



Towards integration of communal narcissism within the structure of the narcissistic personality traits

Marta Rogoza^{a,c,*}, Marta Marchlewska^a, Radosław Rogoza^{b,c}

^a Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Social Innovation Chair, University of Lleida, Spain

^b Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Poland

^c Social Innovation Chair, University of Lleida, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Communal narcissism
Narcissism
Structure
Communion

ABSTRACT

There are three facets of narcissism: agentic, antagonistic, and neurotic. However, not all narcissistic constructs fit into this structural organization. Across two self-report studies ($N = 1154$) and one social network study ($N = 246$; $N = 5986$ total observations), we analyse if communal narcissism could be meaningfully integrated with this three-factor conceptualization of narcissism. We provide evidence that communal narcissism is negatively related to agreeableness when controlling for communion. Also, such residualised communal narcissism negatively predicts objective prosociality as well as being liked less (when controlled for liking others). Relations of the residualised communal narcissism to the facets of narcissism allows to fit this construct within the spectrum of narcissistic personality.

1. Towards integration of communal narcissism

Although narcissism is a heterogenous construct full of apparent paradoxes (Morf & Rhodewalt, 2001), recent research brought a significant advancement in the field leading to a wide-agreement that the two phenotypes of narcissism (i.e., grandiose and vulnerable) are composed of three facets: antagonistic (i.e., self-protection through arrogant, aggressiveness and exploitation), agentic (i.e., assertive self-enhancement through self-promotion), and neurotic (i.e., narcissistic insecurity and hypersensitivity). Within this “trifurcated” model of narcissism, antagonism is identified as the “core” narcissistic construct in that it is shared by the grandiose and vulnerable phenotypes (Ackerman et al., 2019; Back, 2018; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Rogoza et al., 2022; Wright & Edershile, 2018)¹. Still, within the literature, there are some narcissistic constructs, which are not covered by this model. One of such, less studied narcissistic constructs, is the communal narcissism (Gebauer et al., 2012; Rogoza et al., 2019), interpreted as an agentic trait fulfilling the self-views of exceptional self-importance, entitlement, and social power, but using communal means (Gebauer & Sedikides, 2017). Communal narcissism already found a considerable amount of empirical evidence supporting its very existence as well as distinctiveness from other constructs (e.g.,

Gebauer et al., 2012; Mota et al., 2019; Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2020). However, it has not yet been located within the established structure of narcissism (Rogoza et al., 2019) nor it might be even considered as a “dark trait” (Kowalski et al., 2021; Rogoza, Kowalski, et al., 2022), which may raise the question whether the communal narcissism could be still labelled as narcissism? This is the particular question we attempt to address in the current research.

1.1. Communal narcissism as a superficial self-presentation style?

Research on communal narcissism demonstrates that it is consistently linked to higher levels of agreeableness (Gebauer et al., 2012; Rogoza & Fatfouta, 2019) as well as to its more behavioural indicator of liking others (Rentzsch & Gebauer, 2019). Furthermore, communal narcissism has been also positively linked to self-viewed prosociality (Yang et al., 2018), declared levels of civic engagement (Nehrlich et al., 2018), pro-environmentalism (Naderi, 2018), as well as to explicit communal self-views (Fatfouta et al., 2017). On the contrary, however, these effects wore off when more objective methods of assessment were used. For instance, communal narcissism is unrelated to prosociality as assessed through actual behaviour and informant reports in real-life setting (Nehrlich et al., 2018), does not predict donating to pro-

* Corresponding author at: Institute of Psychology, Institute of Psychology, Polish Academy of Sciences, Jaracza 1, 00-378 Warsaw, Poland.

E-mail address: mrogoza@psych.pan.pl (M. Rogoza).

¹ This distinction represents personality psychology view on narcissism (see Miller et al., 2021), however, within the literature on the psychology of self, one might find an alternative view on the core of narcissism, arguing that all forms of narcissism share an excessive focus on self (see Sedikides, 2021).

environmental charity foundations (Naderi, 2018), nor is related to the implicit communal self-views (Fatfouta & Schröder-Abé, 2018). Furthermore, while individuals scoring high on communal narcissism are being liked more because they like other people more than individuals scoring low on narcissism (i.e., the tit-for-tat hypothesis), this association turns more negative if one controls for their tendency to like others (Rentzsch & Gebauer, 2019).

Bearing in mind that those scoring high in communal narcissism hold the global self-evaluations of exceptional self-importance, entitlement, social power (Gebauer & Sedikides, 2017), and describe themselves through communal means but are not seen as such by others, one might interpret communal narcissism as a specific, superficial self-presentation style of grandiose narcissism. While individuals scoring high in grandiose narcissism are usually less motivated by rewards from communal services (Campbell & Foster, 2007), it does not necessarily imply that they do not engage in such activities (Gebauer et al., 2012). Accordingly to Konrath and Tian (2018) those who score high in grandiose narcissism might engage in communal activities such as volunteering for non-profit organizations if this has the potential to enhance their career or if it could bring them attention and admiration they crave (see also Rogoza, Marchlewska et al., 2021). Thus, communal narcissism, while empirically distinguishable, it might be “only” a grandiose narcissism realized in a different domain.

Such interpretation of the communal narcissism is likely to enhance understanding of not only this particular construct, but also would allow to integrate it within the existing models of narcissistic personality (Ackerman et al., 2019; Back, 2018; Miller & Campbell, 2008; Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Rogoza et al., 2022; Wright & Edershile, 2018). Currently, the core of the structure of narcissism (i.e., the antagonistic facet) is linked either to low agreeableness (Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Paulhus, 2001) as well as to its specific indicators (e.g., being disliked by others; Leckelt et al., 2015; Rogoza et al., 2021). Thus, the positive relation of communal narcissism to agreeableness, from structural perspective, denies it could be seen as narcissism unless it could be proven otherwise. Within the current study, we aim to provide such evidence, claiming that even in the light of being seen oxymoronic at the first glance, communal narcissism is still a narcissism.

