Graduate Theses and Dissertations

5-2016

Developmental Traits and Patterns Emerging from Dependent Nurturing Individuals in Narcissistic Relationship

Gregory D. Roberts
University of Arkansas, Fayetteville

Developmental Traits and Patterns Emerging from Dependent
Nurturing Individuals in Narcissistic Relationship

A dissertation proposal submitted in partial fulfilment
Of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy in Counselor Education

by

Gregory D. Roberts
University of Arkansas
Bachelor of Arts, 1977
Oklahoma State University
Master of Science Applied Behavioral Studies, 1997

May 2016
University of Arkansas

This dissertation is approved for recommendation.

_____
Dr. Kristin Higgins
Dissertation Director

_____   _____
Dr. Roy Farley   Dr. Kate Mamiseishvili
Committee Member   Committee Member

_____
Dr. Mary Ramey
Committee Member

ABSTRACT

The concept of personality theories and personality disorders has developed in modern times from deep roots in philosophy and psychodynamic theory. This theory orientation has evolved to diagnostic and treatment application. Much of the literature has focused on personality disorders as independent and singular constructs. Phenomenological discussions and deeper understandings of dysfunctional relationships between the two specific disorders of dependent personality and narcissistic personality are lacking. Significant longsuffering, abusive, and pathological behaviors at times are observed among dependent personality types in bad relationships. The objective of this study was to gather data from a sample of dependent types to discover and reference their developmental traits, their self-awareness, and their awareness of their partner. The search was for important indicators of unhealthy relationship potential which may have existed from the relationship beginning. The study was specific to dependent individuals who experienced intimate relationships with narcissistic personality types.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This dissertation is dedicated to a great first grade teacher from a very long time ago, to a great high school grammarian and literary teacher, to a great professor in graduate school who taught me that clinical evaluation is often a moment when we are in the presence of another human being and we feel a yuk in our gut and to know that the yuk means something. And this work is dedicated to a comrade of psychologists who made me appreciate more the power of quantitative data, and to another group of graduate school professors who taught me that qualitative data collection is a valid, trustworthy, and necessary domain. And this dissertation is dedicated to a wife and family who allowed me to become a better scientist and counselor when often it was too much on their time. I believe that some of us have great ideas from simple observation, and some of us have the ability to ask great research questions, and some of us have a nagging itch to read and to deeply engage in the gathering and consuming of research.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<center>**CHAPTER ONE**</center>

Organization of the Chapter

Chapter one begins with an introduction to the topic of the psychosocial developmental traits and patterns which may emerge from codependent nurturing-type people who are in a relationship with Narcissistic Personality Disordered Partners. This is followed by a brief background of the topic leading to the purpose of the study. Then the research question will be described along with the significance of the data collection. A conceptual diagram will be included to give the reader an idea of how the data will be collected. Next, theoretical sensitivity followed by the parameters of the study. Then, definition of terms and limitations of the study are discussed followed by a summary of the chapter. Finally, the chapter concludes with a section on the organization of this dissertation.

<center>**Introduction**</center>

Common agreement is found to suggest that human beings are social beings. Socialization is necessary for both utilitarian reasons and for what is known as "the common sense of basic needs" (Phillips, 2011). Social responding is a learned and developmental response (Winston, Strange, O'Doherty, & Dolan, 2002). A human brain can process information more completely and at higher levels relative to the size of the social group in interaction (Kanai, Bahrami, Duchaine, Janik, Banissy & Rees 2012). For human beings, socialization in relationship is necessary within culturally defined roles and for productivity and procreation. Socialization is often viewed as a predisposition which is only facilitated by interaction and exposure to multiple levels and numbers of interactions with others. Since the 1980's ideas about social behavior and the concept of emotional intelligence also play into discussions of human development and personality. Daniel Goleman (2006) suggested that socialization and emotional responding are the most important skills of all in the modern culture (Goleman, 2006). Questions

<center>1</center>

arise from these discussions specific to relationship quality and efforts to define what a healthy relationship is. To define a healthy relationship it is necessary to talk about interpersonal and intrapersonal emotional skills (Gardner, 1987). It is also necessary to talk about intimacy. In the literature there are many references to the ability to be able to sense and manage personal emotional states of being and to read and cue into the emotional status of others. In intimate relationships, these abilities and functions are crucial for relationship success.

This study is framed within personality constructs and personality functioning. Personality is defined, as a working definition within this study as: enduring patterns of behavior which remain somewhat consistent over time. Personality has multiple definitions by numerous theorists through many decades. A simple definition presented by the American Psychiatric Association for personality is stated: personality refers to individual differences in characteristics and patterns of thinking, feeling and behaving (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). This study is in effect, a study about intimacy.

Background

Many traditional discussions of personality are more intensively specific to personality disordered behavior. Considerable discussion surrounds disordered behavior and its effects on a relationship or on an intimate partner in a relationship. Foci are often on issues of life quality, quality of relationship, nurturing of family as well as successes or failures in parenting. All of these are at times discussed in psychological research, diagnosis, and treatment.

For dependent personality tendencies there is also a considerable amount of research presented overall and an increasing amount of concern for the individuals who become intimately involved with the narcissistic types. The literature suggests that narcissistic individuals are often displaying high levels of self-esteem and self-concepts of attractiveness and

high intelligence. But it is only those at the extreme end of the spectrum of narcissism who can be labeled as disordered. Discussions in the last decade suggest that the American culture has become increasingly narcissistic in function (Twenge & Foster, 2008). Impeccably groomed women are often narcissistic in pathology. CEO types of corporations of successful business owners often have narcissistic personalities. There is evidence suggesting that both men and women with strong narcissistic tendencies are often engaging in time tested sexual strategies (Kaufman, 2011). Sexual strategies are discussed in the literature as behaviors and mental scripts which are goal oriented specific to achieve sexual intimacy. These are related to same sex competition. Bleske-Rechek and Buss (2006) report also specific differences in short term mating and long term mating. This is of particular significance within the discussion of narcissistic mating (Bleske-Rechek & Buss, 2006).

Effects of Narcissistic Personality Relationships

Concern emerges with awareness of intensively troubled relationships. There is evidence of emotional pain, family failure, marital abuse, and loss of identity which comes from living with a narcissistic personality type (Kaufman, 2011). Kaufman presents a description of "dark charm" and relentless "short term focus" within narcissistic behavior. The narcissistic personality types can propagate damage (Solomon, 1989). A key behavior for many narcissistic types is promiscuity. This appears to manifest for the cheater or adulterer as energy of control and control maintenance. The narcissistic personality disordered (NPD) person in a relationship will often remind their partners that they (as the narcissist) have many options and that they are "choosing" in the moment to be with the dependent partner. This may be internalized within the dependent type as being "wanted" even though undeserving of such attention (Campbell, Foster & Brunell, 2004).

It is apparent that narcissistic types in extreme pathology are more affected by *agentic concerns* (intelligence and power) rather than affected by internalized shame and avoidance. This has been a controversial concept, but newer research suggests that the historical emphasis on shame and wound may not be sound. Concepts of shame and wound may be more derived from experimenter bias (Campbell, Foster & Brunell, 2004).The extreme narcissistic person shows little communal concern but shows significant self-concern about "the grandiose self" and impression management.

Campbell et al. (2004) and co-researchers have suggested that the dependent person, the focus of this study, is a mirror image often to the NPD type. This suggests that the NPD person and a dependent type (DPD) are both imbalanced, but for different reasons. The NPD person places tremendous energy and emphasis on the agentic traits of intelligence and power while the dependent type places emphasis upon and dwells within the desire and the longing for the "communal" issues represented by giving of self and contributing to a connected relationship.

The narcissistic person does not actually worry or utilize energy to avoid failure, but focuses differentially on achievement and success. It is that the NPD narcissistic types may never acknowledge or dwell on failure. They may not be negative thinkers, but positive thinkers. Campbell et al. (2004) suggests that NPDs never show or express great desire to avoid shame as much as they focus and present an impression of success and achievement in many areas of personal life. Behaviorally, this is reinforced or can be described as "working" for the narcissistic type.

The mirror image concept is further extended in the work of Masterson & Klein (1993). Masterson coined several terms in his approach to narcissism and dependent individuals. Klein suggested that both "borderlines" and "narcissists" are at once intriguing and in another

4

moment notoriously infuriating. Klein and Masterson (1993) describe a narcissistic disorder which is not codified in the D*iagnostic Manuel for Mental Disorders (DSM)*. Masterson labels this disorder as *closet narcissistic disorder* (CNP).

The entire system of diagnostic work in mental health is criticized by Klein and Masterson (1993), They suggest that modern mental health services are an attempt to label symptomology which is episodic and transitory. Masterson and Klein (1993) tightly edit their view of the closet narcissist as the individual in relationship who, from an opposite direction, functions more in mild depression not grandiosity and more in self-minimizing than braggadocio. The closet narcissist is rarely a dominating person (Klein, 1995, p. 16).

The dependent personality often has an inadequate concept of self. This is compounded in a slightly "borderline" way with low self-assertion in relationship and denial of self-destructive tendencies. Masterson labels the classically defined or stereotyped narcissistic person as the *exhibitionist narcissist*. The traits of the closet narcissists are similar to the exhibitionist narcissistic disordered person but with two distinct differences. 1) The closet narcissistic person is focused and emotionally invests in the "omnipotent object." The closet narcissistic person (CNP) makes an emotional investment in the "object" of their affection. Over time the dependent types come to be unable to continue to "bask in the idealism and reflected glow" of the exhibitionist partner. They present themselves deflated and disillusioned rather than grandiose and powerful. 2) The closet narcissist cannot maintain continuous defense or defense mechanisms like the exhibitionist can (Klein, 1995 p. 14-15).

Masterson & Klein (1993) further report that the closet narcissistic person CNP is not a borderline personality patient but may share some of those traits. The differences between the two are simple. The borderline will be clinging to the controller and idealize them as their

5

"savior" and will fear abandonment often. The closet narcissistic person will present a "self falling apart" within feelings of humiliation and shame (Klein, 1995, p. 15). It is the closet narcissists who are the focus of this study. There are questions of how and why the closet narcissists are engaging and struggling in what are often extreme and hurtful relationships. The value is in knowing and learning about their awareness of self and their histories in narcissistic relationship.

Heritability: Nature versus Nurture of Personality

Heritability estimates of personality disorders in *DSM* diagnosis of young adult twin studies from past research are 0.27 to 0.35 (Gjerde, Czajkowski, Osrtavik, & Knudsen, et al, 2012). In this study (Gjerde et al., 2012), the heritability rose to 0.60 range. This suggests that the classic nature versus nature discussions continue. There remains a long standing view that dependent personality is only partially hereditary. This view is strong in spite of the report of some newer conflicting research. This study was not focused on heritability unless it emerged in self report from the data which was drawn from structured clinical interviewing. The focus of this study was to determine what trait factors may be reported or self-described from a sample.

There are considerations of studies of personality which look differently at the etiology as some consider categorical traits while Gjerde's most recent study is a dimensional type. Opinions are found suggesting that a dimensional approach is better for the studying of personality disorders because it will capture the realistic nature and function of personality disorders generally (Gjerde et al., 2012).

Narcissistic personality individuals do not make warm caring partners (Keller, Blincoe, Gilbert, Dewall, Haak, & Windiger, 2014). In terms of romantic relationships, it is found that the spouses of pathological narcissistic individuals describe their partner as aggressive, outspoken,

egotistical, self-centered, intolerant, arrogant, demanding, and argumentative (Wink, 1991). Discussions of narcissism flow from viewing it as normal to pathological and as being correlated in both clinical and nonclinical populations. Additionally narcissists are often described to be highly successful in work and finances (Blais & Little, 2010).

Statement of the Problem

A significant amount of research and literature was also available about narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. The literature review indicated that in recent years these concepts have been studied broadly and controversially. This is evidenced by discussions from the development of the *DSM-5* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Dependent personality has historically been popularly discussed in terms of codependency, battered wife syndrome, and chronic enablers. What has been is missing is newer data and analysis about the dependent types *with* the narcissists. The need was found significant for rich and qualitative data specific to the function, purpose and the dynamic of the mix *between* narcissistic partners and closet dependent narcissists. This mix is a phenomenological function. The need to understand this unique dynamic as it affects long term mental and physical health for the dependent partner is crucial. In these imbalanced relationship environments the effects on personality and brain development for children is also unique and severe (Solomon, 1989, p.74).

There is a lack of data and empirical explanation of intimate partners with narcissistic mates. It is difficult to find empirical research that reflects documented experience, self-awareness, or the effects on quality of life for dependent partners. The dependent partner living in minimization and disillusionment was the focus of this study. Little has been known from deep qualitative data about why dependent people try to attach to the narcissistic type. Solomon calls this problem narcissistic vulnerability (Solomon, 1989 p. 44).

Purpose

The research was proposed to determine what or if cues, signs, warnings, or intuitive awareness existed psychologically and psychosocially for dependent type individuals who engaged in intimate relationship with narcissistic personality types. The purpose was to determine from intimate dependent partner types what specific traits, behaviors and thoughts might have been present for them in the beginning of their relationship. Secondly, this qualitative study searched for themes or patterns which may have functioned for dependent individuals through their process of connecting and merging with their narcissistic partners. These data could in a broader scope, contribute to preventing the manifestation of a dysfunctional union for many potential partners and individuals. The data could possibly emerge as a "red flag" warning criteria for individuals of all personality types, but specifically helpful for the dependent types.

The literature has supported that not all narcissistically involved relationships are considered dysfunctional (Back et al., 2013). This concept was a purposeful and intentionally viewed approach throughout the data collection. The need was to know more about why dependent individuals do what they do. The need was also about finding the traits and functions of the participants. These traits and functions were issues of both personality theory and psychological human development.

The intent in data collection was to draw from the participants either living in or recovering from narcissistic relationships. More and specific pertinent self-reported narratives were expected from the data collection. These stories could indicate acceptable, positive, or functional experience as well as pathological negative effects between dependent types and narcissistic types. This study was designed to search for better understanding and additional descriptions of what may be common for the co-dependently engaged individual in relationship.

The use of data from this study was helpful to knowing the dependent closet narcissistic type DPD individuals by defining and exposing patterns of behavior which may be consistent and common for the dependent types especially as they connect with the narcissistic person. New awareness from newer data could in effect aid in "freeing" the dependent types from ongoing misery. The ongoing misery is described well by (Solomon, 1989) as defensive collusion. Collusion is a dysfunctional and miserable exchange of avoidance and control by both parties. In these relationships true and honest communication is avoided through the fear of exposure and humiliation (Lanksy, 1981). The results of this study were considered to be potentially to influence vulnerable individuals away from damaging pathological relationships.

Allegorical behavioral patterns of giving and taking, watching and performing, as well as attention seeking and attention giving behaviors were theoretically grounded in the rationale of this study. These behaviors were believed to represent both symbolically and literally deeply ceded and unconscious dysfunction. This study uses a psychodynamic view and assumptions were made within psychodynamic theory specific to human development, early childhood experience, personality development, and parent child relationships from infancy through adolescence. These developmental issues in theory have been found related to both dependent personality and narcissistic personality types. Psychodynamic concepts also include ideas of self-regulation and ego strength in development.

Additionally, the purpose of data collection was to deepen an understanding of particular identifiable DPD traits which drove or "energized" the partner to an unhealthy connection with the PND. Metaphorically, the DPD can be viewed as "supply" and emotional fuel for the PND. The energy of these relationships is found significant at the beginning, but later becomes exhausted as the imbalance and the interdependency become unsustainable. To better determine

traits and patterns which could predict and explain degrees of longsuffering was a broader goal of the investigation. The research purpose also was extended to know more about the "how" for which DPDs came to be in their PND relationship stories. The study was consciously focused on the "why."

Research Question

The research question for this study was: "What psychosocial and developmental traits and patterns in personality and behavior emerge from dependent individuals partnered with narcissistic personality types? " This research was proposed to facilitate what is needed to better understand a phenomenon. The intent was to discover and define developmental and personality traits and patterns. The question was also framed to find possible determinants of comparable or similar developmental wounds for the dependent individual (DPD). If determined, the question was to become about how does a state of "wounded-ness" for the DPD compare to the wounded state of the PND? Miller (1981) suggested that narcissistic types etiologically are driven from psychological wounded-ness and childhood trauma. The search was to determine what specific wounded-ness existed for the dependent types from self-report. Additionally, from the research question and data collection it was possible to discover "cues" which facilitated the imbalanced relationship in question. These relationships have been observed as destined to be problematic from the beginning. The need is for data to contribute to the what and the why of these severely dysfunctional relationships.

This study was rooted in a consideration for multiple factors. From the literature it was obvious that some participants might report that their relationship with a narcissistic type partner was "working" for them, or was functional. The research and analysis planned for this study did not attempt to answer a call for specific research on narcissism. The research question was

10

formed to function as a facilitating exercise of sifting and shaking out the "effects" and interactions between two disorders or two types.

Significance of the Study

Studies are needed which explore the functions and effects upon dependent type partners in relationships with the narcissistic types. More integrative studies of narcissism in relationship are needed as the research and methodology of narcissism is viewed as fragmented and under pursued (Miller & Campbell, 2010). The literature is significantly sparse for data specific to the open, giving and often naïve or dependent personality individual (DPD) who specifically functions with narcissistic types. The dependent individuals may "sign up" for a marriage, partnership or informal connection with a partner who is a "false self" and impression managing personality (NPD). This appears to manifest for the dependent types without conceptualization of the personality pathology with which they engage. The data collection of this study was about determining what awareness dependent individuals have about their vulnerability.

The belief was that knowledge might mean power as individuals may discover within themselves more of what they sensed or knew and perhaps ignored. This information could be valuable to helping others to face the truth of any relationship early in the process. For this research, the consideration was that both parties DPD versus NPD may be pathological from the outset. The study was also designed to find data to help determine the amount and type of expended energy the dependent type consumes in giving and supplying the narcissistic partner's need for attention.

Conceptual Design

This study was conducted in the following stages:

1) IRB permission to conduct research.

2) Identification of participant.

3) Participant criterion.

4) Standardized assessment *NEO-FFI-3*.

5) Structured and semi-structured interviews.

6) Data analysis and data reporting.

7) Submission for publication or presentation.

Theoretical Sensitivity

Theoretical sensitivity refers to a personal quality of the researcher (Harvard University, Strauss, 2015). It also indicates an awareness of the subtleties of meaningfulness of data. Sensitivity was also viewed in this study as "energy" from experience and significant theoretical awareness from the research therapist. The research therapist's experience with personality disordered individuals and with theories of personality is substantial. Sensitivity to those affected by personality disordered individuals has expanded through most of the 19 years of clinical practice. Through years of clinical work in professional counseling, the researcher brought experience and a realization of a heightened awareness of bias that this experience may bring. It is a proverbial two edged sword in that the experience created interest and an awareness of need for new data. It also increased the tendency to formulate opinions and projections. Efforts to practice conscious awareness were applied to avoid this bias in this research. Strauss (Harvard, 2015) suggested that the researcher should in qualitative research step back and ask, "What is going on here?" "Does what I think I see fit the reality of the data"?

Theoretical sensitivity was first cited in Glaser and Strauss's seminal text (1967) as a two part concept. In the beginning, a researcher's level of theoretical sensitivity is deeply personal; it reflects a personal level of insight into self and the area of research. Secondly, a researcher's level of theoretical sensitivity reflects individual intellectual history, the type of theory that they have read, absorbed and now use in their everyday thought. Researchers are a sum of all they have experienced. The concept of theoretical sensitivity acknowledges this fact and accounts for it in the research process. As a grounded theorist becomes immersed in the data, a level of theoretical sensitivity to analytical possibilities will increase (Birks & Mills, 2011).

Research sensitivity as well should include the concept of remaining skeptical while enjoying the energy of the data. Sensitivity also is about appropriately viewing any results from experience as affirming and exciting but also provisional. The excitement of discovery and affirmation of past experience should be emotionally self-regulated and scientifically solid in acceptance.

Professional Experience

Two decades of experience in clinical counseling work and functioning under a description of "therapist" brought many things to the research table. An evolving process as a professional drew the research therapist to the research question. Narcissism awareness within clinical professional experience comes from the same place that the research methods and participants come. That place being hourly engagement in sessions and interventions with real clients in real time. The experience of the researcher is specific with the dependent types and is longstanding. Many referrals (participants) have come from other client referral. This has formed a growing resource list of potential participants over time. Faculty professorship has facilitated the therapist to add to professional and expert level abilities through the teaching of courses

during the past ten years in these domains: developmental psychology, theories of personality, theories of addiction, codependency, adolescent development, tests and measurements, and forensic psychology. These experiences and educational involvements have facilitated keen interest and significant insight into the topic of narcissistic personality *with* dependent personality *in* relationship.

