



Do narcissists try to make romantic partners jealous on purpose? An examination of motives for deliberate jealousy-induction among subtypes of narcissism



Gregory K. Tortoriello*, William Hart, Kyle Richardson, Alexa M. Tullett

University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 27 January 2017

Received in revised form 21 March 2017

Accepted 23 March 2017

Available online 29 March 2017

Keywords:

Narcissism

Jealousy induction

Motives

Tactics

Romantic relationships

ABSTRACT

We speculated that narcissists' apparent desire for alternative mates might reflect a behavioral strategy designed to induce jealousy in their partners. We assessed grandiose and vulnerable narcissism, propensity to engage in strategic jealousy induction, and five motives for strategic jealousy induction. Both grandiose and vulnerable narcissists reported enhanced strategic jealousy induction. Results revealed that grandiose narcissists induce jealousy as means to acquire power and control, but vulnerable narcissists induce jealousy as a means to acquire power and control, exact revenge on the partner, test and strengthen the relationship, seek security, and compensate for low self-esteem. Additional mediation analyses revealed that the effects of both narcissism subtypes on jealousy induction were reduced upon controlling for Machiavellianism, and the effects of grandiose (vulnerable) narcissism on jealousy induction were accentuated (suppressed) upon controlling for trait self-esteem. Therefore, narcissists' relationship-threatening behavior might, in part, be strategic.

© 2017 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

Narcissism refers to a cognitive-affective preoccupation with the self (Westen, 1990) and can manifest in at least two subtypes: grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. Grandiose narcissists are socially fearless, confident, approach-oriented, and, on first encounters, come across as “narcissistic” (Miller et al., 2011). Vulnerable narcissists, on the other hand, are neurotic, fearful, avoidance-oriented, and, on first encounters, come across as shy and reserved (Miller et al., 2011), but they can also come across as arrogant and conceited after longer encounters (Wink, 1991). Despite these differences, both narcissism subtypes appear associated with relationship-threatening behaviors suggestive of interest in alternative mates (e.g., flirting with or discussing attractive rivals; Buss & Shackelford, 1997; Campbell & Foster, 2002; Campbell, Foster, & Finkel, 2002; Hunyady, Josephs, & Jost, 2008; Peterson & DeHart, 2014; Rohmann, Neumann, Herner, & Bierhoff, 2012). Yet, it remains unclear why narcissists perpetrate relationship-threatening behaviors. Here, we explored the possibility that some of these behaviors might be employed strategically by narcissists to make their partners feel jealous.

Indeed, many of narcissists' relationship-threatening behaviors—appearing unattached/uncommitted, pursuing attractive alternatives, flirting, discussing attractive mate alternatives, etc.—can be used to induce jealousy in a romantic partner (Fleischmann, Spitzberg, Andersen, & Roesch, 2005; Wade & Weinstein, 2011; White, 1980). Jealousy

induction refers to behaviors (e.g., flirting with others; discussing attractive rivals) that are designed to elicit perceived relationship threats in the partner via the presence of rivals (Fleischmann et al., 2005; Mattingly, Whitson, & Mattingly, 2012; White, 1980). Mattingly et al. (2012) proposed five jealousy-inducing motives: (a) acquire power/control, (b) exact revenge, (c) test/strengthen the relationship, (d) seek security, and (e) compensate for low self-esteem. Seemingly, these motives fit under two taxonomies of self-serving behavior that might relate to narcissism (Hart, Adams, Burton, & Tortoriello, 2017): offensive-oriented (a and b) and defensive-oriented (c, d, and e) goals. Table 1 briefly describes these motives (indexed by the Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale [MIRJS]; Mattingly et al., 2012).

Given narcissists' manipulative constitution, narcissism might relate to jealousy induction. Indeed, some researchers posit that narcissists' interpersonal behavior is typified by enhanced use of manipulative tactics to achieve interpersonal goals (e.g., Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Wallace & Baumeister, 2002). Furthermore, in the context of romantic relationships, grandiose and vulnerable narcissists endorse a game-playing love style (i.e., ludus; Campbell et al., 2002; Rohmann et al., 2012) which involves relational deception, manipulation, and distancing (Hendrick & Hendrick, 1986). Nonetheless, ludus and strategic jealousy induction are theoretically distinct constructs and appear only weakly related (Mattingly et al., 2012).