2. Current study

As already stated, we attempt to provide evidence that communal narcissism could be meaningfully located within the existing three-factorial structure of narcissism. Thus, we aim to demonstrate that communal narcissism is a superficial self-presentation style, and the effects of this superficiality could be wore off during the analyses. First two hypotheses regard zero-order relations. Communal narcissism should be related (H1) to other communal-oriented traits (e.g., agreeableness, liking others). Still, as it is hypothesized to be a superficial style of self-presentation, it is expected (H2) to be unrelated to behavioural indices of such (i.e., donating money for charity purposes).

The following hypotheses regard residualised relations. That is, we expect that these expected superficial effects identified in H1 and H2 could be wore off through controlling of shared variance with communal traits (i.e., corporate social responsibility and civic engagement in Study 1), communion itself (Study 2), and self-reported liking others (Study 3). More precisely, we hypothesize to find (H3) a negative correlation between residualised communal narcissism and self-reported agreeableness. We also expect (H4) a negative link between residualised communal narcissism and behavioural task of donating money for charity causes. Finally, accordingly with the literature (Rentzsch & Gebauer, 2019), we also expect that the residualised communal narcissism should be related negatively to peer-reported being liked (H5). The raw data and statistical script are available at: <https://osf.io/8vfv72> The hypotheses were not preregistered. The a priori power consideration computed in GPower v. 3.1.9.7 for Poisson regression (with $\exp(\beta_1) = 1.3$; $\alpha = 0.05$) and power equalling 0.80 indicated that

the minimal sample size should be no < 372 (and 515 for power = 0.90).

3. Method

3.1. Participants and procedure

Study 1 and Study 2. Data were gathered from two independent Polish community online samples. The surveys were fully anonymous, without collecting any sort of personal data. Participation was voluntary; each participant had the right to terminate at any time, and only fully completed questionnaires approved by the participant at the end of the survey were submitted to the database. As a result, no missingness were observed in both datasets. All of the measures were administered in Polish and there were no incentives for participants upon completion of the study. In sum in Study 1 we recruited 620 people aged from 18 to 70 years old (54 % women, $M_{age} = 29.08$, $SD = 10.08$). In Study 2 we gathered responses from 534 people aged from 18 to 70 years old (54 % women, $M_{age} = 30.99$, $SD = 9.01$).

Study 3. The study reported in this paper is a part of a larger longitudinal project evaluating the dynamics of relationship development (for more details see Rogoza, Danieluk et al., 2021). The study regarding communal narcissism was conducted on 10 classes of secondary school students, three months after the start of the school year. Existing studies suggest the three-months interval is sufficient for making relations stable (Selfhout et al., 2010). We report the data gathered from $N = 246$ adolescents (57.3 % girls; 98.4 % of sample aged 16 and 1.6 % aged 15). Students participating within the current study met weekly (from Monday to Friday) for approximately 35 h during three consecutive months before the study. Those students who were absent during the study ($n = 26$; 9.58 % of total sample; i.e., 272) were listwise removed from the analyses. Data was collected during the single lesson of 45 min in which students were administered a set of network measure and self-reported questionnaires. We followed regular ethical standards and all personal data were removed prior to the analyses. The study was conducted with the consent of students, their parents, and school headmasters.

3.2. Measures

Communal Narcissism Inventory (CNI; Gebauer et al., 2012; Żemajtł-Piotrowska et al., 2016). Within the literature, there is only one measure to assess communal narcissism, which we employed in all three of the reported studies. It comprises of sixteen statements (sample item: *I am the most caring person in my social surrounding*) to which respondents answer through rating their agreement using seven-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). The communal narcissism score was computed as a mean result across all the items. The measure has been used in all studies.

Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Questionnaire (NARQ; Back et al., 2013; Rogoza et al., 2016). The NARQ assesses two dimensions of narcissistic personality, that is, admiration (sample item: *Being a very special person gives me a lot of strength*) capturing agentic facet and rivalry (sample item: *I can barely stand it if another person is at the center of events*) capturing antagonistic facet (Back, 2018). It is comprised of eighteen items to which respondents answer through rating their agreement to each statement using six-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*not agree at all*) to 6 (*agree completely*). The questionnaire has been used in Study 1 and Study 2.

Five Factor Narcissism Inventory – Super short Form (FFNI-SSF; West et al., 2021). The FFNI-SSF is a brief measure of all the facets of narcissism (i.e., agentic extraversion; sample item: *I often fantasize about having lots of success and power, self-centred antagonism*; sample item: *It may seem unfair, but I deserve extra (i.e., attention, privileges, rewards)*); and narcissistic neuroticism; sample item: *I wish I didn't care so much about what others think of me*). It comprises fifteen items to which respondents rate their agreement using five-point Likert-type response

scale ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). In the current study, we used the scoring as outlined in Rogoza, Ciecuch, Strus, and Klosowski (2021), that is, agentic extraversion was computed using the indicators of acclaim seeking, authoritativeness, exhibitionism, and manipulativeness; self-centred antagonism was computed as a mean score of exploitativeness, lack of empathy, entitlement, and distrust; and narcissistic neuroticism was computed as a mean of shame, (reversed) indifference, need for admiration, and reactive anger. Moreover, we also scored grandiose and vulnerable narcissism composite scores (Rogoza, Ciecuch, et al., 2021). The measure has been used in Study 1 and Study 2.