Personal Experience

Personal experience is defined from a broad and evolving view of the world and a personal philosophy. The experience comes from many places and times accumulated constructively. Personal experience for the research therapist for this study includes the following. The researcher has strong interpersonal and intrapersonal experience in relationship. This experience is personal and professional. This is evidenced by training-related psychological assessment of the researcher in academic settings which document these traits. The researcher has a strong sense of these personal traits in the settings of education and mental health provision and personally as well. The researcher has an undergraduate degree and graduate school training in communications and communication theory. Additional experience in writing and teaching comes from an academic minor in English as well as training in Montessori Method Education and teaching experience in the setting of a Montessori school. The Montessori Method is grounded in internal self -awareness, personal accomplishment, internalized locus of control, strong autonomy as well as values of personal responsibility. This is an extended philosophical approach to life and learning and not limited to educational theory. Coupled with this view is an extended relationship with Jungian psychology and existential theory. Issues of personal responsibility are also solid in these theoretical orientations.

An existential view of human behavior facilitates the researcher to see human beings as individual organisms who can make emotional choices. Additionally, this concept facilitates the acceptance and "embracing" of pain. Emotional and psychological pain in particular has a place and purpose for the existentialist. The researcher functions within this view.

Jungian Psychology also integrates into the experience and philosophical approach of the research therapist. The tenets of this approach include analytical skills, rapport and trust building with clients. This approach is often termed as an analytical approach. Within the construct of analytical psychology (Jungian), there exists a therapeutic or counseling model. Jung documented and declared that no matter who is doing the therapy, or in this case who is doing the research, it is of course the clients who may know things about themselves that the therapists would never have thought. Those hidden bits of knowledge and information are released in dreams and words of the client according to Jung. It is the integrity of the therapist researcher which becomes important in this view. If the participant is conscious and honest with himself or herself and with the therapist, then he or she may recognize these things and disclose that self-awareness (Carver & Scheier, 2008). This is the approach to this study. It was in this study that an intentional effort of engaging participants to a search for self-awareness and new data. Expressed self-awareness was expected to contribute to new understanding. Past engagement with the participants contributes to validity and concept.

Positivism may seem as an unlikely counterpart to this philosophical representation of the therapist researcher, but it is included. Positivism is another view of the world and a research approach. Positivism is rooted in a principle suggesting that most all knowledge comes from "positive" information within observable experience (Comte & Ferre, 1988). Observation and experience lies deep within this study through considerable history of engaging in

15

communication with individuals in bad relationships. Social research is viewed as difficult due to the difficulty of getting solid and repeatable results. Roots of positivism lie within empiricism. This is exemplified by saying that only analytic statements are allowed to be known as "true."

The research therapist facilitating this study adheres to the positivist's tenet of "naturalism" within a positivist's orientation (Comte & Ferre, 1988, p. 42). This positivist view suggests that the principles of the natural sciences should be used for social science. Secondly, a piece of the positivist's view is that of "atomism." This additionally purports to say that things can be studied by reducing them to their smallest parts and the whole is the sum of the parts (Comte & Ferre, 1988, p. 39).This is as well as gestalt view within psychology. The positivist view is represented in this study through the utilization of a standardized criterion tool (*NEO-FFI –R*) for participant inclusion. Additionally, this positivist view does not typically otherwise demand an empirical or quantitative approach. The positivist approach is a world view and not a research methodology for this study. In summary, this study is rooted within a view suggesting that logical analysis leads to a unified science (Ayer, 1959, p. 144).

Knowledge of the Literature

The birth of psychotherapy and counseling began at the same time historically as the world became modern. Individualism shaped the modern culture. Modernity has created both an individual and a cultural narcissism. No one is born narcissistic, but with the certain mental temperaments some may be more vulnerable to its development (Paris, 2013). The modern culture is modern because it is more dynamic and lives more in the future than any other culture before it. In the literature is embedded with a remarkable amount of discussion of narcissism, but much of it is not empirical and not supported by data. In the modern culture individuals who become entangled as "giving" personality types with the pathological narcissistic types (PNDs)

have been known to suffer in some disillusioned misery in their relationships (Wink, 1991).

There are many unanswered questions as to why this is true.

Masterson (1993) presented his ideas about those among us who attract and latch to the narcissistic types. These as previously discussed, he called the closet narcissistic persons (CNP) who are focused and emotionally invested in the "omnipotent object." The closet narcissistic person (CNP) makes an emotional investment in the "object" of their affection. Over time they come to be unable to "bask in the idealism and reflected glow" of the exhibitionist narcissistic partner. They present themselves as deflated and disillusioned rather than grandiose and powerful. The CNP cannot maintain continuous defense or defense mechanisms like the exhibitionist can (Klein, 1995 p. 14-15). This concept is core to the research process.

Analytic Rigor

Within positivism as a philosophical view, rigor in research is rather automatic. Analytic rigor may be seen as quite different from quantitative measures, but the view becomes stronger to suggest that rigor is more important not only for credibility within the broader research community but also because of the intimacy and variability involved in qualitative measures. Rigorous procedures for this study are general and specific. Generally speaking, careful, intentional, systematic, and consistency in data collection is mandatory. These specifications to rigor were held in awareness through the research process.

<div align="center">

Parameters of the Study

</div>

The parameters of this study include working with individuals who met a criterion of dependent personality type who have been involved intensively with a narcissistic type. A pool of 35 possible participants was available and it was anticipated that 8 would be selected from the screening process. These individuals were voluntarily involved and aware of the purpose and

process of the study. These individuals were expected to be middle aged and female or male. From the pool were four males. It is estimated that 75 to 80% of all narcissistic types are men (Behary, 2008) therefore it was expected that most of the participants in this study would be women. All potential participants were involved in clinical counseling either at the time of their participation or historically. This study was considered to be "emic" in that it is an indigenous orientation and perspective represented by those participants who are a part of the study (Yin, 2011, p. 308). This study did not necessarily assume traditional views of narcissism and dependency research.

Definition of Terms

*Agentic traits***:** defined as the narcissistic type's high level of concern and emphasis on personal traits of intelligence and power (Masterson, 1993). Bandura (2001) suggested originally that this involves agentic action in exploring, manipulating, and influencing the environment.

Assortative: (Jiang, Bolnick & Kirkpatrick, 2013) related to the concept of a healthy relationship being viewed plotted center on a continuum; in relationship two individuals who may "match" as equal distance from center and center being the definitively healthy mean. This term is that of giving and taking, needed and needy, and dependent and controlling. A term often associated with addiction.

Cathexis: a psychodynamic concept (Levin, 1993) defined as an investment of pleasure (libido) energy. The term is original to the work of Sigmund Freud.

Closet narcissistic disorder: a term coined by Masterson (1993) which is related to the definition of the codependent types. Masterson suggests that the closed narcissistic type has borderline personality traits of idealizing others and a self-view of "self falling apart."

Codependent: viewed as dependent personality disorder and as the dependent overly giving and nurturing partner; weak in personal ego strength; sacrificing of self; giving more than taking.

Communal concerns: concern for others in a socially acceptable way balancing self-care with a reasonable concern for others.

Dark charm: a term describing the personality and behaviors of the narcissistic types which is a "Prince Charming" presentation which "seems too good to be true" in the early stages of relationship building. This charm is found to be powerful but the "dark" side of this charm is a hidden energy which drives the narcissistic type to draw unsuspecting dependent types to them. The "dark" connotes an energy which comes from a deeply ceded selfishness and self-serving ambition which is hidden (Solomon, 1989; Behary, 2008). Related to the "dark triad" of pathology which includes narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathology (Jonason & Kroll, 2015).

Dependent partner: any partner in a codependent relationship who functions in more giving behavior and caregiving and a minimal or non-existent level of self-care. Psychodynamically, this is viewed as weak in ego strength (Bornstein, 2013).

Exhibitionist narcissistic disorder: not a clinical or DSM-5 term but one coined by Masterson (1993) to more specifically define the "classical" stereotype of the narcissism which includes the traits of high self-worth, projected success, minimizing of others as well as ruthlessness.

Healthy relationship: a relationship which functions from a "centeredness" on a continuum between giving and taking within relationship. Additionally viewed as a relationship in which two strong and independently self-sufficient individuals may function with each other to produce not dependency, but interaction and "standing with" rather than overly dependent or symbiotic.

Impression management (IM): defined term from Miller (2012); Back et al., (2013) as one who is striving for attention and acceptance by expending significant energy trying to influence the image "in the head" of those around them. This behavior is believed to be nearly constant for the narcissistic types. They are always concerned about what others may be thinking about them. Miller suggests that IM involves self-promotion, supplication, intimidation, and ingratiation.

Mortido: a psychological energy which comes from the opposite of the libido or pleasure energy. It is the energy of negativity or ultimately death in psychodynamic theory (Freud, 1949).

*Narcissistic personality disordered***:** individuals who present a high level of success and power and who are described by partners as aggressive, self-assured, outspoken, egotistical, self-centered, intolerant, arrogant, demanding and argumentative; these individuals are often successful in business, work, finances, and power; those who are "self-made" or who "come from little" project strong presentations of personal single minded accomplishment (Solomon, 1989).

Narcissistic vulnerability: a term which suggests that in weak ego a dependent individual is more susceptible to the charm and power of the narcissistic type. This vulnerability is especially significant and strong in the early stages of relationship connecting.

Omnipotent object: for the dependent types the object of affection which is the narcissistic partner.

One down partner: as opposed to the one up partner which is the narcissistic type. This is typically most prevalent for the dependent types, but it can be anyone engaging with the narcissistic type.

Personality: for this study the working definition of personality is defined as enduring patterns of behavior which remain somewhat constant over time; and individual differences in characteristics and patterns of thinking, feeling, and behaving.

Personality disordered behavior: behavior which is consistent and pervasive for an individual and characterized by interpersonal relationship problems, behaviors which interfere with the quality of an individual's life which impact self; an individual meeting the criteria of a personality disorder as listed in criterion within the *DSM-5*.

Sociosexuality: is a term (Gangestad & Simpson, 1990) suggesting that individual differences to engage in sexual relations without closeness, commitment or other indications of bonding.

Limitations

As in any study this study has some limitations. One limitation is the absence of assessment or screening for the narcissistic partners (NPDs). Although the study was not designed to measure or gather data from those partners specifically, their traits and profile was important. Some assumptions were made about the self-reporting techniques as the dependent type participants described their partners. Both the research therapist and the participants were known to reflect upon narcissistic types of individuals. There was no objective to clinically derive a diagnosis of the narcissistic partners. In fact, to do so would have been unethical. The limitation here is comparable to other limitations associated with self-reported data. The dependent partners reported the qualities of their partners which were compared to diagnostic criteria. The goal was to dig deeply into the experience and awareness of the "closet" narcissists (DPD dependent types) to reveal their stories and specific functions more completely. The traits of the "relationship" became more important than the definition of the narcissistic personality individuals. The participants defined their partners through a trait based questionnaire about their history and experience with a narcissistic partner. This questionnaire was constructed from diagnostic criteria and from psychologically constructed diagnostic traits of narcissistic personality disorder. These traits included information which was listed as criteria within the

DSM-5 (American Psychiatric Association, 2013. p. 669-672). This was viewed as adequate

through experience as many individual dependent types have reported common experience.

        A second limitation was the absence of a plan to differentiate any differences in male and

female participants. Researcher awareness of the sample and population suggested that many of

the potential candidates for participation would be female. It was hoped that males would

participate as they are known to exist in the population. Male and female clients within this study

were viewed to have the potential to be dependent in personality. No specific differentiation was

made through sex or gender.

        Another limitation of the study is the small sample size. In this qualitative study the

desire within the process was to pull data from a more internalized and subconscious source

through a process. In light of theories of personality and personality assessment, a large group of

participants would have been formidable in process for collection and analysis. The small sample

size does not easily lend to statistical generalizability. This study was not focused or designed to

facilitate generalizability. The small sample size does facilitate the possibility of thick

description (Yin, 2011, p. 313).

Summary of Chapter One

        This qualitative project was an effort to gather data which would contribute to the

missing knowledge of dependent type partners with narcissistic types. The need for this study

was evident from the lack of specific knowledge of dependent types who engage intensely *with*

narcissistic types. The specific need for knowledge is about the "why" of and the traits of the

dependent types as they entangle in the imbalanced relationship in question. This was about a

phenomenon. It was also about interpersonal and intrapersonal dynamics, psychological energy

and relationship dysfunction. This process was also about the potential for healthiness. The

dissemination of new awareness was hoped to be helpful for the prevention and treatment of dysfunctional and damaging engagement. It is well known that dependent types eventually burnout and ultimately, metaphorically, psychologically and literally split.

Organization of the Dissertation

The dissertation is organized into five chapters. Chapter One provided the reader with an introduction to the topic of the psychosocial developmental traits and patterns that may emerge from codependent nurturing-type people who are in a relationship with narcissistic personality disordered partners. Chapter Two describes the literature associated with what is known about psychosocial developmental traits and patterns of narcissistic people and their partners. Chapter Three discusses the methods used to answer the research question. Chapter Four contains a presentation of the data that was obtained during the study. And finally, Chapter Five presented the conclusions and recommendations that were discovered during the study.

Review of Literature Narcissism and Dependent Personalities

Organization of the Chapter

Chapter Two is the review of the literature. It begins with the search strategy to seek out information on narcissism and dependent personality. This is followed by an introduction to the literature on narcissism followed by the concepts of narcissism and energy. Next, the narcissistic wound and fatal attraction are discussed as well as the history of narcissism and dependency in psychodynamic theory. A discussion of assortative mating and pathological relationship followed by the dependent personality types and diagnostic criterion further describes the phenomenon. Then, a look at the cultural considerations for the research, the psychodynamic theory framing and the multiple conceptual views of dependency and narcissism are addressed. The chapter continues with additional issues and concepts of developmental etiology for personality, narcissism as mentality, Masterson's (1993) closet narcissism theory and the dark triad and the self-triad of narcissistic and dependent types. And finally, the chapter closes with modern applications and the summary.

Search Strategy

The search strategy to conduct this review of the literature was retrieved from all of the following: text books, multiple databases including but not limited to *Academic Search Premiere*, *ProQuest, Ebsco, ERIC, JSTOR, PubMed,* and *Google Scholar, and ProQuest Dissertations*. Keywords searched were: "narcissism," "narcissistic personality disorder," "dependent," "dependency," "dependent personality disorder," "borderline personality disorder," "narcissistic relationship," "dependent relationship," "psychodynamic theory of narcissism,"

"exhibitionist narcissist," "object relations theory and narcissism," "narcissistic traits,"

"dependent traits," "codependency," and "closet narcissism."

Introduction

Many have been intrigued by the stories of extremely dependent people who engage in

longsuffering abuse and emotional wreckage (Quenqua, 2013). Others are intrigued more by

other extreme personality traits and diagnoses. Most all measures of problematic personality are

grounded both appropriately and at times inadequately in clinical research settings. Unless

individuals avail themselves for help and treatment, they remain in the culture perpetrating and

suffering with ongoing dysfunction. American culture is a host place for narcissism development

(Twenge & Campbell, 2009, p.260). Narcissism as a disorder appears more common in clinical

populations than in the community and is reported as prevalent in 2% of the population

(Zimmerman, Rothschild & Chelminski, 2005) with other estimates to be as high as 6% per

capita which was described as a surprisingly high prevalence (Paris, 2014, p. 221). Many with

traits of personality disorder, who cause damage to others, may never come to the clinical setting

(Zimmerman, et al., 2005). If they do, it is usually in defense mechanism mode. Therefore,

research from a formal and rigid clinical setting may not best represent the phenomenon of "what

is going on." The narcissistic type may not at all be best suited for clinical setting research.

Pincus et al. (2009) made a strong recommendation

> The clinical setting may not be the ideal place to study individuals with
>
> NPD as this will invariably lead to a sample biased on the direction of
>
> Vulnerability given that these traits rather than grandiosity-related traits
>
> that typically motivates individuals to seek treatment (p. 365)

Both broadly and specifically, research on narcissism is "poorly calibrated" (Roche, Pincus, Lukowitsky, Menard & Conroy, 2013) with many fields of study involved in its definition. One of the problems noted was that some narcissistic behavior is viewed as normal, but too often it is viewed with critical disdain. Because of the negative effects upon partners and families, it is difficult for researchers, clinical workers, or partners to be empathic (McBride, 2012, pp. 34. 35).

For narcissism there has been a call for a more integrated single model (Roche et al, 2013). It is difficult to make sense of both dependent personality and narcissistic traits and behaviors with many labels and subcategories existing from multiple domains. A two dimensional integrated approach was suggested (Roche, et al, 2013). Much of the topic of narcissism has been focused upon traits of self-regulation (Kohut, n. d.). More specifically the discussion has been about primitive or immature self-regulatory systems for the extreme narcissistic types (Roche, et al, 2013). In this study, the search considered awareness of self-regulatory abilities for both the dependent types and the narcissists. Specific data was collected from the dependent types.

In the literature, peer reviewed reports suggested that narcissistic exhibitionist or pathological narcissistic disordered people function with excessive impression managing and self-promoting behavior (Back et al., 2013). These behaviors often appear unregulated. These individual PND types are at times found exhausted and weary from their "performing." The narcissistic pursuit of self-esteem also may hinder performance through diminished learning, diminished personal growth, and poorer self-regulation (Crocker & Park, 2004). This significantly affects the relationship quality for the dependent type DPD as it creates situations which may exacerbate their giving and attending behaviors with their narcissistic type partners.

For the long term this pulls much "personality energy" from the dependent person. Freud theoretically discussed personality energy. Freud defined *cathexis* as investment of libido (pleasure energy). He pointing out for example how dream thoughts were cathected with different amounts of affect (Felluga, 2012). This is a psychodynamic view of relationship. A cathexis or emotional charge in the relationships for the dependent with the narcissistic might be positive or negative. This suggests that the cathexis (energy) of *mortido* (death or negative instinct) is the opposite in function of the libido. There are distinguishing differences between love and cathexis, with cathexis being the initial "in-love" phase of a relationship, and authentic love being the ongoing commitment of care. This Freudian discussion is the beginning of several concepts representing the dichotomy of dependent/narcissistic relationship (Peck, 1992).

In other areas of life beyond romance, it was found that dependent personality DPD characteristics positively predict performance related to employees who are evaluated upon customer satisfaction and competency. This suggests that the giving and servicing of other individuals is not limited to intimate and romantic relationships (Giles & Foo, 2010). This indicates a good side to "dependency performance." There are those within counseling and psychological research (Mellody & Freundlich, 2003, pp. 11, 12: Miller, 2010, p. 128; & Symington, 1993, pp. 74, 75.) who do not view dependency in a positive way especially if it is extreme. For economics and consumerism, at times it is a positively valued trait (Giles & Foo, 2010).

The energy of these relationships is about one who gives and another who consumes. A DPD/PND relationship is *assortative* (equal from center) and functions with expended energy from both individuals. The giving dependent one is self-sacrificing with giving and the narcissistic type is exhausted in and performing. Peck (1992) suggested that the "in-love" phase

is euphoric, elated, and giddy, in the beginning. But authentic love is not guaranteed. The concept suggests that the narcissistic type is incapable of being truly or authentically in love because authenticity in love is weak or non-existing for them. For the narcissistic type, even the unbridled and pulsating libido is not cathected or truly invested with another person (Levin, 1993). Levin (1993) suggests that many classical theorists including Freud, Kernberg and Kohut all have perceived narcissism as both healthy and pathological (Levin, 1993). One of the problems with securing data for the stated problem is that narcissism as one construct is common in discussion both within the culture and as well in science, but has a wide range of applications and functions as much in the media as it does in psychology and mental health discussions.

The PND individuals are psychosocially associated with inadequate parental bonding (Rossiter, 2005). Codependent persons are more attentive and responsive to an exploitive individual rather than to a nurturing partner, whereas the opposite is expected for narcissistic persons (Burris, 1999). There is clearly a benefit to collecting data from peers, family or significant others who have known narcissistic types for a period of time (Trull, Verges, Wood, Jahng, & Sher 2012). This suggestion contributes to a valid need for data.