Although grandiose and vulnerable narcissism might both relate to enhanced jealousy induction, the motives which underlie this behavior should diverge as a function of narcissism subtypes. For grandiose

* Corresponding author at: Department of Psychology, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL 35487, USA.

E-mail address: gktortoriello@crimson.ua.edu (G.K. Tortoriello).

Table 1

Descriptions of the Five Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy and sample items from the MIRJS.

Jealousy motive	Description	Sample item (MIRJS) Each sample item is preceded by the sentence stem, "On the occasions in which I try to make my romantic partner jealous, I do so because..."
Power/control	Exerting one's power over the partner to gain leverage	"...I want to gain power over my partner."
Revenge	Retaliating due to partner inducing jealousy in him/her	"... I want to get revenge because my partner had made me jealous."
Testing/strengthening the relationship	Increasing relational closeness by testing the relationship	"...I want to test my partner's love for me."
Security	Seeking relational security	"...I want assurance that my relationship is strong."
Compensatory self-esteem	Needing relationship or partner for approval	"...I feel inadequate."

Note. Descriptions were influenced by those in White (1980) and Mattingly et al. (2012).

narcissism, we presumed it would relate to enhanced power/control and revenge motives (Table 2). Grandiose narcissists desire interpersonal dominance (Campbell et al., 2002; Rasmussen & Boon, 2014) and adopt dominance and revenge goals readily when provoked (Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017). Grandiose narcissism should be unrelated to motives symptomatic of defense against *relationship insecurity* (testing the relationship, seeking security). Because grandiose narcissism relates to secure and dismissive attachment styles (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003), it might have contradictory tendencies on relationship security motives. Nonetheless, because grandiose narcissism relates to high self-esteem (e.g., Bosson et al., 2008; Brunell & Fisher, 2014), it should inversely relate to motives symptomatic of defense against *personal insecurity* (i.e., compensatory self-esteem).

For vulnerable narcissism, we presumed it would relate to all five jealousy-induction motives (Table 2). Like grandiose narcissism, vulnerable narcissism should relate to power/control and revenge motives. Due to their coveting of grandiosity and power (Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017), vulnerable narcissists pursue goals to assert power and exact revenge following provocation (Hart, Adams, & Tortoriello, 2017). Unlike grandiose narcissism, however, vulnerable narcissism should also relate to testing/strengthening the relationship, seeking security, and compensatory self-esteem motives (Mattingly et al., 2012). They are also deficient in self-esteem (Miller et al., 2011), and their behavior is presumed to arise from feelings of personal insecurity (Dickinson & Pincus, 2003).

Table 2

Hypothesized relations between narcissism subtypes and romantic jealousy-induction measures.

	Grandiose narcissism	Vulnerable narcissism
Romantic jealousy induction	✓	✓
Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy		
Offensive motives:		
Power/control	✓	✓
Revenge	✓	✓
Defensive motives:		
Testing/strengthening		✓
Security		✓
Compensatory self-esteem	✓–	✓

Note. "✓" denotes a hypothesized positive relation; "✓–" denotes a hypothesized negative relation.

We related grandiose and vulnerable narcissism to the Romantic Jealousy-Induction Scale (INDUCE; Mattingly et al., 2012) and the Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale (MIRJS; Mattingly et al., 2012). We also included two personality correlates of narcissism that seemed relevant to our theory of narcissism and jealousy induction: Machiavellianism and self-esteem. Machiavellianism refers to a manipulative personality (Christie & Geis, 1970) and is a feature of narcissism (Paulhus & Williams, 2002). If effects of narcissism on jealousy induction reflect a manipulative constitution, such effects of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism might be suppressed upon controlling for Machiavellianism. Self-esteem refers to one's attitude toward the self. Although an implicit form of self-esteem exists (Greenwald & Banaji, 1995), we indexed one's self-reported ("explicit") self-esteem. Theories and findings suggest that explicit self-esteem reduces the need for using interpersonal manipulation tactics for offensive or defensive purposes (Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Leary & Kowalski, 1990). Because jealousy induction represents a form of interpersonal manipulation, we presumed self-esteem would inversely relate to jealousy induction. Given that narcissism subtypes diverge in their relations to self-esteem, effects of grandiose (vulnerable) narcissism on jealousy induction might be accentuated (suppressed) upon controlling for self-esteem.

