissists may, to an extent, be due to the narcissism of their partner (see Keller et al., 2014). These findings underscore the need for future research to investigate narcissism and gender within the context of dyadic relationships.

Despite these limitations, this study provides novel insights into how gender is expressed differently in the presentation of narcissism, and how these differences are related to partner violence outcomes. These findings can inform clinicians to devise treatments that target factors critical to the causation and maintenance of narcissism, in turn creating gender-specific interventions for IPV.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2013). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders: DSM-5*. Washington, D.C., American Psychiatric Association.

Barnett, M. D., & Powell, H. A. (2016). Self-esteem mediates narcissism and aggression among women, but not men: A comparison of two theoretical models of narcissism among college students. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 100-104.

Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2007). Effects of Social Desirability on Students' Self-Reporting of Partner Abuse Perpetration and Victimization. *Violence and Victims*, 22, 243 - 256.

Besser, A., & Priel, B. (2010). Grandiose narcissism versus vulnerable narcissism in threatening situations: Emotional reactions to achievement failure and interpersonal rejection. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(8), 874-902.

Blinkhorn, V., Lyons, M., & Almond, L. (2015). The ultimate femme fatale? Narcissism predicts serious and aggressive sexually coercive behaviour in females. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 219-223.

Buck, N. M. L., Leenaars, P. E. M., Emmelkamp, P. M. G., & van, M. H. J. C. (2014). Personality traits are related to intimate partner violence among securely attached individuals. *Journal of Family Violence, 29*, 3, 235-246.

Carton, H., & Egan, V. (2017). The dark triad and intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences, 105*, 84-88.

Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2012). *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments*. Hoboken, N.J: John Wiley.

Cain, N. M., Pincus, A. L., & Ansell, E. B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*, 638.

Corry, N., Merritt, R. D., Mrug, S., & Pamp, B. (2008). The Factor Structure of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 90*(6), 593-600.

Edershile, E. A., Simms, L. J., & Wright, A. G. C. (2018). A Multivariate Analysis of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory's Nomological Network. *Assessment, 26*, 619-629.

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A.-G., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*(2), 175-191.

Fields, S. K. (2012). *Narcissism and intimate partner violence: An establishment of the link and investigation of Multiple potential mediators*. Digital Commons: East Tennessee State University.

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Thousand Oaks: Sage publications.

Green, A., Charles, K., & MacLean, R. (2019). Perceptions of Female Narcissism in Intimate Partner Violence: A Thematic Analysis. *Qualitative Methods in Psychology Bulletin*, 13-27.

Gormley, B., & Lopez, F. G. (2010). Correlates of Psychological Abuse Perpetration in College Dating Relationships. *Journal of College Counseling*. 13, 4-16.

Grijalva E., Newman D.A., Tay L., Donellan M.B., Harms P D., Robins R.W., & Yan T. (2014). Gender Differences in Narcissism: A Meta-Analytic Review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 141, 261-310.

Keller, P. S., Blincoe, S., Gilbert, L. R., Dewall, C. N., Haak, E. A., & Widiger, T. (2014). Narcissism in Romantic Relationships: A Dyadic Perspective. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*. 33, 25-50.

Kreuter, F., Presser, S., & Tourangeau, R. (2008). Social desirability bias in CATI, IVR, and web surveys: The effects of mode and question sensitivity. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 72, 847–865.

Lamkin, J., Lavner, J. A., & Shaffer, A. (2017). Narcissism and observed communication in couples. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 105, 224-228.

Lamkin, J., Campbell, W. K., vanDellen, M. R., & Miller, J. D. (2015). An exploration of the correlates of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism in romantic relationships: Homophily, partner characteristics, and dyadic adjustment. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 79, 166-171.

Lavner, J. A., Lamkin, J., Miller, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Karney, B. R. (2016). Narcissism and Newlywed Marriage: Partner Characteristics and Marital Trajectories. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*. 7, 169-179.

Meier, M. J. (2004). Exploring narcissism in a group of male batterers. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 64 (10-A), 3846-3846.

Miller, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Pilkonis, P. A. (2007). Narcissistic personality disorder: relations with distress and functional impairment. *Comprehensive Psychiatry*, 48(2), 170-177.

Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Keith, C. W. (2011). Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism: A Nomological Network Analysis. *Journal of Personality*. 79.

Miller, J. D., Dir, A., Gentile, B., Wilson, L., Pryor, L. R., & Campbell, W. K. (2010). Searching for a Vulnerable Dark Triad: Comparing Factor 2 Psychopathy, Vulnerable Narcissism, and Borderline Personality Disorder. *Journal of Personality*, 78(5), 1529-1564.

Miller, J. D., McCain, J., Lynam, D. R., Few, L. R., Gentile, B., MacKillop, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2014). A comparison of the criterion validity of popular measures of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder via the use of expert ratings. *Psychological Assessment, 26*, 3, 958-69.

Miller, J. D., Campbell, W. K., & Lynam, D. R. (2016). Measures of Narcissism and Their Relations to DSM-5 Pathological Traits: A Critical Reappraisal. *Assessment, 23*, 1, 3-9.

Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the Paradoxes of Narcissism: A Dynamic Self-Regulatory Processing Model. *Psychological Inquiry, 12*, 177-196.