Bornstein (1999) concluded in his broad discussion of the dependent types that these individuals were best described by the Neo-Freudian (Fromm, 1947) perspective. This is historically an early description of the dependent types, and is tightly constructed and helpful:

> …these individuals are dependent not only on authorities for knowledge
> and help, but on people in general for any kind of support. They feel
> lost when alone because they feel that they cannot do anything without
> help. It is characteristic of these people that their first thought is to find
> somebody else to give them the needed information rather than to make
> even the slightest effort on their own (Bornstein, 1993, p. 14).

Others have noted that such dependency can at times aid in therapy with alliance and transference (Buss & Malamuth,1996). Eventually, clinical researchers categorized and

pathologized dependency as a disordered behavior. Dependent personality appeared first and officially in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manuel for Mental Disorders DSM-III* in 1980. Since 1980 through the 21st century, discussions of dependent types continued to be viewed negatively and stigmatized by through the addiction stories. The *DSM5* addresses dependent types within the same criteria based definitions as a personality disorder. The *DSM5* criteria includes descriptors. The *DSM5* criteria focuses on "neediness" (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 675). The descriptors as well suggest that dependent disordered individuals have an excessive need to be taken care of resulting in clinging and overly submissive behavior. It is possible that the dependent types of this study may not meet the requirement for diagnosis per the *DSM5* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 676-677).

Concepts of Narcissism and Energy

One of the early presentations of the disorder or concept of narcissism comes from Heinz Kohut (1971). Kohut suggested that "self objects" are necessary for development. Self objects are those figures that were there in childhood and which existed in attuned and empathic parental relationship (Symington, 1993, p. 106). In Kohut's view, the absence of these essential self objects is the root of most all psychopathology. Adding to this is the strong suggestion that narcissism is the source of all mental disturbances, as it is a piece of the sociopathic person, the narcissistic type, the borderline type and all other personality diagnoses (Symington, 1993, p.118).

A narcissistic person may be viewed as one who turns away from the life giver. Symington (1993) suggests that this happens in infancy. Symington admits that talking about what happens in the mind of an infant is factually unknown, mythological or at least difficult. Nonetheless, his suggestion is that in infancy, the child makes an intentional infantile response

during a severe separation or disruption from the mother who has provided initial life resources. At some point in the very early stages of infancy, there is the refusal of the life giving source and the "I" turns and takes the self as a love object. This split depends, according to Symington, to be related to how much the "self" has repudiated the life giver parent. This is a matter of degree (Symington, 1993). This idea is often dismissed for the lack of evidence and lack of empirically support. But it is helpful as a contribution to the larger discussion of a phenomenon. This discussion also adds to an awareness of the variability and unknown etiology of the phenomenon of relationship.

A "high" or extreme pathologically defined narcissistic person PND manifests entitlement behavior at the direct expense of even close others (Rohmann et al., 2012). In some regard PNDs tend to see themselves in a self-distorted direction as superior to romantic partners and most other types of relationships as well. In effect they infer superiority in correspondence to their own entitlements (Rohmann et al., 2012). This self-distorted projection predictably and consistently leaves the one down partner DPD with an absence of connection and an exhausted supply of nurture and care. The nurturing caregiving energy may have seemed overflowing in the beginning, at some point it becomes burnout (Irwin, 1995).

Narcissistic Wound and Fatal Attraction

Narcissism which is shared with another in weak intimacy is a tragic relationship in many cases. It is suggested to contribute to the divorce rate in Western culture (Solomon, 1989, p. 3-4) Paris (2013) reports that he once described "shared narcissism" as a "deathly embrace." He adds that in the beginning these relationships are symbiotic. This may seem counter intuitive as later these relationships are known to become relationships of differentiation and contention. Added

to this is the recommendation that to have and maintain intimacy, an individual is good to have an "adaptive personality" (Paris, 2013, p. 110).

The literature is significant to concepts suggesting that narcissistic personality disordered individuals have core issues of "narcissistic wound" (Adiv-Ginach, 2006). This term reflects an emphasis on pathology and behavioral patterns found in the psychosocial histories of Pathological Narcissistic Disordered Persons (PNDs). Within the past decade in research, the view of narcissism has been challenged and it has been suggested that overt narcissism is not a single dimensional construct (Brown & Tamborski, 2009). Other models of narcissistic injury and of narcissistic energy define the PND in two dimensions (Back, Küfner, Dufner, Gerlach, Rauthmann, & Denissen, 2013). One dimension being that of admiration and a second dimension of rivalry (Back et al., 2013). The PND's charm and charisma, especially in the early days or years of the relationship with a Dependent Personality Disordered DPD, gives the narcissistic person a tremendous empowering energy and what Rowland Miller terms as "fatal attraction" (Miller, 2012, p. 128). This energy is fantastic for the dependent ones in the beginning as it in the beginning meets basic relationship needs of positive feedback from an "adoring" lover. But for dependent types, they tend to feel more at home around those who agree that they are unworthy. This begins with fascination for the dependent types (Miller, 2012, p, 128-129). The two polarized personalities DPD versus PND, also termed Exhibitionist Narcissists (ENP) and Closet Narcissists (CNP), appear to meet, greet, connect, and later become antagonized in rivalry as the narcissist's need for attention and incessant admiration depletes the DPD's energy and interest. For the dependent types this rivalry is internalized. What once was admiration falls to resentment (Back, et al., 2013). What was once fascination later becomes disillusionment and anger (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2009).

A significant part of the connection is that narcissistic behaviors are perpetuated by the way in which they attract others. The attraction and the relationship may not become interpersonally disruptive until a relationship moves into a more intimate level (Oltmanns & Turkheimer, 2009). Contributing to interpersonal disruption is the narcissistic individuals' extreme vulnerability. This vulnerability functions as dysfunction as it manifests as hypervigilance to insult for the narcissistic type (Kealy & Rasmussen, 2012). Added to this is sometimes an odd and excessive shyness and interpersonal avoidance for the narcissistic individual as a function of pulling back from perceived threats to self-esteem.

Self-awareness and self-perception are significantly important in emotional healthiness and in treatment. Self -perception is also core to the features of personality pathology (Lukowitsky & Pincus, 2013). In consideration of two types of disordered behavior, the dependent and the narcissistic, it becomes apparent that at the core of personality concepts and theories rest in the fact that personality as a construct is very much interpersonal in nature (Lukowitsky & Pincus, 2013). It is the distorted self problem which drives the disorder and as well the malignant relationship. Self-regulatory deficits exist in pathological narcissism. This problem is not about the grandiosity so much as it is about a secret core wound or trait which must be warded off from conscious awareness (Kealy & Rasmussen, 2012).

Empirical research on narcissism and interpersonal relationships has at times focused on romantic relationships of dating and marriage. Over the course of a relationship, PND behavior has a negative impact on the DPD dependent type because it is very often linked to emotional "game playing" and infidelity. High levels of unrestricted *sociosexuality* are also reported (Campbell, Rudich & Sedikides, 2002). Sociosexuality is a term which describes individual differences in willingness to engage in sexual relations without closeness, commitment or other

32

indicators of emotional bonding (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992). This behavioral term is important in the discussion of relationship quality between the DPD and the PND. Sociosexual behavior often functions to increase the pain, suffering and disillusionment for the identified participant DPD type (Simpson & Gangestad, 1992).

History of Narcissism and Dependency in Psychodynamic Theory

Narcissism is rooted in psychodynamic theory and as a psychoanalytic concept it advanced with Freud's writings in 1914. This is contrasted with narcissism theories of psychopathy which evolved from the field of forensic psychology. Narcissistic character and narcissistic disorder were articulated by Waelder in 1925 and later added to by Nemiah, Kernberg and Kohut (Levy, 2012). All of these were preceded by Freud's discussion from the early 1900s as Freud's views were concepts of personality and his theory was both a stage theory (psychosexual theory) and a personality theory (psychodynamic). Narcissism as a disorder was in modern times constructed as a more complete diagnosis in 1980. Levy (2012) suggested that the original presentation of the disorder was not grounded in research but more upon clinical writings (Levy, 2012). Levy also called for more specific studies and programmatic research for the PND individuals. It is congruent within literature to say that the narcissistic PND individual can significantly emotionally damage the more naïve and typically unsuspecting DPD partner.

Kohut (1971), taking from and expanding Freud's psychodynamic views, purported that the "self" emerges in a psychoanalytic situation as a structure in the mind (Kohut, 1971, p. xiv-xv). This is important to understand the narcissistic person and his thinking. From his synthesis of Freud's theory, Kohut suggested that the narcissistic person disintegrates to a phenomenal level of cognition resembling the delusions and hallucinations of a psychotic person (Kohut, 1971, p. 9-11).

The consensus also from the literature is that narcissistic individuals create problems in romantic relationships and the role of romantic relationships within narcissism is understudied (Keller, Blincoe, Gilbert, Dewall, Haak, & Windiger, 2014). The materialization of a pathological connection is understood to be often rooted in assortative familiarity and viewed as tragic. These relationships extend psychological pathology through generations.

Kernberg (1976) added to the discussion specific to narcissism (Bernstein, 2013). Kernberg suggested a pathological narcissistic patient was often effectively devaluing others and in treatment initially works to eliminate the therapist as they see him as a threat to be feared (Bornstein, 2013, p. 26). This appears to function much like Freud (1949) had postulated. Freud suggested that narcissistic individuals were indifferent first and later become hateful and deceptive of love. Lovers are seen as objects to the narcissistic partner (Bornstein , 2013, p. 34) as also therapists would be seen as an object of threat. Kernberg also expressed concern that in treatment, a narcissist rage was a serious risk and arousing too much aggression was potentially destructive (Bernstein, 2013, p. 29). Agreement with this concern came from Kohut (1971) and Kernberg (1976) who also added that the narcissistic patients have the absence of a coherent ego (Bornstein, 2013, p. 36-37).

As true for narcissism in research, the literature reported that psychodynamic theory makes a contribution to the understanding and defining of the dependent types as well. Psychologist and peer of Freud, Karl Abraham, who also psychoanalyzed the first feminist personality theorist Karen Horney, suggested that dependent personality types could be viewed from a somewhat different approach (Bornstein, 1999). Borstein added that in the 1920's Abraham suggested that it was useful to distinguish between "oral dependent" and "oral aggressive". Oral dependent individuals were viewed as primarily characterized by passivity and

helplessness. The oral aggressive individual was characterized by aggression and intrusiveness (Bornstein, 1999, p. 19). This of course suggested that dependency in personality began in early or stage one development. This is a common and essential view within psychodynamic theory.

Scientific and cultural theories, like human beings, have their rhythms and cycles and are reflected in the successive generations who contributed to them (Horney, 1967). Psychodynamic theory is just like that. Abraham's patient and psychologist, Karen Horney (1967) extended a view of narcissism to add to the history. Horney declared that attraction is biological at birth and in true psychodynamic form; she added that sex does not start at adolescence but at birth (Horney, 1967. p. 27). Horney spoke of narcissism specifically. She boldly stated that a neurotic need for love is an expression of narcissistic traits (Horney, 1967, p.254). This supports the idea that dependent people and narcissistic individuals are similar perhaps more than they are different. It also adds to the concept of the attraction and union between the two types. Horney also added her support of Freud's ideology expressing that for female individuals there was a fear of loss. This is the fear of the loss of love. (Horney, 1967, p. 254-255). This ideology has power in controversy. These thoughts may be interpreted or misinterpreted to suggest that women are more neurotic or weak.

The longstanding ideology of fixation in psychosexual stage theory is central to psychodynamic personality development. For both personalities, the passive or the aggressive, the classic view is that of too much or too little of the necessary balance of oral activity in infancy creates a problem (Bornstein, 1999, p. 14-15). Fixation at infancy stage one (oral stage) has been included in theories of narcissism and dependency (Horney, 1967). Millon (2011) added to the discussion of personality disordered behavior and integrated clinical identification through a concept of normal to abnormal (Millon, 2011).

Millon & Davis (1996) historically promoted and contributed ideas about dependency. Through Millon's development of a personality assessment tool and extensive work about diagnostic criterion, he defined many personality disorders including what he called the dependent cooperative personality. The traits of this personality are the following: Expressively incompetent, withdraws from adult responsibilities by acting helpless and seeking nurturance from others; is docile and passive, lacks functional competencies, and avoids self-assertion; interpersonally submissive; needs excessive advice and reassurance, as well as subordinates self to stronger, nurturing figure, without whom may feel anxiously alone and helpless; is compliant, conciliatory and placating, fearing being left to care for oneself; and naïve cognitive style (Millon & Davis,1996) (Bornstein, 1999). This theoretical orientation is a culmination of ideas and research combining many pieces from a hundred years of theory. It is the compliancy, the placating behaviors and the nurturing traits of the dependent types that Millon & Davis (1996) described which add a helpful conceptualization of the dependent types especially as they attempt intimacy with the narcissistic partners.

Assortative Mating and Pathological Relationship

Assortative mating is a unique concept describing human relationships especially of a romantic type (Thiessen & Gregg, 1980). Individual people tend to connect and attract to individuals and choose partners who are similar to themselves. This is also known as the concept of homogamy. Attraction grounded in similarity is a tenant of assortative mating. Assortativeness includes similarities in psychiatric conditions (Merikangas & Spiker, 1982). These are powerful attractions. The attraction in relationship suggests that individual persons, though very different in outward ways, are actually connecting assortatively. This assortative matching of the dependent and the narcissistic types to each other is established upon the degree from which both

individuals deviate from "normal" or as they deviate from a statistical mean of "healthy." This is visually represented as opposite sides and directions from "normal" on a continuum or from within statistical constructs such as normal distribution or the bell curve.

Assortative mating suggests that the codependent type (DPD) and the narcissistic type (PND) are equal from center, but from opposite polarizations from mean, average or statistically "normal" (McMahon, 1994). The DPD pattern is specifically that of giving, watching, supporting and tolerating (Rossiter, 2005). The work of Rossiter adds also that the resultant personality structure resembles descriptions of narcissistic personality described in object relations theory and self-psychology theory. These perspectives have not traditionally included the factor of gender. With that suggestion, these individuals who are the focus of this research may be dependent, codependent, giving, and longsuffering. Rossiter (2005) further proposed that codependency can be understood as a feminine manifestation of narcissistic personality disorder (Rossiter, 2005). This concept represented a strong indication of the need for clarification about the dependent personality attaching to the narcissistic type.

Dependent Personality Types and Diagnostic Criterion

A definitive discussion of dependency and dependent behavior is necessary for this study. The discussion for dependency is in some ways more varied than that of narcissism. Husband and wife, Bornstein and Languirand (2003), suggested that the best relationship and behavioral response to an overly dependent person is to respond in classical behaviorism mode. Referencing the father of behaviorism, B. F. Skinner, they suggested that the best response is to an extremely dependent person is to maximize rewards and minimize punishment (Bornstein and Languirand, 2003, p. 63). This is a recommendation for applying infamous operant conditioning techniques.

In a promotion of healthiness, halting the reinforcement of dependent behavior is the recommendation (Bornstein, 2013). For the narcissistic/dependent relationship, it is the narcissistic type who cannot stop the reinforcement of dependency. For the narcissistic type, in the presence of dependency, it is perceived as weakness. The narcissistic type views the dependent partner as powerless. This feeds the narcissistic ego and avoids the personal wounded self. This is their "go to" mode in response to others. They feed the ego (the self) with power, dominance and with collected and demanded admiration. They draw from the dependent ones for supplies of gratitude and attention to cover deeply ceded inadequacy (Solomon, 1989, p. 57-63). From a lesson in behaviorism, an understanding is gathered of the narcissistic individual in relationship.

It is important to be reminded that not all narcissistic traits or individual narcissistic tendencies are pathological or destructive. Everyone possesses some narcissistic traits (Lerner, 2009, p.9). All human beings function with a degree of narcissism in relationship. (Solomon, 1989 p. 43-44). Solomon (1989) adds that narcissism is not an illness in most cases, but actually an aspect of relatedness which is focused on self (p. 43). Solomon eventually developed a concept termed "mature" narcissism which reflects the ability for an individual to take potentiality and goals to create a formation of independent life. Much of Solomon's theory also places the concept of narcissism on a continuum visually represented as extremes of primitive to mature (Solomon, 1989, p. 47-49).

Pathological and primitive narcissism can be extreme and destructive to others especially dependent naïve individuals. The dependent types appear to "enjoy feeding" the PND partners for a season (Lerner, 2009, p. 55-56). In stories of strong naiveté, the dependent type dwells in an inability to consider or imagine the self-centeredness of the PND partner. By nature and

definition, the narcissist must be "liked" in order to secure the supply he needs. If he needs to be feared in order to admired, he makes sure he is feared (Lerner, 2009, p. 57). Clinically, the narcissistic individuals may or may not have a clinical diagnosis. As notes, much of the research is grounded from data with those who have been involved in treatment.

The majority of data for personality disordered behavior is from the treatment settings (Ronningstam, 2011, p.249, 250). The prevalence of narcissism in the culture is convoluted and since most of the data is associated with those who find their way to treatment, the accuracy of the prevalence is always questionable (Stinson et al., 2008; Levy, 2012). Problems with getting accurate statistical information for the prevalence of the disorder are noted and lie within methodology (Ronningstam, 2011). The controversy over prevalence was exacerbated with the discussions and debates about narcissism at time of assembling data for the *DSM-5* (Kupfer & Regier, 2002).

From a review of literature about the dependent types, it was found that the dependent personality types have been given many descriptions and specific diagnostic criterion. Within the context of this study, the *DSM5* traits listed for the disorder of NDP are helpful. The *DSM5* suggests that the DPD types have difficulty expressing disagreement with others because of fear of loss, support and approval (American Psychiatric Association, 2013, p. 675). DPD diagnostic behavior is also described to include the seeking of nurturance and support to the point of "volunteering to do things that are unpleasant." This trait would include self-sacrificing behaviors within a broad range. These behaviors are known to include things such as excessive physical labor and participation in unpleasant sexual behaviors. Many behaviors may fall within a general and gross neglect of self and excessive giving of emotional energy (Jaffe, Goller & Friedman, 2012). The research mentioned that developmentally, emotional factors which influence

dependent personality types are core to the dysfunction, Freud (1949); Miller (1981); Russell (1985); Winnicott, (1990). In particular is the powerful emotion of shame (Ronningstam, 2011). In discussion of human development, it was noted that individuals with dependent tendencies often have overly nurturing or overly authoritarian parents who may prevent the development of autonomy and sense of self-competence within a child (Jaffe, Goller & Friedman, 2012). Autonomy (Erikson) is a concept of from the mid-century and is a pre-school developmental task (Meachum, 1989).

Though not a total consensus, there were also found a significant number of the common contributors to the literature of personality disorders, including narcissistic types and dependents types, which suggested the disorders to be rooted in very early stages of development Freud, (1949); Miller (1981); Russell, (1985); Winnicott, (1990). The difficulty with this advocacy for research is that empirical data is difficult to secure from the first stages of development. It is difficult to psychometrically test infants within the same parameters and means of adults. Individuals with dependent personality disorder often have families of who are characterized by low emotional expression and over controlling parental styles. It is uncertain if these disorders are etiologically related or simply traits that are shared by family members (Paris, 1999, p. 191). Paris (1999) reported that temperamental variability in the form of extreme shyness beginning in early childhood and infancy can be associated with avoidant and dependent personality types (Paris, 1999, p. 188). Paris further recommended that personality disorder be viewed as rooted etiologically in both some predisposition and an approach he termed "working with traits" (Paris, 1990, p. 211).

Cultural Considerations for the Research

The relationship between the narcissistic type and the dependent individual is very visible in the culture and the media. Labels are more common than valid diagnostic discussions. Though scientific awareness may be scant, the behaviors are presented in current media are extensive. Older males with "organizational power" such as officials and controllers of large corporations or political groups are widely known to dump a longsuffering spouse for younger more accomplished and more beautiful women. *Fortune* magazine in 1989 coined the term "trophy wife" and it was a literary phenomenon of discussion (Buss & Malamuth, 1996, p. 31). The media dialogue has continued about CEOs, actors, and professional athletes. Social scientists, including psychologist Harry Levinson, were consulted of this matter and reported their opinions. Levinson in a 1989 response suggested that the issue was about self-indulgence. Evolutionarily speaking, Levinson said that self-indulgence "crept" up on the CEO (Connelly, 1989). He added that indulgence was an issue for people who have worked hard to accomplish much from little. They feel they have earned it (Buss & Malamuth, 1996). Apologizing is rare for the narcissistic type. Showing remorse and being a narcissist are gross contradictions of terms (Lerner, 2009, p. 60-61).