1. Method

1.1. Participants and design

Two-hundred-and-thirty-seven undergraduate students (166 female¹) participated in an online study for partial course credit ($M_{age} = 18.75$, $SD = 0.98$). The design was cross-sectional.

1.2. Procedure and materials

Participants were introduced to a study on personality and romantic relationships in which they completed the following measures (in randomized order): the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Terry, 1988; $\alpha = 0.86$; $M = 16.46$, $SD = 7.25$) to index grandiose narcissism²; the Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale (HSNS; Hendin & Cheek, 1997; $\alpha = 0.74$; $M = 28.63$, $SD = 6.29$) to index vulnerable narcissism; the narcissistic vulnerability dimension of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI-V; Pincus et al., 2009; $\alpha = 0.92$; $M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.60$) to index (pathological) vulnerable narcissism per Wright, Lukowitsky, Pincus, and Conroy (2010); the Mach-IV (Christie & Geis, 1970; $\alpha = 0.66$; $M = 2.72$, $SD = 0.39$) to index Machiavellianism; and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (RSES; Rosenberg, 1965; $\alpha = 0.86$; $M = 2.91$, $SD = 0.51$) to index explicit self-esteem.

Next, to measure participants' propensity toward inducing jealousy in their romantic partner, they completed the Romantic Jealousy-Induction Scale (INDUCE; Mattingly et al., 2012; $\alpha = 0.97$; $M = 1.91$, $SD = 1.08$). Finally, participants completed the MIRJS (Mattingly et al., 2012) that measures the five putative motives for inducing jealousy (see Table 1 for representative items and subscale descriptions): *testing/strengthening the relationship motives* ($\alpha = 0.89$; $M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.47$), *revenge motives* ($\alpha = 0.87$; $M = 2.72$, $SD = 1.36$), *power/control motives* ($\alpha = 0.77$; $M = 2.40$, $SD = 1.12$), *security motives* ($\alpha = 0.85$; $M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.76$), and *compensatory self-esteem motives* ($\alpha =$

¹ Gender did not moderate any relations between narcissism measures and jealousy-induction variables at or below an alpha of 0.05. Hence, we discuss gender no further.

² Although some researchers have expressed concern over the NPI's psychometric properties (e.g., factor non-invariance) and construct validity (see Ackerman et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2009), there is strong evidence of its construct validity (e.g., Miller & Campbell, 2011; Miller et al., 2014), reliability (Raskin & Terry, 1988), and measurement equivalence across genders (Grijalva et al., 2015). Hence, although the scale is imperfect, the NPI total is a well-respected index of grandiose narcissism.

Table 3
Correlations between study variables.

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. NPI	■										
2. HSNS	0.01	■									
3. PNI-V	0.06	0.63**	■								
4. MACH	0.31**	0.31**	0.31**	■							
5. RSES	0.27**	-0.35**	-0.48**	-0.15*	■						
6. INDUCE	0.15*	0.16*	0.22**	0.23**	-0.16*	■					
7. POWER	0.15*	0.25**	0.33**	0.17**	-0.11	0.57**	■				
8. REV	0.04	0.14*	0.11	0.07	-0.06	0.51**	0.60**	■			
9. TEST	-0.07	0.29**	0.30**	0.06	-0.27**	0.35**	0.57**	0.55**	■		
10. SECURE	-0.05	0.29**	0.30**	0.12	-0.25**	0.28**	0.43**	0.30**	0.80**	■	
11. CSE	-0.20**	0.28**	0.34**	0.12	-0.52**	0.36**	0.45**	0.38**	0.67**	0.62**	■

Note. NPI = Narcissistic Personality Inventory; HSNS = Hypersensitive Narcissism Scale; PNI-V = Pathological Narcissism Inventory – Narcissistic Vulnerability; MACH = Machiavellianism; RSES = Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale; INDUCE = the Romantic Jealousy-Induction Scale; POWER = power/control subscale from the Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale (MIRJS); REV = revenge subscale from the MIRJS; TEST = testing/strengthening the relationship subscale from the MIRJS; SECURE = security subscale from the MIRJS; CSE = compensatory self-esteem subscale from the MIRJS.