Big Five Inventory-2 (BFI-2; Soto & John, 2017). To capture basic personality traits we used the BFI-2. It is comprised of 60 items on which respondents rate their agreement using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*disagree strongly*) to 5 (*agree strongly*). We calculated five domain scores of negative emotionality (i.e., renamed neuroticism; sample item: *Is moody, has up and down mood swings*), extraversion (sample item: *Is outgoing, sociable*), open-mindedness (i.e., renamed openness to experience; sample item: *Is curious about many different things*), agreeableness (sample item: *Is compassionate, has a soft heart*), and conscientiousness (sample item: *Is systematic, likes to keep things in order*). Due to the fact that narcissism research is strongly embedded within the nomenclature of the Five Factor Model of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1997), we use the original labeling (i.e., neuroticism and openness to experience instead of negative emotionality and open-mindedness) of the basic traits. In Study 1, we used the full measure, while in Study 2, we assessed only two traits, which are most important for grandiose narcissism, that is – agreeableness and extraversion (Paulhus, 2001).

Charity donation task (Naderi, 2018). All of the participants were entered into a drawing for a chance to win one of 10 prizes that was 25 Polish Zlotys. At the end of the Study 1 and Study 2, participants were informed that *IF* they would win the draw, they could choose all, a portion or nothing of this money to be donated on their behalf to Empowering Children Foundation (which is focused on protecting children from abuse and on minimising the effects of the abuse experience) in Study 1 and MONAR (which is a non-governmental organization that helps people in difficult life circumstances and who may be socially excluded, are homeless, living with AIDS or addicted to alcohol and drugs) in Study 2. Brief description of the foundations was provided in case participants were not aware of the mission of the foundations. Participants indicated the amount (between 0 and 25 Polish Zlotys) to be donated to the foundation if they were among the winners. At the end of the study, the indicated donations were made to the foundations. Their donations in Polish Zlotys (in Study 1 $M = 16.84$, $SD = 11.03$, and in Study 2 $M = 16.57$, $SD = 10.86$), served as the measure of objective prosociality, as previously done in the literature (Naderi, 2018; Nehrlich et al., 2018).

Corporate Social Responsibility Scale (CSR) which is considered as a degree of involvement in pro-ecological activities, buying products for ethical reasons or donating money to charity (Furman et al., 2020; Rogoza, Marchlewska et al., 2021). The respondents assessed to what extent they recognized these behaviours as representative of them, using a five-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*definitely unusual for me*) to 5 (*definitely typical of me*). The measure has been used only in Study 1.

Civic Engagement Scale (Shah, 1998) is a measure consisted of 7 items created to assess civic involvement (example item is *I am influential in my neighborhood*). Respondents had to indicate how often during the past 12 months they have engaged in mentioned activities. Due the error in study preparation, the CES was administered only to $n = 454$ participants. The measure has been used only in Study 2.

Scale of Agency and Communion (Wojciszke & Szelendak, 2010) is comprised of 15 agentic (e.g., *competent, efficient and determined*) and 15 communal (e.g., *friendly, tolerant, and trustworthy*) trait names. Respondents answered about themselves by using self-descriptive rating scale from 1 (*definitely not*) to 7 (*definitely yes*). The measure has been

used only in Study 2.

Measurement of Liking Others and Being Liked. In Study 3, we used the most common approach in measuring social relations (i.e., a binary measure). Each of the class student was administered a full list of class members and was asked to indicate the classmates he or she like. We did not constrain the number of these liking nominations to any particular number, that is – each student has the possibility to indicate no one or select all of class members. These nominations were recoded as separate binary matrix for each class where 0 indicated absence of liking and 1 reflected liking. In sum, we gathered $N = 5,986$ peer reports of liking.

4. Results

4.1. Study 1

Zero-Order Relations. The descriptive statistics, estimates of internal consistency, and scale intercorrelations of all variables utilized in Study 1 are given in Table 1. Expectedly (H1), communal narcissism was the only narcissistic trait to be positively related to agreeableness, whereas all other were related negatively (except for narcissistic admiration, which relation was negative, albeit non-significant). Results of the Poisson regression (which was employed due the count character of data of the charity donation task) revealed that communal narcissism was unrelated to charity donation ($B = -0.01 [-0.03, 0.01]$; $p = .205$), supporting our second hypothesis (H2). At the same time, we found that agreeableness predicted positively donating to charity ($B = 0.09 [0.06, 0.13]$; $p (0.01)$). Grandiose narcissism was a significant negative predictor of the donation task ($B = -0.13 [-0.15, -0.10]$; $p < 0.01$), and so was the relation to vulnerable narcissism, albeit at the boundary of threshold ($B = -0.02 [-0.05, 0.00]$; $p = 0.39$). In regard to other measures of narcissism, agentic [Admiration: $B = -0.06 [-0.08, -0.04]$; $p < .001$; Agentic extraversion: $B = -0.05 [-0.07, -0.03]$; $p < .001$] and antagonistic [Rivalry: $B = -0.08 [-0.10, -0.06]$; $p < .001$; Self-centred antagonism: $B = -0.11 [-0.13, -0.09]$; $p < .001$] narcissism were related negatively to donating to charity, while neurotic facet was unrelated to it ($B = 0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]$; $p = 788$).

Residualised Relations. Finally, we assessed whether accounting for the shared variance with corporate social responsibility/civic engagement would change these relations. In regard to agreeableness, accounting for neither corporate social responsibility ($\beta = 18$; $p < .001$) nor civic engagement ($\beta = 26$; $p < .001$) changed the direction of relation of communal narcissism to agreeableness ($\beta = 0.15$; $p < .001$; $\beta = 0.16$; $p < .001$, respectively). Although it was smaller than the zero-order correlation, it was still positive and significant, thus rejecting our hypothesis (H3). In regard to charity donation, again, accounting neither for the corporate social responsibility ($B = 0.02 [0.00, 0.04]$; $p = .081$) nor civic engagement ($B = 0.02 [-0.01, 0.05]$; $p = 240$) made communal narcissism a significant predictor ($B = -0.02 [-0.04, 0.00]$; $p = .087$; $B = 0.01 [-0.01, 0.03]$; $p = 365$, respectively). Thus, the H4 was rejected as well.