The description of the CEO type appears indiscriminate and very similar to a classic and stereotypical narcissistic type in empirical literature. Buss & Malamuth (1996) and others in the field of evolutionary psychology consider this a definitive function of evolutionary theory (Buss & Malamuth, 1996, p. 37). To view both narcissism and dependent personalities within evolutionary psychology is a bio-psych perspective which is helpful to facilitate a broad concept of the phenomenon of the dependent and narcissist together. This discussion provides opportunity to understand the relationship phenomenon of the research question with a

scientifically driven genre. Evolutionary psychologists have for a long time purported that human beings may be evolutionarily driven to not be monogamous (Buss & Malamuth, 1996, p. 47, 48).

Clearly, narcissists need power (Lowen, 1985, p. 101). Lowen described narcissistic types as "Prince Charming". Lowen (1985) viewed the narcissistic types broadly, but more so from a psychodynamic perspective. This view sees narcissism as developing from the mother as she finds her son charming. The father experiences resentment in viewing the mother son relationship. The father negatively views the relationship seeing it bad or wrong. This functions as "training" for seduction as the male child learns quickly how to seduce his mother into smiling attention (Lowen, 1985, p. 102). Lowen suggested it is the beginning of a personality of self-centeredness. The narcissistic person was defined in the literature often to be self-centered. Self-centeredness was determined to be more pathological and overall more damaging than selfishness. Selfishness is "out there" often without shame. Self-centeredness has to be "flushed out" for the narcissistic person tries always to conceal it (Lowen, 1985). Narcissism is actually a mentality, therefore it always hidden. The narcissistic person does not reveal openly his obsession with self. He is mental in function and love is reduced to an impressionistic façade (Symington, 1993, p. 62-64).

Lowen (1985) added more to the discussion with the concept of the "promise of specialness" as a seductive lure which developmentally molds a child into what the parents want them to be. This manifests not blatantly, but in subtle but consistent parental attitude. Particularly in American culture American parents "want something from their children". This is often related to the individual parent's sense of failure. Parents may use the child for support and affection. The "special" that these children grow up to "feel" is not felt at all according. (Lowen,

1985, p. 100). It is not a feeling. It is a mental construct (Lowen, 1985, p. 101). Therein, may be the root of problem of an inability to experience or engage in authentic intimacy for the narcissistic type.

Psychodynamic Theory Framing

For the dependent types, the "center of gravity" lies in others and not in themselves (Millon, 2011). DPD types tend to protect themselves by quickly submitting and complying with what others want of them. Like borderline personality individuals they want to please for a while to avoid even a possibility of abandonment (Millon, 2011). This appears especially true during the early stages of the relationship. It is the early stages of relationship for which this study has a focus and from which the research question was developed.

Another way of viewing the dependent personality type is to view them as "the forgotten hero" (Waska, 1997). This is accurate for the DPD types who set themselves to be "drained." Waska calls this a concept of being the "servant and toilet of emotion". This view of Waska was mostly a developmental view. A child becomes internalized to believe that he or she is the "cause" of all trouble and bad in the home and within the parents' relationship. This idea is consciously functioning as "painful responsibility" for deficits in parental response and relationship (Waska, 1997). These feelings of self-blaming and painful responsibility for parents experienced as a quiet need for conflict avoidance for the sake of survival. It is effectively an escape and avoidance of angst or anxiety within the DPD. Theories of addiction and treatment termed this a codependent behavior (Solomon, 1989, p. 61). Explanatory theories of anxiety have called it an internalized need for control (Newman, 2013). Sigmund and Anna Freud termed it as defense mechanism (Freud, 1949, p. 57). The narcissistic types think it is love.

DPD Individuals become emotionally dependent on someone in the process of development. In a paradoxical way, the dependent types develop a sense of identity which lies in their perceptions of others. This is perhaps surprisingly similar in construct to the narcissistic types who are also overly attempting to "get in the head" of others with attempts to look grandiose, but in effect this is a reverse of the dependent response. For the dependent ones this may come from parents who either "stole" their identity or from parents who do not present and demonstrate their own clear sense of self. In the process these parents become overly reliant on their children or their marital partner. This functions as a lack of boundaries within the home (Jaffe et al., 2012).

Dependent types may take on one of three roles (Hoogstad, 2008, p. 64). These roles include: the persecutor, the rescuer, or the victim. Rescuers attempt and work hard to lessen the problematic issues of others which in effect make the DPD types dependent upon the controllers. The persecutor and victim roles are strongly related to domestic violence (Hoogstad, 2008, p. 64). These are commonly known as victims of abuse, economic dependency, or parents with nervous concern for their children. The DPDs adapt within a chaotically structured environment to survive or to facilitate their children with basic necessities or a hope for better life. In this, there remains no self-care and no ability to let go of the giving and doing.

Multiple Conceptual Views of Dependency and Narcissism

From the review it also became apparent that there were at least two global views of narcissism and dependency. Social psychologists and clinical psychology have similar views. But also bear slight differences. Both see the dependency negatively (Bornstein, 1999, p. 17). The clinical view though is much more negative than the social psychology view. Social psychologists view dependency in specific situations as positive construct and behavior. This

44

view is easily seen in consideration that dependent types have empathy for individuals in need

and are likely to help and assist those in trouble. That is a positive social function. Dependent

people also "cue the culture," according to Bornstein, to take care of the needy and dependent

ones. Some dependent types may rally themselves and others for a social cause (Bornstein, 1999,

p. 18). This can prompt even the narcissists to give a little or a lot, even if it is for show and

praise. But the narcissistic types typically will only give for as long as they are lauded for their

effort. Their behavior is consistently performance based.

Dependency as a psychological construct was evaluated through a meta-analysis by

Bornstein (1999). The review was of seven specific theorists from the 1970s and 1980s. He

found that the concepts, theories, and definitions were all similar. He concluded that the seven

older theories were found to be virtually indistinguishable from those of Fromm (1947), Horney

(1967), and Sullivan (1947). This report suggested that there has historically been significant

agreement over time as to a definition of dependency (Bornstein, 1999, p. 16).

Codependent traits were proposed as developmentally complementary to dependent

relationship traits (Irwin, 1995). Codependency is a newer concept from longer standing

definitions of dependent personality. It is in fact an extension or specific niche of dependency

rooted in a very fundamental movement beginning with revivalism and temperance movements

of the 1930's and energized with drug and alcohol treatment modalities beginning in the 1970's.

In view of family relationship matters of addiction, the spouse seemingly derives a sense of

identity from a caretaking role (Irwin, 1995). In the 1980's this concept was more fully realized

with the discovery through research that the codependent spouse did not actually become

codependent with the addicted one, but actually developed the dependent personality traits

within their families of origin. These results indicate that the dependent types bring with them their tendencies.

Irwin's research was an attempt to determine if codependence was predictable by childhood trauma. The results were found that it was not predictable by childhood trauma but was a more complex and complicated issue. Personality psychologist and feminist Karen Horney proposed a similar concept in her theory development. Horney's view she labeled as *morbid dependency*. Many researchers have come to see morbid dependency to be the same as modern day codependency. Parents who were non-nurturing, controlling, or coercive were listed as contributors to dependency development for both morbid dependency and codependency (Horney, 1967, p. 229; Crothers & Warren, 1996). Crothers & Warren (1996) study did not find, contrary to previously published literature of the time, support for a relationship between codependency in adults and parental chemical dependency for those participant's. It appears true from Crothers and Warren's work that there is a correlation between having at least one codependent parent and being a codependent person. The exposure to codependency or dependent personality parent seems to be a modeling effect. Crothers and Warren suggested that it was possible that the parental behavior of "controlling parent" could influence a child to regard other people as "objects" of attention. Historically, although other studies were found to report a relationship between chemical abuse in the home and later codependence of adult children, there are several who report no strong correlation (Irwin, 1995). Irwin's data was reasonably consistent in confirming that a contribution of narcissism within the family of origin is a prediction of codependence. This is an important concept in the development of this study. Irwin's (1995) work weakened the significance and validity of theories of codependence 20

years ago. Irwin stated (1995) that no truly sound empirical concept existed during his day for what codependence etiologically was at the time.

Additional Issues and Concepts of Developmental Etiology for Personality

Compared to the codependent individuals, narcissistic types in one study were found to be more influenced by childhood problems which were predictable to adult personality disorders. (Ramklint, Von Knorring, Von Knorring & Eskselius, 2003). Adult narcissistic and antisocial personality types were five to six times more affected or predicated by a childhood or adolescent personality disorder diagnosis as compared to other adult personality disorders or types Adolescents and children were found to be four times more likely to have dependent personality disorder if they were given a diagnosis of major depression as children (Ramklint et al., 2003). This report was derived from self-reporting methodology, so it has some limitations. Depression as a disorder in childhood increased the predictability and correlation to all the clusters of adult personality disorder in this study (Ramklint et al., 2003). Any adult personality disorder has a statistical prevalence in the population of ten percent. In Ramklint's research sample, it equaled 39%. This research pointed to an association between previously experienced mental disorders during childhood and adolescence to adult personality disorder diagnosis.

Bornstein (1999) discussed in research from the 1990's, and he found that dependency was associated with increased commitment in romantic relationships and this was further substantiated that dependency is associated with affiliative tendencies (Bornstein, 1999, p. 69). Affiliative tendencies were discussed historically by Catell (1966) who defined them as "the tendency to move toward others seeking closeness and connection because of genuine feelings of caring, sympathy, and concern versus the tendency to be reserved and detached, and thus be independent and unemotional" (Mehrabian, 1994, p. 99).

47

Childhood dependency is a predictor of marital commitment and stability (Bornstein, 1999). This functions as a perception, which for the longer term manifests as a problem for the dependent ones in relationship. Dependent types are "motivated to perceive" their partners as highly committed to the relationship. This is in effect a "self-serving bias" or distortion in the perception of their partners (Bornstein, 1999, p. 69). The perception comes to mean for the dependent type that they see their narcissistic or abusive partner as greater in commitment than that partner really is or could ever be. This may specifically be for the dependent one, that they are unable to imagine that someone else does not care or commit to their level. This may not be so much naïveté as it is a narrow and limited relationship experience and a cognitive minimizing view of self.

A significant finding from Bornstein's (1999) meta-analysis of dependency reflected data strongly suggesting that dependency is associated with what is called "suggestibility." This term was defined by Millon (1996) to mean that dependent types are "hypnotized" in effect to high levels of motivation to please other people in order to obtain nurture and support. This is the phenomenon created by the influence, impressing, and performing of the narcissistic types. Further investigation of this process extends the revelation that dependent types have greater susceptibility to interpersonal influence from high status rather than low status individuals (Bornstein, 1999, p. 57). This may explain how dependent types get caught up with the narcissistic types. The DPD individuals are prone or predisposed to attract to high profile and impressive people. This was described for the DPDs to be an "auto-kinetic effect. Adding to this discussion is the idea that dependent types have been found to also be high in "yielding" and high in compliance to mates and others (Bornstein, 1999, p. 58). The idea of an auto-kinetic response is intriguing and novel and may add to the collected data of this study. Auto-kinetic

does not suggest heritability, but "automatic" because it became developmentally a coping

mechanism or from the psychodynamic view, a defense mechanism. Defense mechanisms are

known to relieve or to distract from angst and cognitive dissonance (PDM Task Force, 2006, p.

640).

Bornstein (1999) suggested that science and psychology had not gone past the basic

diagnostic and psychometric issues of DPD. From his literature, it appeared that there remained a

need for something beyond the diagnostic discussions of DPD. Rich and thick qualitative data is

much needed to dismantle and expose the interaction and the energy of the phenomenal

relationship between DPD and PND. Adding to the broader discussion of the dependent

individuals were general findings which suggested that more dependent types score higher in

creativity and concept formation (Bornstein, 1999, p. 74).

Bornstein & Languirand (2003) presented views also of "healthy" dependency. Under a

heading of "dysfunctional attachment patterns" they presented a concept of narcissistic

detachment (ND). This concept is generally definitive of narcissism. It is specific to suggest that

PND individuals specifically use their imagined superiority as an excuse for avoiding real or

authentic contact with people. This becomes for them a "justification" for their detachment. This

is epitomized by a suggestion that PNDs very often view "lesser" people as not being worth their

time. It is, psychoanalytically, a defense that keeps strong and internalized feelings of

inadequacy out of conscious awareness (Bornstein & Languirand, 2003, pp. 50-51). It functions

as an ultimate display of impressionism and impression management.

Narcissism as Mentality

Narcissism as a construct also includes an understanding of the cognitive processing and

mental functioning within the personality. Narcissism as a mentality (Symington, 1993) is a

concept helpful to understanding the development and dynamics of narcissistic behavior. When thinking is "flushed" out in narcissism what is revealed is an attitude. Narcissistic mentality can be described as an attitude about both inner and outer events. In effect this facilitates the opportunity for narcissistic attitude to be hidden. As an example, Symington (1993) reported that there is a fundamental terror for the narcissistic type to look inward. If a narcissistic person feels sorry for himself, instead of perceiving that to be related to self, he will "locate it" or relocate it in another person or many other people. Symington (1993) suggested that the cardinal rule of narcissism is that self-knowledge is to be avoided at all costs and in all stories. For narcissistic types there is also always a shrinking back from confrontation (Symington, 1993). Too much confrontation can be costly for the dependent partners because it will not be tolerated by the narcissistic types.

When in the presence of a pervasively functioning narcissistic person, it is possible, through pre-set awareness, to see that the PND is consistently rewriting stories and histories. With this energy they are always outwardly focused and persistently concealing the self. Consider that the PND is self-centered and that this trait is hidden and camouflaged by behaviors which look to be giving and caring. The PND may not look terribly selfish because selfish is "kind of out there" or outside of the true self. A more deeply ceded self-centeredness is hidden very discretely (Symington, 1993. p. 61). Without awareness, it may take an extended amount of time for many individuals to understand the false and manipulative behavior with which they engage. Symington has extensively made a definitive difference between selfish and self-centeredness. This narcissistic concept of Symington (1993), purports that the self-centeredness is more of a mentally consuming experience. Self-centeredness is thinking about self.

Masterson's Closet Narcissism Theory

Klein (1995) and Masterson (1993), from their studies of the dependent type with the narcissistic type, developed a concept specific and unique to describe the dependent type. This was originally focused on an awareness and discovery of narcissism which reflected from their view a depressed and depleted subtype of narcissism. Several different researchers in psychology have noticed this phenomenon (Levine & Faust, 2013). Various names have been applied to this idea. This depleted narcissistic personality has been labeled "closet" narcissism by Masterson (1993). And additionally it has been called covert narcissism (Akhtar, 2009), hyper-vigilant narcissism (Gabbard, 2009), depleted narcissism (Levine & Faust, 2013), and hyper-sensitive narcissism is derived from *Murray's Narcissism Scale* data within an assessment tool (Hendin & Cheek, 1997). Murray (2007) contributed much to the discussions of personality and personality disorder by stating that personality is a "miscellany" of general attributes, driving forces, relations between these forces and developmental modes (Murray, 2007. p. 588).

The closet narcissistic person praises others and devalues self (Levine & Faust, 2013). The morbid exhibitionistic narcissistic type is a consumer of energy as they function in attention seeking opportunistic behaviors. It was further noted that these two forms (CNP versus PND) display some same traits and characteristics. Both of entitlement and a preoccupation with grandiosity are common for both partners. These traits are the same but look and function in different ways each separate partner. They also share traits of low empathic energy and selfishness (Pincus et al., 2009, Wink, 1991). For the closet narcissistic types grandiosity is more unconscious (Bernstein, 2013). The closet narcissistic DPD personality types are often shy and modest in demeanor and when they intimately disclose in a conversation of trust they will share their shame about unachieved goals. They secretly may harbor resentment of others who have

emotional success or authentic relationship experience. Within many comparative discussions of the two personality disorders of dependent types and narcissistic types there is the uncanny realization of similarity. Masterson (1993) suggested a "false self-development" or "arrested development" to be the core issue in many personality disorders (Masterson, 1993).

The mostly oblivious narcissistic types appear to have no awareness of their effect or impact on other people (Gabbard, 2009). Narcissism and other personality disorders may be visualized as sliding on a continuum. It has been easy to view narcissism as negative. Views of the narcissistic types are negative within measures of psychological health and adjustment and as healthy (positive) as these same traits can be viewed as effective, functioning, fulfilling, and as psychological integration (Wink, 1991). Through the literature, significant contributors to narcissism theory including Kohut (n. d.) and Kernberg (1975) have fundamentally agreed that "neurotic degrees" of investment in the "self" crush any ability for connecting meaningfully with others (Jennings, 2007). Jennings adds that both Kernberg and Kohut described several specific defense mechanisms which explain narcissistic behavior. These include: splitting, omnipotence, devaluation, projective identification, and primitive idealization. Splitting is for the narcissistic types manifested as both parents and self being "split" into all good or all bad objects. This facilitates to the PND to bypass the normal human process of any internalized reconciliation. The split for the PND is applied to self as they take profound inferiority and lack of worth and unrealistically, avoid ever integrating or processing of it normally. The narcissistic types have "radar" detection for the limitations and weaknesses of others especially those who offer help and support. The narcissistic type spares self from the "terror" of anything associated with personal dependency (Jennings, 2007). Jennings suggested that treating PND individuals attempt to facilitate a PND type to a Buddhist type of "emptiness" is nearly impossible. The PND lives in

personal emptiness and concepts of Buddhism are oppositional and irreconcilable to narcissistic types. In effect, the narcissistic types have difficulty in valuing any intentional emptying of self or a clearing of the mind (Jennings, 2007).

The Dark Triad and the Self Triad of Narcissistic and Dependent Types

While in discussions of the PND types, a label of the "dark triad" of traits and pathology for narcissistic types was presented (Jonason et al., 2009). On the other hand, Masterson (1993), added that for the dependent types there is the "self triad." This is 1) self-activation or the pursuits of real-self goals which incites 2) abandonment and depression and results in the use of and 3) defenses (Masterson, 1993). As the dependent type begins to slow by necessity they also begin to evaluate the self. They find that they no longer idealize their partner. They manifest new feelings of emptiness, shame, humiliation, and rage. They then face the need to defend against these negative feelings. This often grows to be strong devaluation of self and an arousal of blatant self-destructive feelings and behaviors (Masterson, 1993).

Modern Applications

In not so clinical terms, licensed therapist, Karyl McBride (2012), talked irreverently about "damaged relationship pickers" for women who have been developmentally facilitated to a state of dependency. The research was focused on daughters who were parented by narcissistic mothers. She termed the effect as one of "distorted love." Daughters from narcissistic mothers, McBride (2012) reported, learn that love means "what someone can do for you or what you can do for them" (McBride, 2012, p. 109). Typically, the daughter of a narcissistic mother will choose a spouse who cannot meet her needs emotionally. McBride (2012) speaks of the dependent person's "intuition" which is telling and cueing from the beginning that something may not be right (McBride, 2012, p. 110-111). This "intuition" is the focus of this study. It may

be coined in many terms. It is "red flags" and warning signs. McBride added that many men and women choose their partners mostly on an unconscious level (McBride, 2012, p. 112). If a young adult female person has not "worked out" her relationship with her mother, she will likely find someone who helps to re-create the mother and daughter pattern of behavior (McBride, 2012, p. 112-113). Significant narcissism research contributor Campbell (2004) has validated and supported McBride's narrative work. McBride's work (2012) contributes to the development of this study.

For the grandiose person, a collapse in self-esteem will show clearly how weak and precarious that self-esteem has been. It spins and falls like a deflated balloon. This happens because there was no development of inner strength and support (Miller et al., 2008, p. 34-35). Continuous performance with outstanding achievement for the narcissistic types at times helps to maintain the illusion and delusion of attention on grand things including the self. These individuals from the beginning choose partners in business and in life who were either already depressive or, in marriage, they *assume* the depressive role of the grandiose partner. This keeps the depression on the outside and the grandiose one can tend to his "poor" partner and protect her like a weak child. He is avoiding the wounded self. He can feel strong and indispensable in this role and thus, he soars in his aura of strength and perfection. He denies completely the cauldron of his emotional childhood (Miller et al., 2008, p. 28-39). He is not required to acknowledge his past. He is known to say, "Let's move on." In the infamous legend, Narcissus was in love with his idealized picture but neither the grandiose nor the depressed Narcissus could love himself. His passion for the false self, made it impossible for him to love anyone else.