* $p < 0.05$.

** $p < 0.01$.

0.82; $M = 3.33$, $SD = 1.60$). Participants completed demographics and were debriefed.³

2. Results

2.1. Grandiose narcissism

First, we examined bivariate correlations in Tables 3 and 4. As anticipated, grandiose narcissism related positively to jealousy induction, power/control motives, Machiavellianism, and trait self-esteem, while it related negatively to compensatory self-esteem motives. Inconsistent with hypotheses, grandiose narcissism did not relate to revenge motives.

2.1.1. Mediation by jealousy motives

Presumably, jealousy-induction motives are a proximal cause of jealousy induction (Mattingly et al., 2012). To test whether the effect of grandiose narcissism on jealousy induction was mediated by power/control motives and compensatory self-esteem motives, we ran two separate mediation models using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). We addressed mediation of the motives separately rather than in tandem because we did not wish to de-confound motives that are naturally confounded (in our data, $r = 0.45$) and, in turn, alter their conceptual meaning. Furthermore, both motives were treated separately in our theorizing regarding narcissists' jealousy induction, so it seemed logical to treat them separately in analyses. Each model used 10,000 bootstrap samples with 95% confidence intervals around an indirect effect. Each indirect effect was significant (i.e., the confidence interval failed to contain zero) and in the predicted direction (Table 5 contains total, direct, and indirect effects of each mediation model). Specifically, grandiose narcissists' enhanced power/control motivation seemed to contribute to their enhanced jealousy induction, but their reduced compensatory self-esteem motivation reduced their jealousy induction (supported by inconsistent mediation). Given the correlational design, however, causality is impossible to infer.

2.1.2. Mediation by personality correlates

Rather than assess apparent causal processes, these models tested whether Machiavellianism and self-esteem can help account for the

³ Participants completed two additional measures in the session: 1) Multidimensional Jealousy Scale (MJS; Pfeiffer & Wong, 1989), which measures one's propensity to experience jealousy and 2) the narcissistic grandiosity component of the PNI (PNI-G; Pincus et al., 2009). The MJS was included for the purpose of assessing a separate theory; it was neither germane to our theoretical framework nor anticipated for reporting on in this study. We made no predictions for the PNI-G, as it may be an amalgamation of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism and include pathological traits that are not central to narcissism (Miller et al., 2014). Participants completed no other measures.

Table 4

Comparison of bivariate correlations between narcissism subtypes and jealousy-induction measures.

	Bivariate correlations		
	NPI	HSNS	PNI-V
Romantic Jealousy-Induction Scale	0.15 _a *	0.16 _a *	0.22 _a **
Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale			
Power/control	0.15 _a *	0.25 _{ab} **	0.32 _b **
Revenge	0.04 _a	0.14 _a *	0.11 _a
Testing/strengthening	-0.07 _a	0.28 _b **	0.30 _b **
Security	-0.05 _a	0.29 _b **	0.30 _b **
Compensatory self-esteem	-0.20 _a **	0.28 _b **	0.34 _b **

Note. See Table 3 for abbreviations.

For Steiger's t -tests, correlations with different subscripts within the same row significantly differ at $p < 0.05$.

* $p < 0.05$.

** $p < 0.01$.

relationship between narcissism and jealousy induction. Because Machiavellianism and self-esteem were weakly related, we entered them simultaneously as mediators of narcissism on jealousy induction. Each indirect effect was significant and in the predicted direction (Table 6). Notably, effects of grandiose narcissism on jealousy induction were suppressed upon controlling for Machiavellianism and accentuated upon controlling for self-esteem, suggesting inconsistent mediation. The mediation evidence is consistent with the notion that grandiose narcissists' manipulative nature facilitates jealousy induction while their high self-esteem reduces their jealousy induction.⁴

2.2. Vulnerable narcissism

As anticipated, vulnerable narcissism related positively to jealousy induction, all offensive and defensive jealousy motives, and Machiavellianism, and it inversely related to trait self-esteem (Tables 3 and 4).