4.2. Study 2

Zero-Order Relations. The second study is a conceptual replication of the Study 1, except that instead measuring communal-related traits, we measured communion more broadly. The descriptive statistics and scale intercorrelations of all variables utilized in Study 2 are given in Table 2. As in Study 1, the agreeableness was related positively to communal narcissism, but negatively to all other narcissistic traits, thus, again supporting the H1. Communal narcissism was not a significant predictor of charity donating behaviours ($B = -0.02 [-0.03, 0.00]$; $p = 0.93$), again providing support for the H2. As for other traits, we replicated all our previous findings. That is, agreeableness predicted positively donating to charity ($B = 0.14 [0.10, 0.17]$; $p < .001$). Grandiose narcissism was a significant and negative predictor of the donation task

Table 1
Internal Consistencies, Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations of Study 1 Variables.

	α	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	13
1 Communal narcissism	0.92	4.09	1.05										
2 Grandiose narcissism	0.79	2.64	0.75	0.38*									
3 Vulnerable narcissism	0.74	2.91	0.85	-0.01	0.06								
2 Admiration	0.87	3.47	1.02	0.54*	0.69*	-0.04							
3 Rivalry	0.85	2.50	0.99	0.14*	0.57*	0.35*	0.47*						
4 Agentic Extraversion	0.67	3.31	0.91	0.39*	0.86*	-0.04	0.65*	0.36*					
5 Self-Centred Antagonism	0.68	2.35	0.84	0.18*	0.77*	0.27*	0.44*	0.65*	0.44*				
6 Narcissistic Neuroticism	0.74	2.94	0.97	-0.03	-0.02	0.96*	-0.08	0.27*	-0.09	0.10			
7 Extraversion	0.87	3.34	0.75	0.33*	0.40*	-0.29*	0.52*	-0.02	0.57*	0.04	-0.28*		
8 Agreeableness	0.79	3.61	0.60	0.20*	-0.43*	-0.13*	-0.10	-0.50*	-0.25*	-0.58*	-0.02	0.09	
9 Conscientiousness	0.87	3.53	0.74	0.17*	-0.15*	-0.15*	-0.07	-0.26*	-0.04	-0.22*	-0.14*	0.30*	
10 Neuroticism	0.86	3.02	0.75	-0.17*	-0.11	0.53*	-0.23*	0.15*	-0.16*	0.04	0.52*	-0.43*	
11 Openness	0.81	3.71	0.66	0.19*	0.14*	-0.11	0.29*	-0.09	0.28*	-0.08	-0.08	0.37*	
12 Corporate Social Responsibility	0.82	3.33	0.88	0.28*	0.02	-0.06	0.12*	-0.11	0.08	-0.12*	-0.03	0.19*	
13 Civic Engagement	0.76	3.11	0.83	0.32*	-0.02	0.01	0.04	-0.14	0.03	-0.09	0.02	0.16*	0.61*

Note. Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons applied. Marked significant at $p = .003$. For the sake of table comprehensiveness, we do not report intercorrelations between the basic personality traits as well as 95 % confidence intervals. These are available at the supplementary materials at the OSF page.

Table 2
Descriptive Statistics and Intercorrelations of Study 2 Variables.

	α	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1 Communal narcissism	0.93	3.92	1.13											
2 Grandiose narcissism	0.81	2.58	0.81	0.43*										
3 Vulnerable narcissism	0.71	2.97	0.88	0.09	0.11									
4 Admiration	0.85	3.35	0.99	0.63*	0.69*	0.04								
5 Rivalry	0.88	2.55	1.10	0.27*	0.64*	0.42*	0.51*							
6 Agentic Extraversion	0.69	3.02	0.94	0.43*	0.85*	0.01	0.67*	0.40*						
7 Self-Centred Antagonism	0.73	2.35	0.90	0.25*	0.80*	0.33*	0.46*	0.70*	0.45*					
8 Narcissistic Neuroticism	0.74	3.01	0.99	0.08	0.01	0.96*	0.01	0.34*	-0.05	0.16*				
9 Extraversion	0.86	3.27	0.76	0.27*	0.34*	-0.32*	0.49*	-0.06	0.55*	-0.01	-0.32*			
10 Agreeableness	0.80	3.61	0.61	0.15*	-0.48*	-0.16*	-0.16*	-0.53*	-0.28*	-0.59*	-0.05	0.08		
11 Agency	0.93	4.91	1.11	0.49*	0.43*	-0.25*	0.61*	0.06	0.55*	0.14*	-0.26*	0.69*	0.10*	
12 Communion	0.94	5.59	0.95	0.39*	-0.19*	0.02	0.10	-0.28*	-0.01	-0.36*	0.09	0.15	0.68*	0.38*

Note. Bonferroni correction for multiple comparisons applied. Marked significant at $p = .005$. For the sake of table comprehensiveness, we do not report the 95 % confidence intervals. These are available as supplementary materials at the OSF page.

($B = -0.12 [-0.15, -0.09]$; $p < .001$), while vulnerable narcissism was a non-significant predictor ($B = -0.02 [-0.04, 0.00]$; $p = 101$). As for the facets of narcissism, agentic (Admiration: $B = -0.05 [-0.07, -0.02]$; $p < .001$; Agentic extraversion: $B = -0.06 [-0.08, -0.04]$; $p < .001$) and antagonistic (Rivalry: $B = -0.08 [-0.10, -0.06]$; Self-centred antagonism: $B = -0.12 [-0.14, -0.09]$; $p < .001$) predicted donation to charity negatively, while neurotic facet of narcissism was a non-significant predictor ($B = 0.00 [-0.03, 0.02]$; $p = 704$).