There is considerable research in the literature which points to the very basic need for a parent to provide an atmosphere of respect and tolerance of feelings. In the time of separation

from the parents, a child will be able to give up the symbiotic relationship with the parent and accomplish steps toward individuation and autonomy (Miller, 1981, pp. 6, 7). Miller warns that many individuals who do not have this experience of autonomy and independent self-development will be unsatisfied and repressed. These individuals will be compelled to attempt relationship gratification spending a lifetime seeking gratification through ones who have targeted them on "radar" to consume but never give (Miller, 1981, p. 7).

Chapter Two Summary

Many questions need answers within this topic. The attempt was to learn from the dependent types not only of their relationship, but more importantly to learn about their awareness of self. The research question was to answer what these individuals knew, what they missed, what they have learned and how they coped. The review of literature presented a gap and a need. There was scant specific data which revealed the phenomenon and functional energy of the powerful relationships in question. The evidence of the effect of the phenomenon is hugely represented in modern culture. But the answers to "what is going on here" and "how did it happen" are minimal. It is as if the dependent types were viewed as mute or unknowing of "how they got there." These were the objectives of data collection and analysis for this study. As previously discussed, there is clearly a benefit to collecting data from peers, family or significant others who have known narcissistic types for a period of time (Trull et al., 2012).

Methodology

Organization of the Chapter

Chapter three is the explanation of methodology used to answer the research question. It begins with a brief introduction to remind the reader about the topic. Next, the focus of the study is followed by the research question, as well as the theoretical framework. The research design and sequence timeline to complete the research will be described. The site and sample will be next, as well as, the participants. This is followed by a discussion concerning research ethics, and depth versus breadth. Data collection was conducted in three parts, including interviews, observations and document collection. Then, the researcher's role management is described followed by how the data was recorded and managed. Trustworthiness was considered for reliability and the description of prolonged engagement, persistent engagement, triangulation, peer debriefing, member checks and audit trail. Finally, the chapter is summarized.

Introduction

This study was designed to contribute a paradigm about the relationship between a narcissistic person and a dependent person. Concepts were drawn from two decades of clinical experience with dependent personality types. This study was also a search for more qualitative data. A significant amount of research and literature was available about narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. The literature review indicated that in recent years these concepts have has been studied broadly and controversially. This is evidenced by discussions from the development of the *DSM-5* (American Psychiatric Association, 2013). Dependent personality has historically been popularly discussed in terms of codependency, battered wife syndrome, and chronic enablers. What has been missing is newer data and analysis about the dependent types *with* the narcissists. The need was found significant for rich and qualitative data

specific to the function, purpose and the dynamic of the mix between narcissistic partners and closet dependent narcissists. This is a phenomenological function. The need to understand this unique dynamic as it affects long term mental and physical health for the dependent partner is crucial. In these imbalanced relationship environments the effects on personality and brain development for children is also unique and severe (Solomon, 1989 p.74). This suggests that the effects of narcissistic relationship upon individuals perpetrates to entire families.

There is a lack of data and empirical explanation about intimate partners with narcissistic mates. It is difficult to find research that is empirical and which reflects documented experience, self-awareness, or the effects on quality of life for the dependent partner. The dependent partner who lives in minimization and disillusionment was the focus of this study. Little has been known from deep qualitative research about why dependent people try to attach to the narcissistic type. Solomon calls this problem narcissistic vulnerability (Solomon, 1989 p. 44).

Focus of Research

This study was an effort to determine possible cues, signs, warnings, or intuitive clues exist. And additionally a focus as to assess self –awareness of individual psychosocial development for codependent type individuals. Particularly what is needed is data about the dependent types as they evaluate their dilemma. The purpose was to determine from participants what traits or behaviors functioned in the beginning stages of the relationship and appeared as "red flag" cues of the narcissistic partner. The assumption was that the relationship cues could possibly be missed, avoided, or minimized. An additional goal was also to facilitate self-awareness for the DPD types. The literature reinforced the idea that many narcissistic types are initially charming and often successful in many ways (Back et al., 2013). This study explored to find emerged or revealed themes and patterns which could be evidence of self-awareness for the

57

DPD codependent types. It was further considered that these data could possibly, in a broader

scope, contribute to the prevention of the manifestation of a dysfunctional union for future

partners. There was literature suggesting that not all narcissistically involved relationships are

considered dysfunctional (Solomon, 1989, p. 43). The additional objective task was to determine

from the participants if any self-reported narcissistic relationships were acceptable or functional

for the dependent types.

Research Question

The research question for this study was: "What psychosocial and developmental traits

and patterns in personality and behavior emerge from dependent individuals partnered with

narcissistic personality types?"

Theoretical Framework

Three theories framed the research within this study: These three were psychodynamic

theory, closet narcissistic disorder/The Masterson's approach, and assortative mating theory. An

assumption was made based upon the literature. This assumption was that personality theories

explain often the "why" of behavior and the "how" of development and that qualitative research

often facilitates the effective means for identifying intangible factors, such as social norms,

socioeconomic status, unconscious behaviors and gender roles. These roles and functions in the

research are often not readily apparent; or they may be apparent but incomplete in understanding.

When used along with quantitative methods, qualitative research can help to interpret and better

understand the complex reality of a given situation and the implications of quantitative data

(Family Health International, 2015). For the phenomenon of dependent types in relationship who

attached to the narcissistic type, psychodynamic theory helps to explain the problem, the process

and the phenomenon. There are other Neo-Freudian theories which advance some of the

ideology of the relationship in question. It became apparent that the developmental pieces of

58

psychodynamic theory are significant to understanding any individual in a relationship. Karen Horney and Erich Fromm as classic personality theorists contributed to the conceptualization of the phenomenon of this study.

The view of the researcher clinician was a psychodynamic view. As a frame work of the study, psychodynamic theory for the researcher stems from several years of experience teaching psychological theories in courses within academia. Diligent and purposeful awareness of psychological developmental theories framed the research concepts over many years. Psycho-dynamic theory is viewed as a "view of nature" or world view more than so much a pure treatment modality or an intervention protocol. The rationale was an interpretation of a strong definitive underpinning of psychodynamic views which classically underpin original diagnostic criteria for narcissism as a personality disorder. Dependent personality traits were also defined for this study within that same view.

Research Design

This study was a design for an exploratory and qualitative interview-based study which attempted to assess individual perspectives of experience for narcissistically codependent disordered individuals DPDs engaging for a significant amount of time in relationship with a narcissistic type individual PNPs (pathologically narcissistic personality disordered individuals). The study was a focus on intimate relationships. The relationship criteria guiding the data collection was specific to the procurement of evidence and data of the codependent type. The study drew and grew through a concept of grounded theory.

Grounded theory method does not aim for the "truth" but to conceptualize what is going on by using empirical research (Patton, 2015). In a way, grounded theory method resembles what many researchers do when retrospectively formulating new hypotheses to fit data (Corbin &

Strauss, 1998). However, when applying the grounded theory method, the researcher did not

formulate the hypotheses in advance since preconceived hypotheses result in a theory that is

ungrounded from the data and thematic analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967). There were some

questions as to the application of grounded theory in the context and plan of this study. The idea

of grounded theory also promotes the potential use and development of a systematic approach to

discover an "inductively derived" grounded theory about a phenomenon (Strauss & Corbin,

1994).

Grounded theory, from the seminal text of Glaser and Strauss (1967), was presented

originally as directives for grounded theory process as "guidelines" and not a promotion for

rigidity (Cooney, 2010). The question for this research is about the potential for this thematic

analysis to derive and produce grounded theory. In addition to the guided questions of the in

depth interview process (see *Appendix A*), the study utilized also the *NEO FFI-3 Personality*

Inventory, McCrae & Costa (2012) as a pre-screening qualifier for the participants in the study.

This instrument is a measure of the five major domains of personality as well as the six facets

that define each domain. Taken together, the five domain scales and thirty facet scales of the

NEO FFI-3 facilitate a comprehensive and detailed assessment of normal adult personality.

The *NEO FFI-3* is recognized internationally as a gold standard for personality

assessment (Costa & McCrae, (2012). Reliability and Validity for this instrument is good. The

internal consistency of the *NEO FFI*-3 was high, at: N = .92, E = .89, O = .87, A = .86, C = .90.

The internal consistency of the facet scales ranged from .56–.81. The internal consistency of the

NEO FFI-3 was consistent with that of the *NEO FFI-R,* ranging from α = .89–.93 for domains

and α = .54–.83 for facets. Test retest reliability of the *NEO FFI-3* is also good. The test retest

reliability of an early version of the *NEO* after 3 months was: N = .87, E = .91, O = .86 (Costa & McCrae, 2012).

The total amount of recent data from high level academic journals concerning the *NEO FFI-3* underpins its quality (McCrae & Costa, 2012). The rationale and justification for this instrument in a qualitative measure was to utilize it for qualifying the participants for inclusion. It was assumed that drawing from data facilitated by a standardized instrument could aid in further explanation of phenomena. The administration of the *NEO FFI-3* short version can be administered with clients typically within 30-40 minutes (McCrae & Costa, 2012). It was utilized for the codependent type partners.

Sequence Timeline

The planned order for the data collection and analysis was: consent, document review of chart, *NEO FFI-3* administration, *NEO FFI-3* scoring, semi structured interview with prompts, observation, document transcription, comparison of data sources, appraisal for themes, coding, keying, negative case analysis to eliminate irrelevant data, analyzing for inferences or patterns and separating from those that were not supported. Specific time frames, similar consistent environmental utilization, such as consistent office setting and location were utilized. The research from these individual events was consistently gathered by the lead research therapist. The researcher already had clinically established rapport with the participants before this study began. It was planned that the researcher clinician would remain in an active and engaged role of data collection with the participants over time and some of the participants would continue in treatment through and past the data collection and analysis. It was estimated that the data would be collected over a 60 day period.

Site and sample

The site for data collection was a private practice office with standard ethical boundaries and tight boundaries for confidentiality. The site was familiar to the participants as they were drawn from an active clientele caseload attached to the setting. The sample was screened to meet a criterion for inclusion in the study. All participants had previous experience in treatment at this site. Some of the participants were currently active in treatment.

Criterion for Inclusion

Criterion for inclusion also specifically included that the client had specific dependent/narcissistic experience documented by therapy notes and assessment. The clinical patient/participant data was required to indicate a relationship history with a narcissistic partner. Considerations and assumptions were made as to the effect of the familiarity with the setting and the researcher as well as advantages and disadvantages of professional relationship. The assumption was made that these participants would facilitate new data gleaned from a specific research questionnaire in a semi-structured interview. A disadvantage for this measure was the possibility that that the researcher therapist could manifest experimenter bias because of past therapeutic relationship with the participant. Attempts were made to prevent this bias. An advantage of participant trust was assumed. It was assumed an advantage that the participants had built trust from long therapeutic engagement through past clinical and professional relationship.

Participants

The population focus was the DPD codependent type clients. The proposal was to include both male and female clients. The data base of clients was N=8. A preliminary review of the projected participant pool and review of active patients suggested that the final number of

secured participants would be a mix of male and female clients. The ethnicity of this population was entirely Caucasian individuals of both upper middle class and lower middle class socio-economics status. A criterion of the codependent type DPDs was married or single individuals actively engaged with NPD type partners. Non-traditional relationships of gay, lesbian, or a transgender partnering were not excluded from the data collection process, but none participated in the study.

Parameters for the length of longevity of the relationship were set for the participants. Age range for the participants was set for individuals between the ages 18 to 85 years of age. It was expected that average age of these participant codependent types would be middle aged. The qualification for participation in the study specific to longevity or length of relationship was a minimum of 18 months. There were no proposed limitations on the number of years the relationship may have been actively engaged. A data collection event was used to determine if a definitive partner reported narcissistic personality relationship existed for each participant.

The participants were drawn from what can be defined as a homogenous sample and the plan was to include individuals who could substantiate authentic intimate experience with a PND person. From therapeutic experience with individuals with narcissistically functioning codependency issues (DPDs), it was known specifically that they were prone to giving too much, being too agreeable, being non-assertive and to be seeking of unconditional acceptance and love (Levine & Faust, 2013). They additionally met past or present criteria of a need for treatment. Those with severe physical or transportation limitations, non-English speaking abilities or intellectual low functioning were not included in this population. Individuals with extreme dual diagnostic criteria such as psychotic features or severe bipolar disorder were not included in the sample. Anyone who was unable to provide appropriate informed consent was also excluded for

participation. Current patients and archived referrals within the clinical practice were the database for the participants. Their collective experiences were exclusive of other treatment history, other practitioners, or previous diagnoses. The past experience was viewed as rich for both the research clinician and the potential participants. The DPD dependent type individuals were expected to have personal perceptions, personal experience and self-reported psychological awareness of a dysfunctional relationship.

Research Ethics

This researcher considered it inappropriate and unethical within research standards to label or diagnose the narcissistic types of partners of this study. There was no measure or intent to assess, evaluate or officially diagnose the alleged PND (narcissistic) partners. The narcissistic type individuals were not live participants in this study. Ethical standards of the American Psychiatric Association (2013) forbid provisional or formal diagnosis without appropriate assessment and face to face contact with patients or clients. *Appendix B* was a designed to accumulate data to resolve any concerns about descriptions or labels for the non-participatory partners. The additional questionnaire of *Appendix B* provided for the DPD dependent type participant a means to describe or self-report their partners' behaviors and their history within the relationship.

These self-reported data of "narcissistic partner information" from the dependent participants were analyzed to determine authentic narcissistic relationship. The data was required to validate that the participants' experience from a five point criteria of narcissism. These data are qualifiers for inclusion for the participants. The dependent types met criterion from the standardized assessment tool *(NEO-FFI-3).* This would constitute dependent traits such as high

scores in agreeableness and other traits which are commonly and classically known to define

dependent personality types.

Breadth versus Depth

Qualitative research is known to be mainly inductive. This approach is known to be ideal

for measuring or identifying previously unknown processes and explanations of why and how

phenomenon occur and as well as the range of their effects (Klassen, Creswell, Clark, Smith &

Meissner, 2012). This approach therefore functioned to pull deeper data from intense experience.

This is of course unlike quantitative data which tends to be deductive and drawing from already

"known" processes. This study can be described as mixed in that there is more breadth of

research from the quantitative piece of with the *NEO FFI-3,* a standardized instrument, and

also deeper data from the clinical interviews conducted with the same individuals.

Data Collection

The research therapist scheduled the participant interviews through letter, phone

solicitation, or in therapy sessions prior to the data collection. Information and data gathered

were analyzed with tools such as coding in order to identity patterns and themes in the data

(Bloomberg & Volpe, 2012). The data collection was formal and structured with much

consideration for both consistency and spontaneity. The data collection was documented through

audio recording and note taking. The structured interviews were individualized single events.

Informed consent was utilized before participants were screened or accepted (*See Appendix C).*

Observations

Observations for this research collection were very specific to "in the moment" non-

verbal assessment and data collection of the participants from clinical interviewing. In addition

to audio recordings and notes taken of content additional notes were made for each participant as

to their countenance and facial expressions and interpersonal reaction. Additionally, the

participants were observed for visible indications of anxiety, lability or tearfulness or any visible

or auditory signs of stress or emotion. These observations were viewed to indicate multiple

meanings including internalized stress from memory or indicators suggesting fear of disclosure

or sudden in the moment new awareness.

Document Collections

Existing documents for this qualitative study included the transcribed and the audible

recordings of the semi-structured interview, the hand written notes from the interviews from the

researcher, and the standardized assessment document of the *NEO-FFI-3*. Also included was the

manual of instruction for administering and scoring for that instrument. The informed consent

was also an existing document. The existing document of a "prompting" sheet for managing and

utilizing research questions for the interview as found in the appendices is also a noted existing

document. Copies of many peer reviewed journal articles as used and listed in the reference

section are also existing documents. The references section also included textbooks and classic

literature books which for this study were also existing documents. These were secured and

stored and available for any audit of records for this study.

Researcher's Role in Management

The researcher therapist was the manager of the data collection and the data documents.

The research therapist was responsible for the security and the anonymity of the process and the

data. The researcher's role with the participants and the data is an issue of prolonged

engagement. It is inevitable that the researcher therapist will know which data is attached or

derived from which participant since he is the interviewer and the recorder of the data. This

relationship of trust is believed to be established before the data collection. This called for the

research therapist to adhere to professional protocol in both arenas. These arenas were specific to that of a clinician and a researcher.

The researcher found some dissonance with separating appropriately and ethically the role between and about therapist versus researcher therapist. Typically, it is found common that in qualitative studies anonymity is required through informed consent and often it is found that pseudo or alternative identification is given to participants. The researcher assigned "letters" (DP-A, DP-B, etc.) to the participants in order to disconnect them in identity more so for the therapist as the change to a significantly different role as data collector was made. This was a conscious consideration for the researcher through the awareness that the participants would read the completed report and common pseudo names were considered inappropriate for this study. This accomplished a goal of "role change" for the therapist to become the researcher.

Managing and Recording Data

All documents accumulated and notes from the day the proposal was developed and the data which helped to facilitate the proposal, especially those listed as references, were kept secure. All documents containing participant disclosure, assessment and demographics were kept secure. All documents and records within this study were kept secure beyond the minimum standard of health care which is five years (Creswell, 2014, p. 100; Sieber, 1998)

Peer reviewed journals were utilized and were helpful in the supporting of a theory of orientation to explain and support the research question. It was helpful and appropriate to secure both qualitative and quantitative research to support and explain specifically the psychodynamic theory. The literature often mentions the end product of "rich" or "thick" data in qualitative measures. The approach in this study was to see the data as significant to meaning and significant to an increasing of awareness, and grounded theory. Significant data as a qualitative

term, suggested a more understandable and specific concept with less connotative value and less ambiguity. The documents were organized and secured to support the procedure, the data, the analysis, the conclusions, and the recommendations of this study.

Trustworthiness

A basic issue related to trustworthiness, or soundness, is credibility. The question to be answered is "How can an inquirer persuade his or her audience that the findings of an inquiry are worth paying attention to and worth taking into account?" (Creswell, 2014). The purpose of trustworthiness is to demonstrate transferability. The results of this study should mean something to the reader. The reader is the one who determines whether or not they can use the information within these pages. Does it provide insight? Can the user use the information? (Patton, 2015). It is important to understand that the inquiry can provide creditability, in that the inquiry was conducted in a manner as to ensure that the subject was accurately identified and described (Wolcott, 2009). In addition, the researcher has taken every attempt to account for changing conditions in the phenomenon and can account for changes to make certain that the information is dependable (Marshall & Rossman, 2011). Also, the researcher has carefully analyzed the data to make sure that it captures the traditional concept of objectivity, or what Denzin and Lincoln (2011) call confirmability (Denzin & Lincoln, 2011).

Prolonged Engagement

Prolonged engagement for the research with numerous years of specifically related clinical experience meets the standard for long-term involvement. Additionally, the participants had been seen in the clinical setting for a minimum of 18 months of treatment with the researcher. The specific data gathering time designed for the study was considered adequate.

This equaled a sixty-day period for gathering data with a minimum of 1.25 hours for each in actual data collection.

Persistent Engagement

Persistent engagement was discussed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Ethically, they suggested researchers should not become closed minded or quickly finished. A topic in which a researcher is deeply engaged with the participants and with the "culture" of the data collection can cause the researcher to immerse into a feeling of completion. Some researchers make conclusions quickly and fall into premature closure. Persistent engagement is performed best by employing negative analysis (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Negative analysis is defined as the elimination of anomalies to shake out relevant data through a structured process of elimination. Anomalies are viewed as random and not reflecting patterned information (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In this study, for the research therapist, persistent engagement was longstanding. This study did not reflect the end of a topic or an ultimate answer for the researcher, but more a beginning of expanded awareness for answers to more questions about narcissism and dependent types in relationship.

The topic and this study drew forth more research questions and more potential research applications about dependent type individuals. Negative case analysis is a central data analytic approach in qualitative methods and is essential to the rigor of most qualitative data plans. Negative case analysis was necessitated by seeking spontaneously appearing pieces of data which differed from the researcher's expectations, assumptions, or working theories. Although there can always be some "dread attached to the appearance of cases that appear to call into question one's carefully constructed analytic framework, negative cases are integral to strengthening findings" (Brodsky, 2008; Given, Ed., 2008, p. 698). Any data discovered about

the dependent type individual in intimate relationship with the narcissistic type person is helpful. The consideration of the effect a dysfunctional relationship might have upon the quality of life brought forth an increased need and desire for more in depth awareness of the phenomenon. For a phenomenon, a single qualitative study is incomplete. This study reflected a clinical psychological construct with a counseling psychotherapy application. Counselors and psychotherapists are naturally drawn to qualitative inquiry and such inquiry often requires close personal contact with participants (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, Eds., 2008). This process was creative and social by design and application. Social and creative traits of research are important to counselors and psychotherapists (Goldman, 1989).