2.2.1. Mediation by jealousy motives

To test whether the effect of vulnerable narcissism on jealousy induction was mediated by each jealousy motive, we ran ten mediation models (5 motives as mediators \times 2 indices of vulnerable narcissism) using PROCESS (Hayes, 2013). Again, we treated the motives separately

⁴ Given that grandiose narcissists' jealousy induction appeared predominantly driven by power/control motives, it is possible that the effects may be amplified by using the "power" subscale of NPI scale (proposed in Kubarych, Deary, & Austin, 2004). Nonetheless, the effects of the NPI Power subscale on jealousy-induction variables appeared identical in overall magnitude (and direction). This suggests that other features of narcissism tapped by the NPI total scale contribute to power assertion in the context of jealousy induction. For example, people who feel entitled might pursue control/power with the distal goal to ensure the self's superior treatment.

Table 5

Total, direct, and indirect effects of narcissism subtypes on jealousy induction via jealousy-induction motives.

Mediation path	Total effect			Direct effect			Indirect effect		
	Effect	SE	<i>p</i>	Effect	SE	<i>p</i>	Effect	SE	95% CI
NPI → POWER → INDUCE	0.164	0.070	0.02	0.073	0.058	0.21	0.091	0.039	[0.021, 0.172]
NPI → CSE → INDUCE				0.253	0.065	0.001	−0.089	0.029	[−0.151, −0.037]
HSNS → POWER → INDUCE	0.174	0.069	0.01	0.022	0.060	0.72	0.153	0.046	[0.071, 0.249]
HSNS → REV → INDUCE				0.097	0.061	0.11	0.077	0.037	[0.009, 0.155]
HSNS → TEST → INDUCE				0.072	0.069	0.29	0.102	0.026	[0.059, 0.165]
HSNS → SECURE → INDUCE				0.097	0.071	0.17	0.078	0.022	[0.042, 0.131]
HSNS → CSE → INDUCE				0.072	0.068	0.29	0.102	0.028	[0.057, 0.169]
PNI-V → POWER → INDUCE	0.24	0.069	0.001	0.045	0.061	0.47	0.195	0.045	[0.118, 0.293]
PNI-V → REV → INDUCE				0.179	0.060	0.003	0.061	0.040	[−0.012, 0.146]
PNI-V → TEST → INDUCE				0.138	0.069	0.05	0.101	0.025	[0.059, 0.161]
PNI-V → SECURE → INDUCE				0.165	0.070	0.02	0.075	0.022	[0.039, 0.131]
PNI-V → CSE → INDUCE				0.123	0.069	0.08	0.116	0.029	[0.069, 0.187]

Note. See Table 3 for abbreviations.

Bolded estimates for unstandardized indirect effects are significant.

p values denoted as 0.001 have significant effects at or below 0.001.

individually rather than simultaneously in mediations because we did not wish to de-confound naturally confounded motives. Each model used 10,000 bootstrap samples with 95% confidence intervals around an indirect effect. Each indirect effect was significant and in the predicted direction (see Table 5).

2.2.2. Mediation by personality correlates

In a multiple mediation analysis, we included Machiavellianism and self-esteem as simultaneous mediators for the effect of vulnerable narcissism on jealousy induction. The results partially supported hypothesis (Table 6). We obtained a significant indirect effect of vulnerable narcissism on jealousy induction through Machiavellianism. The indirect effect of vulnerable narcissism through self-esteem was significant as indexed by HSNS but not by PNI-V. Hence, vulnerable narcissists' manipulative constitution and low self-esteem helps explain their amplified jealousy induction.

3. Discussion

The present findings are limited by methodology. First, all measures were self-report and, hence, susceptible to potentially biased and erroneous responding. Second, given that some researchers have questioned whether the NPI is a valid index of grandiose narcissism (e.g., Ackerman et al., 2011; Brown, Budzek, & Tamborski, 2009; for counter-evidence, Miller & Campbell, 2011; Miller et al., 2014), effects of grandiose narcissism may be cautiously interpreted as effects of NPI-defined grandiose narcissism and may not generalize to non-self-report indices (e.g., clinical diagnoses). Third, because our results were correlational, we cannot derive causal conclusions. Future research might seek to manipulate

jealousy-induction goals in narcissists and non-narcissists and measure their tendencies toward jealousy induction.