Residualised Relations. When communal narcissism was entered into a single regression model alongside communion ($\beta = 0.73$; $p < .001$) predicting agreeableness, the observed relation of the former was negative ($\beta = -0.14$; $p < .001$), supporting the H3. Communal narcissism, when controlled for the shared variance with communion, appeared as a significant and negative predictor of charity donation behaviour ($B = -0.05 [-0.07, -0.03]$; $p < .001$). Communion, in turn ($B = 0.12 [0.09, 0.14]$; $p < .001$) positively predicted charity donation behaviour. Thus, H4 was confirmed in the second study in full. Interestingly, the residualised communal narcissism demonstrated stronger relations to grandiose narcissism ($\beta = 0.60$; $p < .001$) and its facets: agentic (Admiration: $\beta = 0.70$; $p < .001$; Agentic extraversion: $\beta = 0.51$; $p < .001$) and antagonistic facets of narcissism (Rivalry: $\beta = 0.45$; $p < .001$; Self-centred antagonism: $\beta = 0.46$; $p < .001$) but not to the vulnerable narcissism ($\beta = 0.10$; $p = .040$) nor the neurotic facet ($\beta = 0.06$; $p = .228$).

5. Study 3

5.1. Statistical analyses

To assess how communal narcissism predicts liking others and being liked, we used the Temporal Exponential Random Graph Model (TERGM; Leifeld, Cranmer, & Desmarais, 2018). The TERGM is a multigroup extension of the Exponential Random Graph Model, which allows to study connections and behaviour of individuals in social groups (Lusher, Koskinen, & Robins, 2013). That is, it allows to evaluate mechanisms of network formation (such as mutuality of relations) with simultaneous consideration of the impact of individual attributes (i.e., here: how scores on communal narcissism predict incoming (being liked) and outgoing (liking others) relations). The TERGM was estimated by Markov Chain Monte Carlo Maximum Likelihood Estimation (MCMC-MLE), as implemented in the *xergm* package (Leifeld, Cranmer, & Desmarais, 2016) available in R (R Core Team, 2015).

Of main interest were the “Receiver” and “Sender” effects, reflecting how communal narcissism predicts being liked liking others. Additionally, we estimated the *Edges*, which negative values informs, whether the relations are not likely to be formed at random; mutuality parameter, informing whether individuals within the network have a general tendency to reciprocate liking relation, Geometrically Weighted Edgewise Shared Partner (*GWESP*), which informs whether direct friends have other shared friends; and Absolute Values of the Difference (*abs diff*), which informs about the tendency of group members having similar levels of communal narcissism to like each other more than expected by chance (*abs diff*).

6. Results

At zero-order level, communal narcissism ($M = 4.18$; $SD = 0.87$; $\alpha = 0.92$) was unrelated to being liked ($r = 0.00$; $p = .945$; $M = 0.27$; $SD = 0.13$) and weakly positively related to liking others ($r = 0.14$; $p = .032$; $M = 0.27$; $SD = 0.17$). Liking others and being liked were moderately and positively related one to another ($r = 0.40$; $p < .001$). The results of the TERGM are provided in Table 3. The value of *Edge* was negative and significant in all models, which means that the relations within networks were not formed at random and thus, are meaningful to interpret. In the zero-order models, communal narcissism was a non-significant predictor of being liked, and a significant positive predictor of liking others. In the residualised model, in which we controlled for the shared variance between liking others and being liked, we found that communal narcissism positively predicted liking others (confirming H1), but negatively predicted being liked (confirming H5). These results supports the assumed hypotheses stating that communal narcissists reports to like other more (H1), but are disliked in return when one controls for their tendency to liking others (H5). The *GWESP* values across all models, were positive and significant, suggesting that people within the analysed network share third-party friends. Estimates of the absolute difference were also the same across all models and were non-significant, suggesting that those who score similar on communal narcissism are unlikely neither to like or dislike each other. The values of *mutuality* were positive and significant across all models, which suggest that in general, the liking relations were mostly reciprocated.

7. Discussion

Within the current paper we attempted to embed the communal narcissism within the three-factor structure of narcissistic personality (Ackerman et al., 2019; Back, 2018; Krizan & Herlache, 2018; Wright & Edershile, 2018). Until now, the status of communal narcissism was to some extent uncertain as due its positive correlation to agreeableness, while antagonism is identified as the “core” of narcissistic personality structure (Miller et al., 2021; Rogoza et al., 2022). As a result, existing theoretical accounts (e.g., Krizan & Herlache, 2018) did not even mentioned communal narcissism. In fact, research on communal narcissism continue in quite independence to the “mainstream” research on narcissism. For instance, leading research on communal narcissism differentiate communal from grandiose narcissism (Rentzsch & Gebauer, 2019), however, the agentic and antagonistic facets of grandiose narcissism are not appropriately addressed (Back, 2018; Sedikides, 2021). Thus, we aimed, at least in some preliminary extent, to connect these two research branches, hoping to lead to a better understanding of the construct of narcissism.