Triangulation

For this study, triangulation is described as follows: Triangulation was accomplished through semi-structured clinical interviews. These interviews were guided through a researcher developed questionnaire designed to gather data to answer the research question. Secondly, observations were made of the participants within the semi-structured clinical interview as they answered and processed questions of personal experience with the narcissistic types. These observations were formulated as field notes and compiled as a research journal within data collection. The observations were of nonverbal facial expressions and visual cues which were congruent or non-congruent with the verbal expressed data. Also, observations were made to look for indications of mood and attitude of the participant. Other observations were made to determine levels of confidence, comfort, trust, and self-awareness. Common, expected and unusual behaviors were noted as they occurred.

The third piece of triangulation was document collection. The standardized testing criterion instrument was a significant document for assessing the validity of the participants as

they became involved in the study. The assessment documents included the standardized testing instrument, the manual of test administration, the scored results, and feedback reports of the instrument provided to the participants.

The use of these three measures provided validity and reliability. Observations in particular were significant and ongoing throughout the study. The interviews were significant to this study as they provided important data and opportunity for clarification and extended processing with the participants. This facilitated and provided thick and rich data to answer the research question.

Member Checks

The literature of qualitative measure teaches that "member checking" is the most crucial activity of the establishment of credibility (Lewis-Beck, Bryman, & Liao. Eds. 2004). Member checking for this project involved follow up specifically with each or any of the participants to assure clarity and understanding especially should any question arise about the "intended" meaningfulness from the participants' interviews. Secondarily, and upon further consideration, member checking came to be a more significant idea in light of the realization that the researcher has a long-standing and intimate therapeutic relationship with these participants.

Peer Debriefing

Another significant way in which credibility in research is established is through peer debriefing. This is a simple but important process which involves the researcher exposing himself to a disinterested and available peer for help in exploring the research process to discover new awareness. This has been suggested as an exercise to help keep the researcher "honest" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). This served also to probe and note any biases and meanings of the researcher. Peer conversation can also function as a wide open discussion where any

71

questioning of method and ethics is appropriate. It can also function as a "defense" of the study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

Lincoln and Guba (1985) also added that the process of debriefing can be cathartic. Debriefing for this study was accomplished with peers from social science academia, higher education, and counseling, but none specific to clinical psychology. Considering that the research design utilized participants drawn from a therapeutic professional relationship with the researcher therapist, peer debriefing was significantly important.

Audit Trail

Accountability and organization are important in research. There is utility in collecting information per audit requirements. Whether or not an audit is intended or expected, the audit trail is most ethically necessary (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An audit trail may include raw data, both written and electronic. It may also be analysis notes and procedures. Literature, final reports, data construction documents, progress notes, any notes applicable to the research and analysis should be included for the audit trail. Documentation of observations, questionnaires as well as all items related to data should be organized and secured during, for and after the study is completed (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).

An audit trail for this study was specifically important as the data collection involved information about intimate relationship and also made use of standardized test scores with interpretive feedback. These data are held to high degrees of confidentiality. The audit trail helps in the organization of multiple pieces of data and contributes to security and confidentiality of data.

Qualitative methods are ideal for discovery rather than confirming views (Nelson & Quintana, 2005; Willig & Stainton-Rogers, Eds., 2008). Nelson and Quintana (2005) suggested

also that qualitative methods are ideal for counseling theory development. The use of qualitative techniques such as peer debriefing, audit trail and engagement contribute to credible use of deep and thick data for the counseling and psychotherapy profession. In qualitative research, a theory's credibility and utility is continuously evaluated against ongoing data collection and analysis making all of the specific validity and reliability applications very significant (Willig & Stainton-Rogers, 2008).

Coding

The narrative data was organized per participant and later by themes and axial coding. Participant identity was not connected with the thematic codes or specific documents of disclosure. Although the research therapist knew and retained awareness of these participants from therapeutic relationship, information from the study was not identifiable from documents but through descriptive and assigned pseudo identifiers. Themes reflected the pieces of a developing theory which answered appropriately the research question. The intention was to reveal any discovered thematic based theory which evolved or sprang forth naturally from the research experience with individuals in the stories.

The study called for appropriate extraction from the data to find any patterns or consistencies. Therefore, it was important to specifically code and document information which was pertinent to the research question. For open coding the documents were recorded, transcribed and read. Created notes and labels for chunks of data which summarized cognitive, nonverbal, and emotional action from the interviews was analyzed. Data was prioritized and organized in terms of severity, consistency in occurrence, consistency of pervasive patterns, clinically defined diagnostic criteria, common response, historical similarity, historically

similarity in developmental milestones. Openness to unusual or uncommon self disclosed stories was practiced.

Axial Coding: For the Axial Coding process diligent identification of relationships among the open codes was completed. The search was for connections. The findings were charted in a readable format which expressed relationship. *Selective Coding*: This was viewed as difficult, but was suggested to involve a search for a core variable or many core variables which were representative of information most completely reflected from the research question. A re-assessment of the original data was needed to connect and code data that related to core variables. For this study some of the core variables were connected to the five point diagnostic criteria specifically identified by the DPD client's views of the narcissistic type partner. Other core variables were unknown but open for discovery. This qualitative study design was not about a predicted outcome, but about a point of discovery from the qualitative process (Gallicano, 2013)

Chapter Three Summary

The methods of this study were tied appropriately to the research question. The methodology also was closely assimilated through a clinical view of a specific dysfunctional relationship. The dependent type and the narcissistic type together were seen as a phenomenon. In order to secure good empirical data, it was necessary to consider specific focus, existing theory and a designed framework. The screening criterion added a quantitative measure of inclusion for the participants. The qualitative measure of clinical interviewing and data analysis was designed to facilitate rich and thick data about the phenomenon from the perspective of the dependent personality types. The utilization of trustworthy procedures and ethical awareness for the researcher was integrated into data collection attitudes and researcher behaviors. The

procedures of data collection and analysis through the process of coding and theming of the data

were grounded in trustworthy qualitative methodology, persistence, triangulation and conscious

awareness of research bias and researcher experience.

CHAPTER FOUR

Data Collection

Organization of the Chapter

Chapter four is the presentation of data. There are three specific sources of data for this measure. The first data are from a standardized instrument, the *NEO-FFI-3*, which serves as a criterion qualifier for the participants. The second data collection is a data set from a self-reporting questionnaire of 40 questions which was designed to substantively qualify that the dependent type participants were presently or historically involved with a narcissistic personality type. The questionnaire data are from the dependent participants and not secured from direct contact with the narcissistic types. The questionnaire is considered valid evidence for substantiating intimate experience with narcissistic types. This self-reported psychosocial and historical data is complimented within data collected from the semi-structured interviews with the qualifying dependent type participants. Of the eight individuals (N = 8) within the study, three were males and five were females

All of the eight participants who qualified for the study scored at elevated levels indicative of dependent traits on at least one or more of the five factor dependent specific descriptors in the standardized scoring. The data collected from the questionnaire (*Identification of Relationship Quality and Type Form,* See Appendix D*)* substantiated more specific dependent partner experiences and traits with the narcissistic types. The qualitative measure of semi-structured interviews make up a core of data after the qualifying data was completed. The qualitative interviews will be reported in the third section of this chapter.

The Dependent Partners Self-reported Data of Narcissistic Type Partners

The data collected from the questionnaire *(Identification of Relationship Quality and Type Form)* substantiated more specific dependent partner experiences and traits with narcissistic types. The data from this qualifying form suggested that all of the eight dependent type participants had been intimately connected with individuals who presented narcissistic traits in behavior. This documented that the partners presented traits and diagnostic criteria to the dependent participants. A summary the first part of that data is found in Table 1.

Table 1

Dependent reported data of experience and perceptions of narcissistic intimate partners.
Descriptive statistics

Variables	N	Range	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std D
Giving and Taking View of self	8	3	-5	-2	-3.87	(.991)
Giving and Taking view of N-type Partner	8	3	3	2	3.88	(.991)

The data as shown in Table 1 presents the dependent type participants' view of both themselves and their narcissistic type partners. The five point rating scale of the questionnaire represented perceptions of self and partner. The results show a very similar mean for each domain. These scores and their similarities are significant. The scores indicated that the dependent participant sample of this study saw themselves significantly different than their partner. M = 3.88 (SD .991). The participants rated themselves as nearly equal in "giving" qualities, M = -3.87 (SD .991) as they rated their partners in taking qualities. The mean scores can be viewed as directionally opposing, but nearly equal from center on a continuum. The continuum concept was visually represented as a part of the data collection question. The "giving

and taking" concept reflects also the discussion in the review of literature specific to assortative mating (Jiang et al., 2013). As a qualifying measure of inclusion, the dependent type was similar in many ways to the co-dependent type individual which is often discussed in addiction theories. The *giving* represented caregiving, enabling, and lack of confrontation. For decades co-dependency has been a controversial concept. One appropriate working definition of co-dependency is ''external focusing, self-sacrificing, attempting to control other people, and suppressing one's emotions'' (Dear, Roberts, & Lange, 2005, p. 189).

The concept suggests that both partners are equally distant from a "center" point which may be viewed as "healthy center." The specific data in this study from dependent type individuals supported that dependent types did view themselves nearly equal from center compared to their partners. This concept will be discussed further in Chapter Five.

This definition of codependency (Dear, et al., 2005) reflects the perception and behaviors of the dependent participants from the questionnaire data. From this qualifying data it was apparent that the sample participants had a concept of themselves as caregiving and their partners as *takers* within the relationship. This concept was important to more complete data analysis in light of the possibility that qualitative interviews would reveal either similar or different results.

The questionnaire which was designed and utilized for the study provided additional data for inclusion and was specific to the perceptions of self and partners. These data are represented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive statistics of reported perceptions of self and narcissistic partners: Traits, behaviors, and experiences: Inclusion criteria

DPD Perceived Traits, Behaviors, Experiences of Narcissistic Partner Types	N	min	max	mean	(sd)
World view	8	1.00	4.00	1.94	(1.21)
Self-regulation ability	8	1.00	4.00	2.50	(1.10)
Human needs	8	1.00	2.00	1.63	(.518)
Relationships outside of marriage	8	1.00	3.00	1.75	(.886)
Ego strength	8	1.00	4.00	1.88	(1.13)
Need for control	8	1.00	5.00	3.50	(1.85)
Need for attention	8	1.00	5.00	3.38	(1.60)
Desire for success	8	1.00	5.00	3.88	(1.80)

These data above were drawn from the questionnaire which was designed within two domains and several facets. The two general domains of the questionnaire were "world view and approach" and "how different the perception of self, versus the perception of the narcissistic partner." The domains were created to gather information about the dependent participant's view. This is similar to the "giving and taking" question previously noted. The specific categories of data are also listed in the table above, Table 2.

Overall, this questionnaire of criterion successfully identified perceptions from the participants as to how they viewed their partners, whether current or historical. All of the participants viewed their partners as narcissistic in tendencies and behaviors and in meeting at least a moderate to severe level or criteria for narcissistic pathology. It is important to note again that this data is data of "perception" and does not represent clinically derived pathology from examination of the narcissistic partners.

Demographics of participants

For the eight participants in the study, five were female with a mean age of 47.5. Three men participated in the study. The mean average age for the men was 36.7. The combined mean age for the study = 43.6. All of the participants were Caucasian and American citizens. These data are found in Table 3.

Table 3

Means and standard deviations of demographic variables: participant gender and age.

Dependent type participant	No.	mean	(sd)
Age Female	5	47.50	(8.53)
Age Male	3	36.67	(10.69)

Additional demographics of educational level, marriage status, marriage history, and work and career are found in Table 4. As noted in the table, for this sample, the men were less educated overall than then females and on average all of the participants had two children. Table 4 represents means and standard deviations for these specific demographics.

Table 4

Means and standard deviations of demographic variables: Education and number of children.
(1-15; 1-12= primary secondary education; 13+ = college or formal academics or training)

Dependent type participant	means	(sd)
Educational level in years female	15.40	(2.61)
Educational level in years male	12.67	(1.16)
Number of children female participant	2.00	(1.00)
Number of children male participant	2.00	(10.36)

The participants were all involved in outpatient therapy specific to relationship problems

or an adjustment disorder within 12 months of the data collection. Only one of the female

participants had a current partner in therapy. One female client was actively involved in a

divorce proceeding with her narcissistic type partner. Another female client had at the time of

data collection separated from her narcissistic partner. One male participant had during the

course of treatment within six months before the data collection secured custody of his children.

Another female participant was currently separated and filed for divorce from her narcissistic

type partner within a few months of the data collection. Two female participants had divorced

and had been disconnected from their narcissistic type partners for more than eight years.

Indications were that the effects of the past relationship were ongoing and significant. These

indications were found more completely in the transcribed interviews. The relationship effects

were extensive and emotional from the self-reported data. The relationship "effects" were

reported to be long term for 7 of 8 of the participants. Long term was defined as more than four

years and as long as 20 years. One male participant indicated that the longevity of his intimate

relationship with a narcissistic partner had recently ended and marital longevity equaled

approximately 14 months. The dependent type partners' marital statuses were varied at the time

of the data collection. Marital status of the participants at data collection is found in Table 5.

Table 5

Marital statuses of dependent participants

Relationship type	N	Percentage of sample
Married currently to narcissistic type	5/8	37.5
Divorced/remarried to a non-narcissistic type	3/8	27.0
Single/divorced from narcissistic type	3/8	27.0

Table 6

Means of marriages and marriage history of sample participants

Number of marriages female participants	M = 1.80
Number of marriages male participants	M = 2.67
Combined means of both male and female marriages	M = 2.24

SES Demographics for the Sample

The sample varied in socio-economic status (SES) and education. The women were more

educated than the male sample. Four of the five females in the study were college graduates or

attended college. One female participant had no education beyond high school. That individual

was also the highest scoring individual in the domains of Conscientiousness (score of > 45) and

Agreeableness (score = 45). The high scores in A and C placed this individual in the 99

82

percentile for both of those domains of the standardized assessment. These are extreme scores for the Domain of C and A.

Socio-educationally, the men were smaller in number and less educated. None of the men held a college degree. One male participant was a highly skilled mechanic with an extensive skill set to fix, repair and construct. One male participant was employed in a government related position with an extensive military background. The third male participant was by vocation employed in a lead supervisory position related to security and law enforcement. By vocation, it was determined that these male participants were employed in moderate to extreme positions related to conscientiousness and duty. The facets of the Conscientiousness domain are specific to include behaviors reflecting "doing the right thing" and orderliness. Dutifulness and Deliberation are also related facets under this domain which were reflected in these individuals within their vocational work. The *NEO-FFI-3* assessment data supports this with scores and indicators in high to very high range for seven of eight participants. The remaining "out liar" participant E has been discussed and included in the study and explained herein.

Psychosocially and educationally, the female participants were involved in a wide variety of activities, careers, and roles. One participant was an advanced degreed English teacher, one was an accountant working part time, and one was a social working caregiver. Four of five of the female participants met, married, or cohabitated with their significant other narcissistic partner while the partner was attending college. Some of the female participants went or attended college with their partner and two others took time away from school to support their narcissistic type partners' education endeavor and to mother children. By vocation, two of the five female participants were staying at home to accomplish homemaking, home care, or raising children throughout most all of the relationship history. All participants, male and female, had children.

Six out of eight of the participants were actively involved in a parenting role. The mean for number of children for the entire sample, M = 2.00.

Two of the female participants reported the loss of custody of their teenage children as the result of their male narcissistic partner's legal aggression. These custody conflict stories to a great extent explain the original reason for referral and treatment for these participants. The two participants (female) were court ordered to treatment by a circuit court to work on the resolution of their non-custodial relationships, specifically with their children. All three of the male participants at the time of data collection were actively involved in court related matters of custody and visitation of their children.

Data Collection: *NEO FFI-3* as a Standardized Instrument Criterion

The *NEO-FFI-3* is widely accepted assessment tool with five domains. These domains include the traits of Openness (N), Conscientiousness (C), Agreeableness (A), Extraversion (E), and Neuroticism (N). These five factors have wide application and have shown to be stable over time and are well documented in adult personality discussions and literature. This model is predictive of many outcomes and scenarios of adult life (McCrae & Costa,1988). In current literature, the scales of A and C are noted in a "global score." This can be to an extent thought of as levels of social, psychological, and occupational functioning that could also be used quantitatively. Costa and McCrae discuss the relevance and meaning of the domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness extensively.

The *NEO-FFI-3* is a 60 item questionnaire which was developed as was its forerunning counterpart, the *NEO-PI*, through analytic factor analysis for measuring the five factor domains (Piedmont & Weinstein, 1993). For this study, the domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness are significant as qualifiers and definers for the dependent type participants.

In a more complete discussion, the domains of A and C are defined more thoroughly by Costa and McCrae (2010) and supported within specific facet scales within the five domains. These facets add significantly to identifying dependent personality types. Agreeableness primarily indicates individual strategies and motivations (Miller & Lynam, 2008). The facet scales for A include: Trust, Strait-forwardness, Altruism, Compliance, Modesty, and Tender-mindedness. For the C domain of Conscientiousness, the facets include: Competence, Order, Dutifulness, Achievement, Self-discipline, and Deliberation (McCrae & Costa, 2010). All items in the *NEO-PI* and the *NEO-FFI-3* are balanced to control for acquiescence (Costa & McCrae, 2010).

From well documented data for the instrument (Haigler & Widiger, (2001); Jonassant, Seigler, Barefoot-Christopher, Edwards & Williams, (2011); Piedmont & Weinstein, (1993) reported specific facets and domains which may indicate personality tendencies and personality types. Some of these tendencies and traits reflect the dependent type personalities. Costa and McCrae, (1999) describe high scores in agreeableness to be associated to individuals who often engage in abusive relationships. For the narcissistic types, they are often viewed as egocentric, controlling, self-absorbed, and minimizing to partners (Costa & McCrae, 1998a; Costa & Widiger, 2002).

The *NEO-FFI-3* instrument is developmentally rooted in the personality theories both classical and modern. These theories include the theoretical work of Henry Murray (2007), (alphabetical list of individual needs) and Jungian psychology (1923), (psychological types). Jung was the first to discuss in measurement the concept of extraversion and introversion. These theories are disclosed and listed by Costa and McCrae within the history of the development of this instrument (Costa & McCrae, 2010).

85

Specifically, the *NEO-FFI-3* manual suggested that "big five theory" trait of Agreeableness is primarily an interpersonal relationship trait. Agreeableness is additionally defined to represent behaviors in a relationship of sympathetic response, eagerness to help and a belief that others will be eager to help them as well. Low scorers for the *NEO-FFI-3* would be as expected more disagreeable and antagonistic and at their most extreme, egocentric. To understand this domain more completely, Costa and McCrae (2010) added that high agreeableness is *not* a virtue in courtroom activities or in military action. And on the other hand, skeptical or disagreeable thinking attributes more to accurate analysis in the sciences (Costa & McCrae, p. 20, 2010). Though not represented within this sample, a low A score is indicative of narcissistic, paranoid, and antisocial personality disorders. A high A score in associated with the dependent personality type or dependent disorder (Costa & Widiger, 2002). Costa and McCrae (2010) appear quick to point out that it is important to not place negative or positive values on these domains as they can be good or bad or productive or non-productive depending upon prevalence and circumstances. The participants for this study were required to score above average or above the standardized mean for Agreeableness in order meet inclusion criteria. If potential participant did not score high in A or C, other factors of personality and assessment were viewed as possibly acceptable and were considered for one female participant. This client presented elevated scores in other domains and presented also strong evidence from the second questionnaire that she was involved in a long term relationship with a strong and aggressive narcissistic type. This client and the domains are discussed within this chapter and in Chapter Five.

The concept of Agreeableness also has sub-facet listings which include behaviors and tendencies of sincerity (Widiger, Trull, Clarkin, Sanderson & Costa, 2002). Widiger et al.,

(2002) further suggested that Dependent Personality Disorder (DPD) consists of high

anxiousness, self-conscientiousness, and vulnerability which are Neuroticism traits. Added

descriptors of trust, altruism, compliance, and modesty are all strong in association for

Agreeableness (A). High A scorers tend to be naïve (Costa & McCrae, 2010). The trait of

altruism is also important as a sub-facet of Agreeableness. Altruism is defined for the NEO

Model as an "active concern for others". Compliance is also a sub-set of Agreeableness.