Murphy, C. M., & Hoover, S. A. (1999). Measuring emotional abuse in dating relationships as a multifactorial construct. *Violence and Victims, 14*(1), 39–53.

Onofrei, L. (2009). A critical examination of the theoretical and empirical overlap between overt narcissism and male narcissism and between covert narcissism and female narcissism. *Theses, Dissertations, and Projects*. Paper 1133.

Peterson, J. L., & DeHart, T. (2014). In Defense of Self-Love: An Observational Study on Narcissists' Negative Behavior During Romantic Relationship Conflict. *Self and Identity, 13*(4), 477-490.

Pincus, A. L., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G. C., Levy, K. N., & Ansell, E. B. (2009). Initial Construction and Validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment, 21*(3), 365-379.

Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the Narcissistic Personality Inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54, 890–902.

Rinker, L. S. (2009). Narcissism and type of violent relationships for perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 70, 5802.

Ro, E., & Lawrence, E. (2007). Comparing three measures of psychological aggression: Psychometric properties and differentiation from negative communication. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 575–586.

Ryan, K. M., Weikel, K., & Sprechini, G. (2008). Gender differences in narcissism and courtship violence in dating couples. *Sex Roles*, 58, 802–813.

Sachetti, G. M., & Lefler, E. K. (2014). ADHD symptomology and social functioning in college students. *Journal of Attention Disorders*, 1–11.

Straus, M. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2004). A short form of the revised conflict tactics scales, and typologies for severity and mutuality. *Violence and Victims*, 19(5), 507–520.

Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D., & Anderson, P.B. (2003). Tactics of sexual coercion: When men and women don't take no for an answer. *The Journal of Sex Research*, 40, 76–86.

Southard, A. C. (2010). *Sex differences in narcissism: Expression of and relationships with the exploitativeness/entitlement factor*. Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, NC.

Talbot, F., Babineau, M. and Bergheul, S., (2015). Narcissism and self-esteem dimensions as predictors of aggression in intimate partner violence. *Annales Medico-Psychologiques*. Vol. 173, No. 2, pp. 193-196.

Thomas, K. M., Wright, A. G. C., Lukowitsky, M. R., Donnellan, M. B., & Hopwood, C. J. (2012). Evidence for the criterion validity and clinical utility of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 19, 135-145.

Wilson, S., & Maclean, R. (2011). *Research methods and data analysis for psychology*. New York: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Wright, A. G. C., Lukowitsky, M., Pincus, A., & Conroy, D. (2010). The Higher Order Factor Structure and Gender Invariance of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Assessment*, 17, 467-483.

Table 1
Participant demographics

	Males (<i>n</i> = 152)	Females (<i>n</i> = 176)
Mean Relationship duration in months	49.8	50.1
Relationship status		
Dating	99	89
Cohabiting	25	51
Engaged	7	9
Married	21	26
Sexuality		
Heterosexual	130	116
Homosexual	15	8
Bisexual	5	46
Pansexual	1	6

Note. One participant did not report relationship status.

Table 2
*Gender differences in narcissism using independent samples *t*-tests*

	Males (<i>n</i> = 152)		Females (<i>n</i> = 176)		<i>p</i>	<i>Cohen's D</i>
	Mean (SD)		<i>t</i> (df)			
Grandiose narcissism	2.8 (.82)		.863 (326)		.389	.12
Vulnerable narcissism	1.9 (.86)		-7.440 (324)		<.001	.85

Table 3
*Correlation matrix (Pearson's *r*) between grandiose and vulnerable narcissism and IPV.*

	Grandiose narcissism			Vulnerable narcissism		
	Males	Females	Fisher-Z	Males	Females	Fisher-Z
	<i>r</i> (<i>n</i>)	<i>r</i> (<i>n</i>)	<i>p</i>	<i>r</i> (<i>n</i>)	<i>r</i> (<i>n</i>)	<i>p</i>
CTS2S Perpetration	.136 (151)	.265** (176)	.230	.218** (151)	.390** (176)	.089
MMEA Perpetration	.351** (151)	.364** (173)	.896	.303** (151)	.468** (173)	.083

Note. CTS2S = short form of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale; MMEA = Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse. Number of participants in brackets. ***p*<0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 4
Summary of independent variables predicting CTS2S perpetration

Males (<i>n</i> = 144)					
Predictor variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Vulnerable narcissism	.304	.143	.215	2.121	.036*
Grandiose narcissism	.006	.148	.004	.043	.966
Females (<i>n</i> = 166)					
Predictor variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Vulnerable narcissism	.713	.172	.451	4.154	.001***
Grandiose narcissism	-.161	.220	-.079	-.731	.466

Note. CTS2S = short form of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale. * $p < 0.05$. *** $p < 0.001$ level.

Table 5
Summary of independent variables predicting MMEA perpetration

Males (<i>n</i> = 143)					
Predictor variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Vulnerable narcissism	.886	.590	.144	1.504	.135
Grandiose narcissism	1.721	.621	.265	2.772	.006**
Females (<i>n</i> = 164)					
Predictor variables	<i>B</i>	<i>SE_B</i>	β	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
Vulnerable narcissism	2.677	.616	.458	4.346	.001***
Grandiose narcissism	.100	.786	.013	.127	.899

Note. MMEA = Multidimensional Measure of Emotional Abuse. ** $p < 0.01$ level. *** $p < 0.001$ level.