We have executed two well-powered self-report studies, including a behavioural charity donation task, and one social network study gathering almost 6000 peer-reports. First, we expected that communal narcissism would be positively related to agreeableness and both self-report studies supported this claim. In a similar vein, in Study 3 we found that communal narcissism was related to liking others. This finding is not surprising neither theoretically, as communal narcissism

uses communal means to realize one’s goals nor empirically, as previous research already reported such result (e.g., Gebauer et al., 2012). Second, as in the end, individuals scoring high in communal narcissism are expected to realize agentic goals (Gebauer & Sedikides, 2017), we did not expect it to positively predict more objective communal behaviours such as donating money for charity purposes. The results we obtained, were congruent to what was already present within the literature (Naderi, 2018) – individuals scoring high in communal narcissism, despite declaring their willingness to help in self-report, does not exhibit any actual prosocial behaviours, supporting our second hypothesis. What is worth noting is that we purposely changed the supported foundation, from helping severely ill children in Study 1 to helping addicted and socially excluded people in Study 2. Despite this radical change, the findings were all nearly identical, providing evidence of robustness of our expectations. The results from the social network study were highly congruent on this issue as we revealed that communal narcissism predicts liking others more, but is unrelated to being liked by others.

Seeking of how one could disentangle communion and narcissism out from communal narcissism, we used a similar methodology as typically used in respect to collective narcissism. Within social psychology, researchers differentiate between the two types of ingroup identity: secure and defensive (i.e., narcissistic; e.g., Marchlewska et al., 2021; for a review see Cichocka, 2016). To assess the effects of narcissistic versus secure identity on other variables (e.g., support for populism; Marchlewska et al., 2018), one needs to control for the shared variance between collective narcissism and classic forms of ingroup identification. In such way, one is able to observe the unique effects of secure versus narcissistic form of ingroup identity separately one from another. In fact, this is the standard procedure in studying collective narcissism, which, in some cases, even changed the direction of the relationships between collective narcissism and many variables (e.g., ingroup disloyalty was found to be positively related to national narcissism after accounting for the variance shared between the two types of identity; Marchlewska et al., 2020). In the first study, to divide communal narcissism, we introduced previously found to be positively related to communal narcissism indices of subjective prosociality (i.e., civic engagement and corporate social responsibility; Nehrlich et al., 2018). These, however, did not changed the observed results. Communal narcissism still was positively related to agreeableness and did not predict objective donation for charity purposes. It seems, that these constructs are too narrow to sufficiently disentangle communal narcissism. To address this limitation, in the second study we used directly measured communion. When controlling for communion, we reversed how communal narcissism was related to agreeableness. Furthermore, communal narcissism appeared as a negative predictor of objective prosociality in the same extent as grandiose narcissism, thus, supporting our fourth hypothesis.

Our final hypothesis regarding the residualised effects was tested in our social network study. At the zero-order level, we have found a no relation between communal narcissism and being liked by others, however when we controlled for the self-reported liking others, the effect of being liked turned negative. Thus, on one hand we provided

Table 3
Estimates of the Temporal Exponential Random Graph Model.

	Zero-Order			Residualised						
	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p	Estimate	SE	p	
Main effects										
Liking others	–	–	–	0.10	0.03	0.001	0.22	0.04	<0.001	
Being liked	–0.01	0.03	0.772	–	–	–	–0.15	0.04	<0.001	
Exogenous network dependencies										
Edge	–4.13	0.20	<0.001	–4.51	0.22	<0.001	–4.40	0.22	<0.001	
Mutuality	2.32	0.10	<0.001	2.31	0.11	<0.001	2.33	0.10	<0.001	
GWESP	1.75	0.14	<0.001	1.70	0.14	<0.001	1.71	0.15	<0.001	
Communal narcissism: abs diff	–0.01	0.03	0.772	–0.01	0.03	0.878	–0.02	0.03	0.508	

support for the tit-for-tat hypothesis (i.e., individuals scoring high on communal narcissism might be liked more because they like other people more), but we also revealed that this effect falls off when controlled for the self-declared liking others. Although the network study was conducted on adolescent population, these findings are congruent to the ones already reported in the literature (Rentzsch & Gebauer, 2019). Moreover, the difference in mean scores in communal narcissism across the samples investigated within the current manuscript was negligible. This limitation is also minimized by the fact that previous research already investigated communal narcissism in adolescent samples (e.g., Barry et al., 2017) as well as there is evidence that grandiose narcissism assessed in adults and adolescents is invariant (Rogoza & Danieluk, 2021).

Summing up, communal narcissism might be interpreted as a superficial self-presentation style, that is, those scoring high in grandiose narcissism might use this particular communal pathway in order to realize the goal of maintaining a grandiose self-view (Back et al., 2013; Rogoza, Marchlewska, & Szczepańska, 2021; Sedikides, 2021). Indeed, existing research points out that under certain circumstances, those scoring high in grandiose narcissism might engage in communal behaviours (Konrath & Tian, 2018). Our findings help to understand the role of communal narcissism within the general structure of narcissistic personality. It turned out, that communal narcissism, when controlled for the shared variance with communion, was negatively related to agreeableness as well as to communal behaviour of donating for charity. Thus, we were able to empirically support the Gebauer et al. (2012) notion that communal narcissism indeed hold agentic global self-evaluations. Our findings do not only solve the problem of communal narcissism being oxymoronic (Gebauer & Sedikides, 2017), but furthermore, they allow to meaningfully locate it within the structure of narcissistic personality (see Miller et al., 2021; Sedikides, 2021). It seems that communal narcissism most closely aligns to grandiose narcissism, given how it is related to personality traits (i.e., positively to extraversion and negatively to agreeableness; Paulhus, 2001). Moreover, it is related to specific narcissistic facets in a same extent as is the overall grandiose narcissism (e.g., related to agentic and antagonistic but not to the neurotic facet; Crowe et al., 2019). This, again, supports the early ideas of Gebauer et al. (2012) who wrote that communal narcissism is an agentic trait expressed through communal means. Summarizing, we provided evidence that communal narcissism is theoretically plausible and explained how it is organized in respect to the three-factor model of narcissism (Miller et al., 2021). Our results suggest that communal narcissism might be an additional behavioural pathway (i.e., superficial self-presentation) employed by individuals scoring high in grandiose narcissism under certain circumstances.