Compliant individuals and high scorers in A often defer to others, tend to forgive and forget, and

to generally be meek in relationship response (Costa & McCrae, 2010). This understanding of

Agreeableness as integrated to dependent personality types and is crucial to understanding the

participants in this study and the inclusion criterion.

The literature for *NEO Model* instruments and "big five trait theory" admonishes that

many personality theories historically have suggested impulse control to be an important

consideration. Psychodynamic theory is particularly suggestive of impulse control and is

important in a discussion of personality and behavior (Costa & McCrae, 2010, p.22). Related to

understanding and identifying the dependent type of individuals for this study, the C Domain or

Conscientiousness best addresses impulse control and self-regulation. As noted, Costa and

McCrae (1991) developed the theory and the instrument of use. Their explanations of these

domains are clear. Conscientiousness or high score of C further indicates a person to be

purposeful and strong willed. It also indicates a person who has a strong "will to achieve" (Gore,

Presnall, Miller, Lynam & Widiger, 2012) and, one who may be longsuffering (Pincus &

Gurtman (1995).

For the *NEO-FFI-3* and a specific discussion of dependency, structural analysis identified

three different types of dependency: love dependency, exploitive dependency, and submissive

dependency (Pincus & Gurtman,1995). Conscientiousness contributes to the discussions of these three dependent types. Agreeableness and conscientiousness contribute to both brief and longsuffering intimate relationships.

In considering the participants in this study, it was considered that conscientious individuals are often, according to Costa and McCrae (2010), punctual, scrupulous, and reliable. Low scorers are not necessarily low in morals, but less exacting or meticulous in applying morals. Costa suggested that those individuals are "lackadaisical". Costa and McCrae, (1991) reported in their norming samplings that high C individuals are very active, surgent (rising and falling in waves of energy) and emotionally hardy (Costa, 1991).

Discussion of Domain Scores and Facets for the Participants

One of the female participants in the study, Participant E, did not have an elevated A or C score from the *NEO-FFI-3*. She did have extremely high scores in N (Neuroticism, score = 40 *very high*) and O (Openness, score = 43 *very high*). This individual also had a below average or low score of E (Extraversion, score = 26 *low*). This individual's A and C scores were in the low average range. This was unexpected and remarkably different from the other participants. This participant was included in the data collection because her self-reported data and experience of dependency appeared to be rooted in her lack of Extraversion, extreme Neuroticism, and high score in Openness. The high Openness score is meaningful for this data collection and inclusion for the study. Accordingly to Costa and McCrae (1999) a high score in O indicates a modest association with intelligence and openness to novel and different ideas as well as an attraction to rich and curious experiences. Open individuals are unconventional and are prepared to take on new ethical and changing social ideas. This very high Openness (O) scoring female in this study worked in a social work setting and had been involved with an extremely needy and

dysfunctional population of clients. Her employment was, by her disclosure, very unconventional. Of interest also is that she was one of the participants who lost custody of her teenage child and was estranged from her college aged daughter due to the father's, her ex-partner's court proceedings against her accusing her of neglect. Her low extraversion score concurs with defeated-ness and isolation. Her High O score can be interpreted as an indication of attraction to the narcissistic type was due to curious openness and maybe an openness to charm and excitement.

Female E participant's high scores in N and O are atypical for dependent types. According to Costa & McCrae (2010) individuals who score extremely high in N may be prone to psychological distress, less able to control stress, and less able to control their impulses. These things are true for Female E. Although Participant E did not meet the original criteria for inclusion, she was included in the study because her data and experience was otherwise substantiated as valid. This participant's perception of her narcissistic type and her recovery, treatment, and progress was long term and appeared to affect her state of wellbeing and recovery. The scores for the *NEO-FFI 3* sample of dependent participants are listed and summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Descriptive statistics of the NEO-FFI-3 domains for the sample

NEO Domains	N	range	minimum	maximum	mean	sd
Openness	8	28	40	68	55.75	8.99
Conscientiousness	8	27	45	72	61.13	10.70
Extraversion	8	34	33	67	47.00	12.06
Agreeableness	8	34	43	77	57.38	11.35
Neuroticism	8	39	33	72	48.13	13.64

Table 8

Standardized Means and Standard Deviations of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness of the

NEO PI-R Combined Instruments and its Revisions: NEO-PI-3, NEO-FFI-3, NEO-PI-R

standardized means from generalized from Table B.8 NEO-PI manual, Costa & McCrae, 2010

Scale	Male	Female	Combined
	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	*M (SD)*
A: Agreeableness	28.6 (6.10)	30.4 (6.16)	29.5 (6.13)
C: Conscientiousness	27.67 (6.94)	29.33 (7.30)	28.5 (7.12)
O: Openness	27.47 (6.43)	29.50 (6.20)	28.48 (6.31)
N: Neuroticism	21.33 (6.9)	24.20 (7.37)	22.77 (7.14)
E: Extraversion	28.40 (6.0)	31.80 (7.34)	30.10 (6.67)

Table 9

Sample Means and Standard Deviations of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness NEO FFI-3

Participant	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Mean
Female A	35 (high)	41 (very high)	-
Female B	45 (very high)	45 (very high)	-
Female C	35 (high average)	35 (high)	-
Female D	32 (high average)	26 (low average)	-
Female E	30 (average)	27 (low average)	-
Sample Total Mean Females Agreeableness			35.4
Sample Total Mean Females Conscientiousness			34.0
Male F	*27 (average)*	36 (high)	-
Male G	*24 (low)*	42 (very high)	-
Male H	37 (high)	41 (very high)	-

Table 10

Sample means of the domains of Agreeableness and Conscientiousness

	Males	**Females**	**Means**
Sample Total Mean Males Agreeableness	*3*		29.33
Sample Total Mean Males Conscientiousness			39.67
Sample Combined Female and Male means Agreeableness		*5*	32.37
Sample Combined Female and Male (8) means Conscientiousness			6.83

Relationship Type Questionnaire Data as Criterion Qualifier

The relationship type questionnaire was designed to gather evidence of narcissistic partners. The dependent types self-reported their awareness and experience. The questions were designed to align with and support data which exists in personality theory and the *DSM-5* (2013) criteria of narcissism and dependent type functions (American Psychiatric Association *DSM-5*, 2013). Descriptive statistics have been discussed from this measure are found in Table 2.

It is important to know that these data only represented the self-reported views and experiences of the dependent type participants and did not represent any data collected from the narcissistic type partners. The questionnaire reflected externalized thoughts, memories, and opinions of the dependent types about themselves *and* their partners. The data further indicated that these partners had specific experience and relationship with narcissistic partners in an intimate way. Some of the dependent participants were actively involved in the troubled

92

relationship and others were recovering from deep ceded past experiences with a narcissistic husband or wife.

The questionnaire data revealed that all individuals had significant experience with narcissistic partners. The domains and descriptors brought forth data showing that the dependent partners saw their narcissistic type partner as having high levels of desire for success, high ego strength, taking and using others behaviors versus giving, lying, need for control, grandiosity, attention seeking, impression management, and charm. The criterion data showed the dependents types to view themselves as significantly different from the narcissistic partner types.

For ego strength of the narcissistic partners, the dependent partner realized and indicated by the results of the questionnaire, that their partners were mostly high in "false" self-esteem and perceived as low in actual ego strength. The data from the questionnaire indicated that the dependent partners perceive themselves as quite different from their partners. The data suggested that the dependent partners viewed themselves with the narcissistic partner on opposing poles of strength, self-awareness and honesty.

Also from the questionnaire data, the perception of the narcissistic partner's "need for attention" is moderately significant, M = 3.38 (SD 1.6). Some of the narcissistic partners were viewed as very attention seeking and some less so. Most of the partners viewed their narcissistic type mates to have had a strong need "to be great" or successful, M = 3.88 (SD 1.8).

As the questionnaire was designed to determine, the perceptions of narcissistic traits, the data emerged for the narcissistic partners to be defined and viewed with moderate to significant levels of narcissistic traits and behavior. This self-report was overall substantive to report data of experience, feelings, and memories with a narcissistic personality type.

As the narcissistic types are viewed as pathological or disordered it is important to consider that narcissism and many other personality disorders do not facilitate the personality disordered person to suffer. It is noted in the classic Freudian literature (Freud, 1949) of the early 20th century that personality disordered individuals "act out" upon those around them with all kinds of impulsive, pathological, antisocial, and dangerous behaviors (Rinsley,1989). Narcissistic and antisocial disordered people do more damage and harm to those around them than to themselves. A determinant for narcissism can be the extent to which a person is able to self-regulate. The dependent type partners viewed their narcissistic counterparts as relatively low in self-regulation, M = 2.50 (SD 1.10195). Generally, as to Honesty the DP partners saw the narcissistic mates as liars (honest scale M = 4.1563 (SD .76692), grandiose, M = 3.5250 (SD .86808), Impression Management, M = 4.1111 (SD .59391). Indicators were elevated as well for the dependent partners to view their narcissistic partners as entitled and exploitive.

Grounded Theory

The nature of the research question and the experience of participants facilitated the method of collecting data. Within the method of interviewing, screening, and analyzing, the objective was to externalize deeper concepts, thoughts, and perceptions from the participants. These data were expected to deliver a code-able set of documents to manifest a grounded theory. The literature suggested (Sbaraini, Carter, Evans & Blinkhorn, 2011) that at least four types of grounded theory have emerges since the seminal text of Corbin and Strauss (1967). All of these types are similar.

The particular grounded theory utilized for this study more closely resembles that of Charmaz (2014) and this theory type is known as Constructivist Grounded Theory. Constructivist grounded theory was applied for this study and involved the following: Charmaz

recommended the utilization of an adequate, and at times, a lengthy list of interview questions. Secondly, Charmaz suggested that sampling be purposeful. By purposeful, the sampling should, as Sbaraini (2011) suggested, be drawn from a place known to be established in a dramatic or prolific way. This approach fits well with the sample drawn from previously identified counseling patients. Thirdly, the recommendation was that coding for this type of study is a pivotal link between collecting data and developing an emergent theory to present the meaningfulness of the data. In study and for this type of grounded theory, the concept became the process of coding data to define what was happening in the data and to wrestle with what the data meant. The method used for this study, similar to that of Charmaz, utilized for selective coding, the application of "gerunds" which grammatically are, of course, the "ing" words which express energy and action. One final and interesting recommendation for coding from Charmaz was the idea of "coding quickly" (Sbaraini et al., 2011, p. 5) which he stated tends to keep the coding as similar to the data as possible. These concepts were crucial to the data collection for this study.

Codes

Open Coding

Open coding is the initial task to the coding process. The transcribed interviews (8) were carefully reviewed in a search for semantic consistency, references to developmental issues, self-reported evidence of personality traits, themes, patterns, and similarities and differences within the data. The coding activity within grounded theory resulted in a comparison between data and theory or data to data (Dick, 2007). The task was to identify categories which are roughly the same as themes or variables with properties which in effect are the subcategories.

95

Axial Coding

Coding, as a research activity, functions significantly in a grounded theory approach. Beyond open coding, Rabinovich & Kacen (2013) cited the seminal work of Strauss and Corbin (1998) by explaining the process of axial coding by stating that axial coding is a predefined assembly of categories which are mapped. Specifically, Rabinovich reports

> The conditions under which the phenomenon developed, the actions/
> interactions that developed under said conditions and the consequences
> that resulted from them. This categorization helps in approaching
> the material, yet it does not dictate the themes revealed because it
> addresses very broad categories that include various types of data.
> Moreover, basing themselves on axial coding (Rabinovich & Kacen,
> 2013, p. 228).

In this context, Strauss and Corbin (1998) further recommended conducting selective coding in which researchers compare the various categories with each other and assess the relationships between them.

Presentation of the Axial Codes

Family of Origin

The first axial code is Family of Origin. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed in Table 10 *Axial Codes for Family of Origin*.

3Table 10 *Axial Codes for Family of Origin*

Pre-conditioned	Back-burner
Put me down	Needed
Rescued	Second
Afraid of judgment	Monster
Family secrets	Confusing

What qualifies family of origin as an axial code is that these participants reflect and report significant issues from their family histories and developmental milestones from relationships within their family in earlier stages of their life. Participants reported similar stories and unique experiences with caregiving

within the family and of submission as well as neglect from parents. Many of these participants allude to confusion and fear. These mixed thoughts and fears in these participant stories include disclosures of feeling judged and minimized within their family history and childhood. These participants generally report a longing for family different from their family of origin.

Dependent partner E states,

> I had appealed to my family for help, to get me out of this relationship. I did not have the support there. And, I really didn't know what to do. I really kind a thought that this is what relationship is all about, this is what I deserve. I was kind a pre-conditioned in my family, that, you know, being treated second was okay. Because, that was the way I was treated in my, my family of origin because of being a twin. My twin was kind of the favorite one. She was ill……..Mom was taking care of. So, I was on the back burner. Being on the back burner, to me, was normal. [DP-E/3-4]

Dependent partner E shares family history specific to adolescent developmental and family process to contribute to her attraction and engagement with narcissistic types through her disclosures.

Dependent partner E goes on to say,

> When my older sisters and I would sit and talk about our relationship with our parents. They were mean. When my Mom died and my older sister tried to establish herself in the family and I guess what her role was, try to say that, her relationship with Mom was different than ours. She stated one day that Mom read books to us. I just kind a looked around and said, "Well, Mom didn't have time to read the books to you, to us." Because with every child your relationship is going to be different. Mom had less time to develop us, to spend time with us. She had to take care of a home. And I felt like she was trying to put me down because Mom didn't have time to read to me. And I wasn't going to allow it. And I was needy. I kind a had a nervous breakdown when things went haywire. [DPE/9]

Dependent partner E continues,

> I just got so overwhelmed with things. That was at the time with, a lot of pressure was put on me (gonna start crying). My year, by my senior year, man (mumble) that was the year Momma died with, it was throat cancer. So, here I am with a twin sister who had lung issues. Because they would collapse because they did not

97

develop enough. A Mom who had colon cancer, a Dad who was out of town constantly, my older sisters were not there to help and my Mom had to go in for cancer treatment. And, I was working and going to school and taking care of everything. [DP-E/10]

Dependent partner E responds,

I was looking for a good person at that time. I was wanting somebody who was family oriented more than what my family was and could do things as a family unit, because that was important to me. I can remember expressing those goals. Because my family, we never went on vacations together, it was very rare we went on vacations together. We could, it's not like you go to…. like some families go to the lake house, enjoy the holidays and stuff like that. But, we did, you know, celebrate at home and cook dinners and stuff, we had that. It was other things we did not do, a large part of it due to my dad, because he just did not, could not handle it. And, I expressed that going to movies, going out to dinner, doing things with the kids, doing functions with the kids, I never got to do that. I mean, I was in band and my family rarely showed up to see me. The whole family didn't see me. And I wanted that for (children's names) like if they do, you know, in band or they were in choir that they have that support. It was important to me. And I thought he was that person, he was not. [DP-E/21]

Dependent partner E adds,

I think it was the acceptability of being, my needs not being met in my family. When my mom died, I can remember her saying to me, "I should have put you first more often". I can remember that anger in me that it wasn't about being first, it was about being treated fairly. And getting the support and attention that I needed. But I think because I was put a little bit on the back burner…even my grandmother favored (sister's name) and it was so obvious. And, I just grew up feeling, like okay, being second is normal for me. Feeling less than is going to be my normal. [DP-E/38]

Some of these participants also allude to family secrets and assuming or being placed in positions within their families of high responsibility expectation.

Dependent partner E states

It was, ok, a lot was, ok. My mom basically, she ran a tight ship. She had four girls. My dad traveled out a lot. My dad was also in the war and he was very PTSD. There were things he did not like noise. And I see now, looking back, we all kind a protected him. Because when he came home he kind a dictated what his needs were. I need to be left alone for a little while. I need you guys to not be so noisy. He was a good person. But,

you know, when we would go and talk to him about our problems, it always amounted to a war story. We always heard the war story, counted with a war story. And now, I can't match, you know, D Day or any of those other days. You know Battle of the Bulge stuff. So, to him, what was a problem was way up here and where our problems were way down here. And then my mother, because he was not emotionally available, she had depression, especially when battling all these illnesses. She was a smoker. But, yeah, it was a little bit tough. [DP-E/38-39]

In addition to feeling overly responsible, several of these participants report of feeling strong willed and judged by their families and parents.

Dependent partner A states,

I was the middle child. I have an older brother and younger sister and...I would say growing up closer to my mom. Afraid of my dad. I don't even know even how to describe that. Not fear of being, Just afraid maybe of judgment and wanted to do the right things. I was always considered to be head strong, stubborn. Strong willed. [DP-A/15]

Dependent partner A responds,

My dad really, really liked him. Everyone likes him when they meet him because he's very outgoing. Seems to be kind, generous, all of the things that people like in people. But people don't get to know him on the level I do. Because he never allows that. No one gets to see who he truly is. My dad once said told me, "I think he is just crazy about you" [speaking that her father was talking about her narcissistic partner] [DP-A/24]

The above disclosure suggests that Participant A was closer to her father than to her mother. This theme can be found with other participants who indicated that they were "on the back burner" within her original family.

Dependent partner A reveals,

They (my parents) made me feel really, really bad about myself for having an abortion. When I got pregnant I know they were very unhappy. But they never, we never had one discussion about it at all. And when I told my mom I was going to have an abortion. She said, "Do whatever you think you can live with". And that is the total amount of conversation we had about my pregnancy. My boyfriend's mother said, "Oh, you need to have the abortion" and blah, blah, blah. And I was 19 years old and I just felt lost and got nothing from my parents and

just listened to the other adult who was talking to me. And, my boyfriend, you know, felt we should do what his mother said. And I just before I knew it, it happened. And afterwards I was sick about it but there was no turning back. So, I felt like I should have made a different decision, I should have been strong enough to say no and I didn't. [DP-A/29]

Participant A revealed in the context of the interview that the abortion was a forever and complete life changing experience for her. In the interview she indicated that she believed that her cancer, her son's drug addiction and this marriage to a narcissistic partner was her punishment for aborting a baby.