Nonetheless, our findings contribute to at least three perspectives on narcissism. First, theorists debate whether grandiose narcissists might conceal personal insecurity behind a veneer of confidence (Bosson et al., 2008). Our data fit with models (e.g., Hart, Adams, & Tortoriello, 2017; Krizan & Johar, 2015) which presume that grandiose narcissists are unlikely insecure individuals that loathe the self. Indeed, grandiose narcissists did not engage in jealousy motives indicative of “relationship insecurity” and revealed reduced tendencies toward motives indicative of self-esteem compensation. Second, theorists debate whether narcissists' narcissistic behavior is better epitomized as tactical (Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Hart, Richardson, Tortoriello, & Tullett, in press) or impulsive (Vazire & Funder, 2006). The present study aligns well with a tactical perspective by implying that some of narcissists' relationship-threatening behavior is strategic. Third, some theorists have suggested that vulnerable narcissists' behavior is less focused than that of their grandiose counterparts (e.g., Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Hart, Adams, & Tortoriello, 2017). The present findings accord with this perspective. Indeed, grandiose narcissists induce jealousy solely as a means to acquire power/control, whereas vulnerable narcissists induce jealousy as a means to fulfill both offensive (e.g., power/control) and defensive (e.g., security) pursuits. Other work supports the notion that grandiose narcissists have a focused approach toward agentic traits, but their vulnerable counterparts reveal a haphazard pursuit of competing traits (Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Hart, Adams, & Tortoriello, 2017).

Interestingly, grandiose narcissism did not relate to revenge motives for inducing jealousy, which might—on the surface—disagree with the notion that grandiose narcissists are highly vengeful people (Brown, 2004; Hart, Adams, Burton et al., 2017; Hart, Adams & Tortoriello,

Table 6

Total, direct, and indirect effects of narcissism subtypes on jealousy induction via personality traits.

Mediation path	Total effect			Direct effect			Indirect effect		
	Effect	SE	<i>p</i>	Effect	SE	<i>p</i>	Effect	SE	95% CI
NPI → (MACH, RSES) → INDUCE	0.164	0.070	0.02	0.164	0.075	0.030	0.000	0.040	[−0.074, 0.083]
NPI → MACH → INDUCE							0.052	0.027	[0.010, 0.118]
NPI → RSES → INDUCE							−0.052	0.023	[−0.106, −0.015]
HSNS → (MACH, RSES) → INDUCE	0.174	0.069	0.01	0.068	0.076	0.37	0.107	0.034	[0.049, 0.182]
HSNS → MACH → INDUCE							0.066	0.028	[0.022, 0.131]
HSNS → RSES → INDUCE							0.041	0.022	[0.001, 0.089]
PNI-V → (MACH, RSES) → INDUCE	0.24	0.069	0.001	0.145	0.080	0.072	0.095	0.039	[0.024, 0.179]
PNI-V → MACH → INDUCE							0.059	0.025	[0.020, 0.119]
PNI-V → RSES → INDUCE							0.036	0.032	[−0.026, 0.101]

Note. See Table 3 for abbreviations.

Bolded estimates for unstandardized indirect effects are significant.

p values denoted as 0.001 have significant effects at or below 0.001.

2017; Krizan & Johar, 2015). But, perhaps their vengefulness fails to extend to behavior in romantic relationships. Indeed, following a partner's infidelity, grandiose narcissists may neither exhibit enhanced anger nor be significantly likely to exact revenge (Besser & Priel, 2010; Rasmussen & Boon, 2014). It is also possible that narcissists' revenge motives in relationships may fail to manifest as jealousy induction but instead manifest as violence or verbal abuse (Rasmussen, 2015).