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Marta Rogoza: Conceptualization, Formal analysis, Visualization, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. **Marta Marchlewska:** Writing – review & editing. **Radosław Rogoza:** Conceptualization, Methodology, Supervision.

Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by National Science Centre, Poland under (2019/35/B/HS6/00123) and Norface Democratic Governance in a Turbulent Age Research Programme [project Threat, identity, and dissent: Understanding and addressing political polarization in European democracies is financially supported by the NORFACE Joint

Research Programme on Democratic Governance in a Turbulent Age and co-funded by National Science Centre, Poland and the European Commission through Horizon 2020 under grant agreement No 822166; National Science Centre, Poland, project number 2019/01/Y/HS6/00033]. The work of Radosław Rogoza was supported by National Science Centre, Poland (2020/39/B/HS6/00052) and the Foundation for Polish Science (FNP).

References

- Ackerman, R. A., Donnellan, M. B., & Wright, A. G. C. (2019). Current conceptualizations of narcissism. *Current Opinion in Psychiatry*, 32, 32–37. <https://doi.org/10.1097/YCO/0000000000000463>
- Back, M. D. (2018). The narcissistic admiration and rivalry concept. In A. D. Hermann, A. B. Brunell, & J. D. Foster (Eds.), *Handbook of trait narcissism. Key advances, research methods, and controversies* (pp. 57–67). Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92171-6_6.
- Back, M. D., Küfner, A. C., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105, 1013–1037. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0034431>
- Barry, C. T., Lui, J. H. L., Lee-Rowland, L. M., & Moran, E. V. (2017). Adolescent communal narcissism and peer perceptions. *Journal of Personality*, 85, 782–792. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12287>
- Campbell, W. K., & Foster, J. D. (2007). The narcissistic self: Background, an extended agency model, and ongoing controversies. In C. Sedikides, & S. J. Spencer (Eds.), *The self* (pp. 115–138). Psychology Press.
- Cichočka, A. (2016). Understanding defensive and secure in-group positivity: The role of collective narcissism. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 27, 283–317. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2016.1252530>
- Crowe, M. L., Lynam, D. R., Campbell, W. K., & Miller, J. D. (2019). Exploring the structure of narcissism: Towards an integrated solution. *Journal of Personality*, 87, 1151–1169. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12464>
- Fatfoua, R., & Schröder-Abé, M. (2018). A wolf in sheep's clothing? Communal narcissism and positive implicit self-views in the communal domain. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 76, 17–21. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.07.004>
- Fatfoua, R., Zeigler-Hill, V., & Schröder-Abé, M. (2017). I'm merciful, am I not? Facets of narcissism and forgiveness revisited. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 70, 166–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2017.07.007>
- Furman, A., Maisson, D., & Sekścińska, K. (2020). Segmentation based on attitudes toward corporate social responsibility in relation to demographical variables and personal values – quantitative and qualitative study of Polish consumers. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 450. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00450>
- Gebauer, J. E., & Sedikides, C. (2017). Agency and communion in grandiose narcissism. In A. E. Abele, & B. Wojciszke (Eds.), *Agency and communion in social psychology*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., Verplanken, B., & Maio, G. R. (2012). Communal narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 103, 854–878. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a00296292>
- Konrath, S., & Tian, Y. (2018). Narcissism and Prosocial Behavior. In A. Hermann, A. Brunell, & J. Foster (Eds.), *Handbook of Trait Narcissism*. Cham: Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-92171-6_40.
- Kowalski, C. M., Rogoza, R., Saklofske, D. H., & Schermer, J. A. (2021). Dark triads, tetrads, tents, and cores: Why navigate (research) the jungle of dark personality models without a compass (criterion)? *Acta Psychologica*, 103455. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.actpsy.2021.103455>
- Krizan, Z., & Herlache, A. D. (2018). The narcissism spectrum model: A synthetic view of narcissistic personality. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 22, 3–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868316685018>
- Leckelt, M., Küfner, A. C. P., Nestler, S., & Back, M. D. (2015). Behavioral processes underlying the decline of narcissists' popularity over time. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 109, 856–871. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000057>
- Leifeld, P., Cranmer, S. J., & Desmarais, B. A. (2016). xergm: Extensions of Exponential Random Graph Models. *R package version, 1(7)*, 3. <http://CRAN.R-project.org/package=xergm>.
- Leifeld, P., Cranmer, S. J., & Desmarais, B. A. (2018). Temporal Exponential Random Graph Models with btergm: Estimation and Bootstrap Confidence Intervals. *Journal of Statistical Software*, 83(6), 1–36. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v083.i06>.
- Lusher, D., Koskinen, J., & Robins, G. (2013). *Exponential random graph models for social networks*. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
- Marchlewska, M., Cichočka, A., Furman, A., & Cislak, A. (2021). Who respects the will of the people? Support for democracy is linked to high secure national identity but low national narcissism. *The British Journal of Social Psychology. Advance online article.* <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12499>
- Marchlewska, M., Cichočka, A., Jaworska, M., Golec de Zavala, A., & Bilewicz, M. (2020). Superficial ingroup love? Collective narcissism predicts ingroup image defense, outgroup prejudice, and lower ingroup loyalty. *The British Journal of Social Psychology*, 59, 857–875. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12367>
- Marchlewska, M., Cichočka, A., Panayiotou, O., Castellanos, K., & Batayneh, J. (2018). Populism as identity politics: Perceived ingroup disadvantage, collective narcissism, and support for populism. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9, 151–162. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617732393>

- McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1997). Personality trait structure as a human universal. *American Psychologist*, 52, 509–516. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.52.5.509>.
- Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. K. (2008). Comparing clinical and social-personality conceptualizations of narcissism. *Journal of Personality*, 76, 449–476. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00492.x>
- Miller, J. D., Back, M. D., Lynam, D. R., & Wright, A. G. C. (2021). Narcissism today: What we know and what we need to learn. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30, 519–525. <https://doi.org/10.1177/09637214211044109>
- Morf, C. C., & Rhodewalt, F. (2001). Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory processing model. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 177–196. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_1
- Mota, S., Humberg, S., Krause, S., Fatfouta, R., Geukes, K., Schröder-Abé, M., & Back, M. D. (2019). Unmasking Narcissus: A competitive test of existing hypotheses on (agentic, antagonistic, neurotic, and communal) narcissism and (explicit and implicit) self-esteem across 18 samples. *Self and Identity*, 19, 435–455. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15298868.2019.1620012>
- Naderi, I. (2018). I'm nice, therefore I go green: An investigation of pro-environmentalism in communal narcissists. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 59, 54–64. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2018.08.010>
- Nehrlich, A. D., Gebauer, J. E., Sedikides, C., & Schöel, C. (2018). Agentic narcissism, communal narcissism, and prosociality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 117, 142–165. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000190>
- Paulhus, D. L. (2001). Normal narcissism: Two minimalist accounts. *Psychological Inquiry*, 12, 228–230. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327965PLI1204_2
- R Core Team. (2015). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing. Available from <https://www.R-project.org/>.
- Rentzsch, K., & Gebauer, J. E. (2019). On the popularity of agentic and communal narcissists: The tit-for-tat hypothesis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 45, 1356–1377. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167218824359>
- Rogoza, M., Marchlewska, M., & Szczepańska, D. (2021). Why dark personalities participate in politics? *Personality and Individual Differences*, 186, Article 111319. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111319>
- Rogoza, R., & Danieluk, B. (2021). Linking adolescent and adult narcissism research: A contribution by the Narcissistic Admiration and Rivalry Concept. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 93, Article 104129. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2021.104129>
- Rogoza, R., & Fatfouta, R. (2019). Normal and pathological communal narcissism in relation to personality traits and values. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 140, 76–81. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2018.03.039>
- Rogoza, R., & Fatfouta, R. (2020). Decoding the narcissism-charisma link: A facet approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 156, Article 109774. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2019.109774>
- Rogoza, R., Ciecuch, J., Strus, W., & Baran, T. (2019). Seeking a common framework for research on narcissism: An attempt to integrate the different faces of narcissism within the Circumplex of Personality Metatraits. *European Journal of Personality*, 33, 437–455. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.2206>
- Rogoza, R., Ciecuch, J., Strus, W., & Kłosowski, M. (2021). Investigating the Structure of the Polish Five Factor Narcissism Inventory: Support for the Three-Factor Model of Narcissism. *Psychological Assessment*, 33, 267–272. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000901>
- Rogoza, R., Crowe, M. L., Jamison, L., Ciecuch, J., & Strus, W. (2022). Support for the three-factor model of narcissism and its personality underpinnings through the lens of the network psychometrics. *Psychological Assessment*, 34, 880–890. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0001149>
- Rogoza, R., Danieluk, B., Kowalski, C. M., Kwiatkowska, K., & Kwiatkowska, M. M. (2021). Making and maintaining relationships through the prism of the Dark Triad traits: A longitudinal social network study. *Journal of Personality*, 89, 338–356. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12585>
- Rogoza, R., Kowalski, C. M., Saklofske, D. H., & Schermer, J. A. (2022). Systematizing dark personality traits within broader models of personality. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 186, Article 111343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.111343>
- Rogoza, R., Rogoza, M., & Wyszynska, P. (2016). Polska adaptacja kwestionariusza NARQ do pomiaru dwóch obliczy narcyzmu. [Polish adaptation of the NARQ questionnaire to measure two faces of narcissism]. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, 21, 410–431. <https://doi.org/10.14656/PFP20160306>.
- Sedikides, C. (2021). In search of Narcissus. *Trends in Cognitive Science*, 25, 67–80. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tics.2020.10.010>
- Selphout, M., Burk, W., Branje, S., Denissen, J., van Aken, M., & Meeus, W. (2010). Emerging late adolescent friendship networks and Big Five personality traits: A social network approach. *Journal of Personality*, 78(2), 509–538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.2010.00625.x>
- Shah, D. V. (1998). Civic engagement, interpersonal trust, and television use: An individual-level assessment of social capital. *Political Psychology*, 19, 469–496. <https://doi.org/10.1111/0162-895X.00114>
- Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113, 117–143. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000096>
- West, M. P., Miller, J. D., Weiss, B., Spencer, C. C., Crowe, M. L., Campbell, W. K., & Lynam, D. R. (2021). Development and validation of the super-short form of the Five-Factor Narcissism Inventory (FFNI-SSF). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 177, Article 110825. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110825>
- Wojciszke, B., & Szlendak, M. A. (2010). Skale do pomiaru orientacji sprawczej i wspólnotowej [Scales to measure agency and communion orientations]. *Psychologia Społeczna*, 5, 57–70.
- Wright, A. G. C., & Ederhile, E. (2018). Issues resolved and unresolved in pathological narcissism. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 21, 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.10.001>
- Yang, Z., Sedikides, C., Gu, R., Luo, Y. L. L., Wang, Y., Yang, Y., ... Cai, H. (2018). Communal narcissism: Social decisions and neurophysiological reactions. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 76, 64–73. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2018.07.003>
- Żemajtł-Piotrowska, M., Czarna, A. Z., Piotrowski, J., Baran, T., & Maltby, J. (2016). Structural validity of the Communal Narcissism Inventory (CNI): The bifactor model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 90, 315–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.11.036>