The present effects might be compared to prior effects examining psychopathy and jealousy induction (Massar, Winters, Lenz, & Jonason, 2016). One conceptualization of psychopathy is that it manifests in two forms: primary and secondary psychopathy (Karpman, 1941). Primary psychopathy is associated with grandiosity, manipulation, and low anxiety and empathy, whereas secondary psychopathy is associated with behavioral delinquency, negative emotionality, and impulsivity (Hare, 2003). Both dimensions of psychopathy appear related to jealousy induction (Massar et al., 2016). However, in Massar et al. (2016), primary psychopathy related to offensive motives (i.e., power/control and revenge), whereas secondary psychopathy related to a mixture of offensive (i.e., power/control) and defensive motives (i.e., testing the relationship and compensatory self-esteem).

Hence, the two sets of findings seemingly confirm overlap between manifestations of psychopathy and narcissism (e.g., Miller et al., 2010), but they also highlight theoretically-meaningful divergences between the traits. First, in Massar et al. (2016), primary psychopathy was unrelated to compensatory self-esteem motives, whereas grandiose narcissism was inversely related. This suggests that grandiose narcissists' high self-esteem subdues jealousy-induction responses (as supported by our mediation modeling), which distinguishes grandiose narcissism from primary psychopathy. Second, secondary psychopathy did not significantly relate to security motives, whereas vulnerable narcissism did relate. Perhaps the more callous psychological profile associated with secondary psychopathy versus the need for relational dependence associated with vulnerable narcissism is what best differentiates these two constructs vis-à-vis jealousy induction.

References

- Ackerman, R. A., Witt, E. A., Donnellan, M. B., Trzesniewski, K. H., Robins, R. W., & Kashy, D. A. (2011). What does the narcissistic personality inventory really measure? *Assessment*, 18, 67–87.
- 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, 874–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.2010.29.8.874>.
- Bosson, J. K., Lakey, C. E., Campbell, W. K., Zeigler-Hill, V., Jordan, C. H., & Kernis, M. H. (2008). Untangling the links between narcissism and self-esteem: A theoretical and empirical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Compass*, 2, 1415–1439. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00089.x>.
- Brown, R. P. (2004). Vengeance is mine: Narcissism, vengeance, and the tendency to forgive. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 38(6), 576–584. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2003.10.003>.
- Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35, 951–964. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167209335461>.
- Brunell, A. B., & Fisher, T. D. (2014). Using the bogus pipeline to investigate grandiose narcissism. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 55, 37–42. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2014.05.015>.
- Buss, D. M., & Shackelford, T. K. (1997). Susceptibility to infidelity in the first year of marriage. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(2), 193–221. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2175>.
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, C. A. (2002). Narcissism and commitment in romantic relationships: An investment model analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(4), 484–495. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167202287006>.
- Campbell, W. K., Foster, C. A., & Finkel, E. J. (2002). Does self-love lead to love for others? A story of narcissistic game playing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(2), 340–354. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.2.340>.
- Christie, R., & Geis, F. L. (1970). *Studies in Machiavellianism*. New York, NY: Academic Press.
- Dickinson, K. A., & Pincus, A. L. (2003). Interpersonal analysis of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, 17(3), 188–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/pedi.17.3.188.22146>.
- Fleischmann, A. A., Spitzberg, B. H., Andersen, P. A., & Roesch, S. C. (2005). Ticking the monster: Jealousy induction in relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 22(1), 49–73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407505049321>.
- Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (1995). Implicit social cognition: Attitudes, self-esteem, and stereotypes. *Psychological Review*, 102, 4–27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.102.1.4>.
- Grijalva, E., Newman, D. A., Tay, L., Donnellan, M. B., Harms, P. D., Robins, R. W., & Yan, T. (2015). Gender differences in narcissism: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141, 261–310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0038231>.
- Hare, R. D. (2003). *The Hare psychopathy checklist-revised (PCL-R)*. Toronto, Ontario: Multi-Health Systems.
- Hart, W., Adams, J., Burton, K. A., & Tortoriello, G. K. (2017). Narcissism and self-presentation: Profiling grandiose and vulnerable narcissists' self-presentation tactic use. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 104, 48–57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.062>.
- Hart, W., Adams, J. M., & Tortoriello, G. (2017). Narcissistic responses to provocation: An examination of the rage and threatened-egotism accounts. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 106, 152–156. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.049>.
- Hart, W., Richardson, K., Tortoriello, G., & Tullett, A. (2017). Strategically out of control: A self-presentational conceptualization of narcissism and low self-control. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 114, 103–107.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Hendin, H. M., & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A reexamination of Murray's Narcissism Scale. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 31(4), 588–599. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jrpe.1997.2204>.
- Hendrick, C., & Hendrick, S. (1986). A theory and method of love. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 392–402.
- Hunyady, O., Josephs, L., & Jost, J. T. (2008). Priming the primal scene: Betrayal trauma, narcissism, and attitudes toward sexual infidelity. *Self and Identity*, 7(3), 278–294. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298860701620227>.
- Karpman, B. (1941). On the need for separating psychopathy into two distinct clinical types: Symptomatic and idiopathic. *Journal of Criminology and Psychopathology*, 3, 112–137.
- Krizan, Z., & Johar, O. (2015). Narcissistic rage revisited. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 108, 784–801. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000013>.
- Kubarych, T. S., Deary, I. J., & Austin, E. J. (2004). The narcissistic personality inventory: Factor structure in a non-clinical sample. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36, 857–872.
- Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 34–47.
- Massar, K., Winters, C. L., Lenz, S., & Jonason, P. K. (2016). Green-eyed snakes: The association between psychopathy, jealousy, and jealousy induction. *Personality and Individual Differences*. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.01.055>.
- Mattingly, B. A., Whitson, D., & Mattingly, M. B. (2012). Development of the Romantic Jealousy-Induction Scale and the Motives for Inducing Romantic Jealousy Scale. *Current Psychology: A Journal for Diverse Perspectives on Diverse Psychological Issues*, 31(3), 263–281. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s12144-012-9144-3>.
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Addressing criticisms of the narcissistic personality inventory (NPI). In W. K. Campbell, & J. D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder* (pp. 146–152). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- 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, 1529–1564. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00660.x>.
- Miller, J. D., Hoffman, B. J., Gaughan, E. T., Gentile, B., Maples, J., & Campbell, W. K. (2011). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: A nomological network analysis. *Journal of Personality*, 79(5), 1013–1042. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00711.x>.
- 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), 958–969. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0036613>.
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The dark triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556–563. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6).
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2013.868368>.
- Pfeiffer, S. M., & Wong, P. T. (1989). Multidimensional jealousy. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 6(2), 181–196. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/026540758900600203>.
- Pincus, A. L., Ansell, E. B., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. G., & Levy, K. N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 21(3), 365.
- Raskin, R., & Terry, H. (1988). A principal-components analysis of the narcissistic personality inventory and further evidence of its construct validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 54(5), 890–902. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.5.890>.
- Rasmussen, K. (2015). Entitled vengeance: A meta-analysis relating narcissism to provoked aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 42(4), 362–379. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.21632>.
- Rasmussen, K. R., & Boon, S. D. (2014). Romantic revenge and the dark triad: A model of impellance and inhibition. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 51–56. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.018>.
- Rohmann, E., Neumann, E., Herner, M. J., & Bierhoff, H. (2012). Grandiose and vulnerable narcissism: Self-construal, attachment, and love in romantic relationships. *European Psychologist*, 17(4), 279–290. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000100>.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: University Press.
- Vazire, S., & Funder, D. C. (2006). Impulsivity and the self-defeating behavior of narcissists. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 10, 154–165. http://dx.doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr1002_4.

- Wade, T. J., & Weinstein, A. B. (2011). Jealousy induction: Which tactics are perceived as most effective? *Journal of Social, Evolutionary, and Cultural Psychology*, 5(4), 231–238. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0099260>.
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.5.819>.
- Westen, D. (1990). The relations among narcissism, egocentrism, self-concept, and self-esteem: Experimental, clinical, and theoretical considerations. *Psychoanalysis and Contemporary Thought*, 13(2), 183–239.
- White, G. L. (1980). Inducing jealousy: A power perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 6, 222–227.
- Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4), 590–597. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.590>.
- Wright, A. C., Lukowitsky, M. R., Pincus, A. L., & Conroy, D. E. (2010). The higher order factor structure and gender invariance of the pathological narcissism inventory. *Assessment*, 17(4), 467–483. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1073191110373227>.