Dependent partner C states,

I think when I was in my late teens early twenties, I probably was not as confident as I should have been or could have been based on reality. I had a healthy amount of boyfriends in my twenties, some good some bad. I was engaged to a man briefly that was cheating on me. My long term college boyfriend cheated on me. And that was a huge sore spot for me because my dad had cheated on my mother causing their divorce. That was a huge that was my biggest fear in a relationship and it happened, twice. My first two, you know, but I had good relations, you know healthy boyfriend, girlfriend relationships. [DP-C/5]

Dependent partner C continues,

It was a weird role (for me). I was always the caretaker, fixer especially of younger brother. Both parents said I was smarter. I was always smarter and pitted against my brothers. I was empathic of younger brother. Mother and father were obsessive and worried and fearful. Lots of judgement about money. Lots of discussions about money and management... [DP-C/7]

Dependent partner B states,

I am the youngest. I have one brother. I am the one that is very vocal, very opinionated, very strong in my convictions. I'm old faithful if you need something done. You call (me) and she can either get it done or figure it out or find somebody to do it for you. I'm also the one most of the time told "You're too head strong" or "You need to...[DP-B/5]

Dependent partner B continues,

Emotionally, an anchor, I guess you could say. As far as everyone expects that (me) will take care of whatever needs to be taken care of. They don't have to worry about, me being too dependent upon that many people. They know that,

I'm very, I think things through. I am very prepared. I'm a planner when given the chance. I'm stable. [DP-B/5]

Dependent partner B adds,

I came from, um, a stable environment. You know, mom and dad had food, had clothes, had groceries. I was going someplace, didn't know where I was going but I was going to go someplace in the world. I always had the confidence of I can take care of whatever's gonna happen. And if something doesn't go right, I would come up with another plan or action or, you know, take care of some sort of situation, problem. [DP-B/15]

Dependent partner H states,

I was a tidy kid. You didn't have to tell me to make my bed. I guess that's probably one of the reasons why I always felt my mom never, my mother never really had ever told me she was proud of me for anything or had much to do with me. She figured I could take care of myself because I did it. I started on an early age taking care of myself. And you know. I'd try to help my sister out or help my brother out. I'd cook them dinner or make lunch for them or something like that. I cooked and cleaned, did laundry. I mean I was 12 or 13 years old doing all that. [DP-H/11]

Dependent partner G states,

Basically, my mom and dad, my mom was 16 when she had me. My dad joined the military and, of course, took off. He was non-existent in my life all the way up until, well, even now. I will see him occasionally. He signed his rights away when I was five years old. So, he basically didn't want to have anything to do with me. I was adopted by my grandpa actually. No, my mom raised me. Mom had custody of me. We travelled all over the place. She had multiple relationships. We were in and out, it was kind a one of those deals. She has been married five times if you count my dad. [DP-G/6]

Dependent partner G adds,

There are some similarities, I mean my mom…Up until she got with the guy she currently is with now and she's been with him a long time. She's been with him 10 years now. It was just one of those hot, cold, let's go, let's do this, spur of the

moment, not really thinking. She's one of these, money wise. She always wanted to be with someone who had money. Of course, she had her own for the most part. [DP-G/7]

Dependent partner F states,

Organize everything from in the house to the garden. I was the "go to" person to decide when and what to do…on most subjects anyway. I was the oldest of twelve, five brothers and six sisters. I didn't learn that there was a difference between sex and intimacy until I was, probably, in my early twenties. I guess I actually started becoming, I actually started becoming intimate with (male friend) and, I actually realized what a good friend was when I met (significant other). [DP-F/3]

Dependent partner F goes on to say,

(I had an inappropriate relationship with your sister) Yeah, with two of my sisters. (And internalized that) for probably 10 years. Or there abouts. (But, nothing ever came of that) Nothing except a bunch of accusations in court. Or a bunch of, attempt to substantiate the fact that I am a monster. In other words, the only thing that has ever became of it is I've been attacked because of it by people. All of which have been unsuccessful at……punishing me in some way, I guess,……what I'm looking for. [DP-F/15]

Dependent partner F continues,

We were home schooled, didn't, we went to church from, we did go to church for 12 years on a regular basis. And, then when we quit going to that church, we went to another one for a couple of months and after that we quit going to church at all. Other then, occasionally we would go to a home church in other families like our own. [DP-F/16]

Dependent partner F reveals,

I didn't want my family secret to be a family secret to start with. Which is how I found out so quickly that my ex-wife would not forgive me. Because I asked questions because I wanted to know if I could tell her my hidden secret. And that's how I found out on that third phone call I couldn't tell her. So, she (long pause) so I continued the relationship and worked on trying to get her to be

102

understanding enough to where I could tell her. And of course, my relationship got stronger with both of them, actually. And then my ex-wife offered sex and I started thinking nothing wrong with it. I think that is the best way to explain what happened. [DP-F/20-21]

Blindsided/Naivety

The second axial code is Blindsided/Naivety. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed in Table 11 *Axial Codes for Blindsided/Naivety*.

Table 11 *Axial Codes for Blindsided/Naivety*

Gut Feeling	Not seeing
Throwing me under the bus	Sucked in
Missed	Fell for it
Intimidating	I'll change
Affair	Very strict

Dependent partner E states,

Not when I was younger. As I was, as some of the years passed by you could kind a tell the cycles. The time when you knew it was coming and when it wasn't. He got transferred from job to job to job. I had to give up everything for the very, for the betterment of him. His career. And I would always see it coming. It's a, it's in the wind. I talked to him about it, the constant moves or his constant job changes. It was always, oh, I'm doing it for us. But, he wasn't doing it for us. I got the gut feeling that it wasn't really…those moves were not in my best interest. [DP-E/1-2]

Dependent partner E continues,

It took me awhile, probably in the Books A Million self-help section (laugh). Well, I was reading one day and I was going wait a minute, this all sounds familiar. Yep, bought a book on relationships [DP-E/4].

Dependent partner E goes on to say,

I did not know that people were seeing him the way I saw him. Cause it would make me mad. And it's like what they said, go to church, close the door at the home and you are a different person. I mean, he is a chameleon. And I don't think there is any one person to (partner's name). He is who he needs to be in the

103

situation. And it's just mind boggling, it was just like….is like multiple personality disorder without the diagnosis. [DP-E]

Dependent partner E adds,

> Yeah. And I didn't get it. Okay, am I asking, what's going on? What am I not seeing? What am I not appreciating here? Because I wasn't getting it at all. I wasn't seeing what they were seeing. Of course, when you've got all these other people around you, telling you what a good person he was and you're sitting there, basically holding it, being empty. No, he wasn't. [DP-E/22-23]

Dependent partner E replies,

> And, I can remember. I called my Mom and talked to her about it. And, she said, "it probably means nothing." And I'm sitting there going, "Thanks Mom." It does, it was very, very significant. Cause that was, she was the first one I was (inaudible) that whole marriage. That was the first week. I mean trust to me just blew up, like, a balloon. [DP-E/27]

Dependent partner E responds,

> When he was throwing me under the bus with people. Verbally. It was probably, a few months. When I was trying to find work and I was having difficulty finding work. And, I was also…. I'd never lived in the big city before. I was completely by myself because he audited. I got criticized for that. Because there was nobody there with me. I was in St. Louis basically by myself most of the time. I had to learn quickly how to become self-reliant. And, I can remember talking to my Dad. And my Dad told me, "Get out a map. Find a place you want to go, get there and come back home." [DP-E/28]

Dependent partner A states,

> I missed the whole thing. Meaning, I fell for everything he put out there. I just fell for it. I believed that he was that special wonderful person. [DPA/2]

Dependent partner A responds,

> I think in the beginning I was so caught up in what I thought we had. And then, I think I started seeing different things in him and started to question was that really for real? And, also in the very, very beginning I felt like, oh my goodness this is so good and he is so wonderful. I didn't believe that was even happening. And, I would get…..this is….almost too good to be true. But then I would tell myself…..be happy with how things are and how wonderful he is and how he treats you. But I also had a feeling of within I didn't believe him sometimes when

he would have to go out of town or he wouldn't be available. I did doubt that but I wouldn't let myself go there because I wanted so badly for it to be real. And, after we were married even after about a year or so, he started to pull away from me. I didn't know why. And I thought what's wrong with me that he's not as attracted to me anymore. It just kept going that direction. And then, of course, I found out that, you know, he had had affairs and so I was devastated. But for a long, long time I just felt like, what did I do or what should I've done differently. I blamed myself and wondered what I had done to cause him to not be madly in love with me. [DP-A/6-7]

Dependent partner A reveals,

I just, part of me felt that like things were not as they appeared to be. But I just would not allow myself to focus on that. I, at times I was hurt because I just, I mean my head told me he was lying to me but then I would think, no, he's so wonderful. You do want this, you just have to put that aside and move on. So that's what I would do. [DP-A/9]

Dependent partner A adds,

And if you don't go with this, this is so wonderful. Finally, in your life you have this wonderful person who loves you and thinks that you are good enough to be with him. When lots of women would love to be with him because everyone thinks he's wonderful. I mean it was the ultimate thing for me because I had felt bad about myself for so long. And then, boom, here he is. And everything that I could possibly ever want was in front of me. And I didn't want to throw that. [DP-A/13]

Dependent partner C states,

More natural for me to understand in a more timely fashion exactly what is going on. Before I was kind a bewildered, I didn't even understand what a boundary was, I guess. Now, it is a lot clearer to me. And I can unemotionally say, "This is my boundary, if you stand me up again the door will be locked." It's easier for me to stand up for myself in a non-emotional, crazy tone kind of a way. [DP-C/2]

Dependent partner B reveals,

It is really intimidating. It can be very scary. I try not to let it happen very often because it is like walking on egg shells. Like you don't want to say the wrong thing, you don't want to put off the wrong expression, the wrong attitude, the wrong body language because he could very easily erupt. And if he doesn't erupt in anger then there is going to be a *deadly* silence. And during most of that it's

almost like you are playing some sort of game to figure out what's behind his actions, behavior, tone of voice. [DP-B/8]

Dependent partner B adds,

At the time, it completely baffled me at the time because he has always saying I was the problem no matter what it was. He, I believe, always wanted me to fix his emotional state. [DP-B/15]

Dependent partner B continues,

Um, he was best at turning my statements around on me or emotions around on me. To where at the very end after arguing and arguing, I just would be like I'm sorry. This won't happen again. I will modify, I'll change. We won't talk about this hot subject again if it gets this bad. So, I would relent and I think it would make him feel like he was superior. Or won't have to deal with that again because she's backed down unless it was something I was dead set on and then he would know to never touch that subject or those actions again. [DP-B/17]

Dependent partner B states,

In the beginning, yeah, I mean, because he was good at, I believe he had a double life from the beginning. I was probably too young and naïve to even realize it…….. Oh, I gave him just an open opportunity. I was like a sitting duck. [DP-B/20-21]

Dependent partner H states,

Very charming. I mean it was almost like……It was like we were made to be together. I mean it was almost like I met my soul mate. I mean everything she told me I believed. I believed this was who this person was. [DP-H/4]

Dependent partner H adds,

I realized that to me I started seeing the fact that she was lazy. Everything that she had told me was absolutely not even what she was doing. She was a good housekeeper, she liked to keep clean. Everything she had told me, everything she had described herself to me as was not the case. I would go to work while she was there at the …. apartment. And I'd come home after she had been there all day and the house, the place was a mess. Dishes from when I'd cooked dinner the night before were still in the sink and she is just sitting there watching TV all day. I mean, I kind a got upset, "Could you at least do the dishes? You've been here all day." And she didn't do anything. And I realized that she had lied to me. But, I

guess because then, and you know like a said, after I left {Place} I found out she was pregnant. And there's no way I could not want to be with my kid. [DP-H/4-5]

Dependent partner H continues,

I remember when I found out she was having an affair on me. I was begging her, you know, begging her to take me back. And then whenever I did find out about the affair, her response was, "Well, you were the one that left". So it's my fault. When I started finding out about her cheating on me early on in the marriage, when I quote confronted her about that, once again, "You wouldn't have sex with me". So, it's my fault that you went and had an affair? That's the way it was the whole time, all the way through it. [DP-H/6]

Dependent partner G reveals,

Meeting guys in hotels and stuff like that. She went back to dancing. You know, try to find the next sucker I guess. [DP-G/8]

Dependent partner G adds,

It just depends on the setting and where it was. If it was people I knew, you know and everything else, it was one thing. But if it was like…if we were out at a club and everything else. She would always run off, "I'm going to the bathroom." And she would come back with a couple of random people she knew. You know, so you never really knew what that was about. [DP-G/9]

Dependent partner G reveals,

Yeah, honestly. I mean, it's persona, she's blonde hair, big boobs the whole nine yards. She had a great body and everything else. It was arm candy for me. I would go to functions with work and stuff like that. We had high school get-togethers still and all that. I would take her. Everybody liked her. She worked the crowd. She worked the room. [DP-G/13]

Dependent partner F states,

I felt like I knew her but for some reason was naïve enough to think that her anger and bitterness or the way she responded to disappointment would never be directed at me. [DP-F/19]

Dependent partner D states,

I was more of a thinker and I was very naive. My parents were also pretty strict. So, I was, I didn't get to go do all the wild crazy things everybody else was doing.

107

So I think I was just very protected. And I think then when I was, what, 18 or 19 whenever I met him. [DP-D/8]

Dependent partner D continues,

Now, see you start bringing more things back. In the beginning, he had such a…god, it's almost embarrassing that I fell for it. He would talk about himself [DP-D/9]

Dependent partner D adds,

He's messed up. He's messed up. I'll tell you one thing. This shows my naïve. I remember I was, when we lived in (name of town). I was about 19 or 20, I worked at the mall and went to school. Well, I went to the mall and they let me off early at night. So I come home. And I walk in and he's got the vacuum, this is disgusting, he has the vacuum cleaner going and he's on the couch somehow. And I think he's vacuuming the couch. He was not vacuuming the couch. (He was using the vacuum cleaner for self-pleasure) That's how fucked up he is. Yeah. And he, and I said Hey. I'm talking about years later I realized that was what he was doing. You know he got angry with me for, it was like crazy. NO. And he was caught. But I never reacted like he was caught. I thought he was, you know, vacuuming the couch. Just like everything else probably in my late twenties, I mean, you know. I don't know. [DP-D/21]

Feelings of Self

The third axial code is Feelings of Self. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed in Table 12 *Axial Codes for Feelings of Self*.

Table 12 *Axial Codes for Feelings of Self*

Regressed	Deteriorated
Suicidal	Hurt
Damaged	Not good enough
Worthless	Ruined
Miserable	So sad

Dependent partner E states,

My emotional experience was a horrible one. I came into the relationship and I had energy that I could accomplish things and get things done. But, I regressed and deteriorated the longer that relationship lasted. [DP-E/3]

108

Dependent partner E continues,

> He would be in the room and we would be in the other side of the room and he
> would be there trying to do his (?) stuff. We would be sitting there making jokes
> about it. I think the guys were trying to do that to try to ease my tensions because
> they could see me. Because, I stiffened up. The preacher that we went to church
> with told me one day, he told me "Donna", he told me. I don't know what I had
> said but he goes….I just remember him saying, "He was mentally abusive to
> you." [DP-E/19]

Dependent partner A states,

> And, I just feel that, ok maybe I just need to ride this out whatever to the end. Also,
> because of feeling so hurt and I guess damaged from this relationship. I don't have the
> courage to even think that I could experience another relationship. [DP-A/4]

Dependent partner A responds,

> My first very serious relationship I was totally madly in love with this person. We
> talked about marriage, and it was pretty much settled that was where that was
> going. Then, he met someone else actually at my house. And, made a statement to
> someone else that, and it got back to me, that I was a nice person but he wanted to
> marry someone who everyone thought was beautiful. And so, I did not realize at
> the time how much that hurt me but I think I carried that my whole life. Not pretty
> enough, not good enough, just not enough. And so, I lowered my standards. I
> mean, I really started to date people that I probably would not have even dated
> before that happened to me. Because I felt like, ok, I cannot date the people I
> would probably put myself with because I am not good enough for them. I am not
> pretty enough, I not enough. [DP-A/11]

Dependent partner A reveals,

> I allowed myself to be in relationships I shouldn't have been in. And got pregnant. Had
> an abortion and then felt very bad about myself. So, then, I didn't feel, I guess, I don't
> know. Maybe I didn't feel good enough to date people I really would have wanted to
> date. Cause now I had another thing hanging over my head. I wasn't pretty enough and
> now I am a really bad person for doing what I did. I felt like I didn't deserve that good
> relationship, that good person. I wasn't good enough. [DP-A/12]

Dependent partner A adds,

> I still have so much regret for having an abortion that I still can't get pass, get totally past
> that and believe that I am worthy of being loved, truly loved, I guess [DP-A/14]

Dependent partner A continues,

> Because I think if I had been stronger in that relationship, had I been stronger at
> that time I probably would never had ended up with him. Because I think, I lost a
> lot of that when I started seeing myself as a, you know, not good enough person
> for my boyfriend. No, not good enough, not pretty enough, not enough…And
> then, to feeling bad about myself because of choices I made. That I think my
> strong will maybe dwindled. Allowed me to end up where I did. [DP-A/16]

Dependent partner C states,

> I don't feel strongly emotional about my partner. Which, from the point I am at in
> this process, before I felt very strongly negative and sad, depressed, too emotional
> in a bad way. And I don't know if going forward if I will feel joy, love, deeper
> emotion, right now I just feel kind a more peaceful which is very pleasant. [DP-
> C/3]

Dependent partner C continues,

> I think I spent the first 15 years blaming myself. Had to be something wrong with
> me. I kept turning it back on me. I'm not loveable, I don't know who I am, I don't
> have a career. I used a life coach for a while and she pointed out that I was too
> focused on (significant other) and his short comings in our relationship. And, I've
> gone to other therapist and they kind a said (pause) that I need to work on myself
> which is always true. But I don't think I got any guidance pointing out that I was
> in an unsafe relationship until the last year.

Dependent partner C says,

> At the time I didn't. I would blame a lot of it on communication. That I wasn't
> communicating my needs or I wasn't communicating. And I kept thinking that I
> would somehow I would hit the nail on the head one time and it would open up
> our lines of communication. I just kept thinking well I'm not communicating well
> or he isn't. Or, no, I didn't think he was doing it on purpose. [DP-C/4]

Dependent partner C reveals,

> True but he was very unsupportive of my career, me jugging the kids and the
> career and step-kids. You know kind a belittling about it. Oh, absolutely. And we
> were at about the same place in our careers even though he's ten years older when
> we got married. It could have gone either way. I can't honestly tell you how it
> happened. [DP-C/6]

Dependent partner B adds,

> Historically, he wants to make me feel like I am worthless that no one else would
> be interested in talking to me or being around me. That my opinions don't matter
> that I'm too emotionally strong or motivated in my own convictions. Um, overall
> he would like for me to feel just any and every negative opinion or emotion about
> myself. That is what he would like for me to feel. [DP-B/11]

Dependent partner H states,

> I think for me that I'd, I tried, I felt like I was trying to constantly to live up to her
> expectations. It got to the point where I always felt like all I was, was a paycheck.
> I didn't matter. It was all about her. Everything was always about her. Not feeling
> like I'm getting what I deserved by working really hard at my job. And then
> when I looked back on it I think, I always said that my job might be ruining my
> marriage but I think what happened was my marriage ruined my career. The way I
> was being treated at work was the exact same way I was being treated at home.
> And I don't know if it was just because I was allowing it to happen or what. So
> much to the point it actually, actually ended my career. [DP-H/5]

Dependent partner H adds,

> Harder, harder, and harder. Oh my God, oh God, did I try hard. I did everything. I
> mean, I tried so hard to the point that I feel like I no longer knew who I was. I had
> given up so much of who I actually was to try to get along with her. That I almost
> resented myself. I resented myself for being so foolish. Why did I do that? Why
> did I let myself go that far? I hated who I was. I truly did. I hated who I was. In
> the relationship. The person that I was while I was with her. I hated me. I truly
> did. I don't know that I ever actually be equated to being depressed. I don't
> know…Negative. Miserable. Always feeling worthless. [DP-H/7]

Dependent partner H continues,

> In the past I always felt like I had to protect her. Evidently, it got to the point
> where I felt like all I was, was a paycheck to her. Somebody to support her. And
> then now, when I'm around her all I am is guarded. I'm guarded. I can't let my
> guard down at all when I am around her. I know that anything that I say or
> anything that I do she will eventually try to use that or turn that against me or use
> that in other means to hurt me. No matter what it is or no matter how small. If
> there is any way that she can use the slightest information or the slightest emotion
> that I give her. Whether it be good or bad, if it's negative emotion she'll take it, if
> it's positive emotion she'll take it. Either way, she is going to turn it around on

me. So, I don't do anything. I *don't* give her any emotion. How I feel is completely shut down. I don't have emotion with her. [DP-H/12]

Dependent partner H reveals

> It was an emotional, it was an emotional hell. It was a constant feeling of crap. Like I said it started on a great sex life for me and it ended with her having sex with a bunch of other guys. Started with sex and ended with sex but in between trying to hold the relationship together based on sex and not having anything else in common. Being opposite on just about everything else, morally, everything. I mean to tell you, you name it. It was a constant battle. [DP-H/22]

Dependent partner F states,

> It was the most miserable time in my life. By several times. Well, I don't like going home alone necessarily but I hate going home and not being welcomed because there is somebody there that wishes I wasn't there. That hates the fact that I'm there. Hates the fact that I exist. Isn't afraid to demonstrate that toward me. Depressed. Hated going, hard to get up and go to work. Because I didn't feel like I was working for anything except for what she was going to take away from me. [DP-F/1]

Dependent partner F continues,

> Maybe embarrassing is the wrong word. I guess a better way to describe it is a failure. Like I failed. Well the marriage had obviously failed but I felt like I had failed too. Because of the marriage failed. [DP-F/8]

Dependent partner F goes on to say,

> And, I also didn't understand how empty that would be for me and much less I would want that to be. How much less I wanted it, I'm not saying that right. How much less I would want out of a relationship would be. Because, what I'm saying is I wanted my wife to love me and be interested in me not just take me because she thought I was a "good dad." [DP-F/13]

Dependent partner D states,

> Well, (he made me feel) from one extreme to another. He could make me feel very good or very bad. There were different stages of our relationship. It was no point. I was isolated, it was done. And, before then, um, it became, you know, I've said this before. I became so sad that I began wanting those things that he wanted. When we moved back here, because there's nothing else that makes you happy, there's no happiness. The way he operated to make you happy was to buy

you something to impress somebody. I was so sad that I almost became like that. (heavy sigh) [DP-D/18]

Isolation/Loneliness

The fourth axial code is Isolation/Loneliness. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed in Table 13 *Axial Codes for Isolation/Loneliness*.

Table 13 *Axial Codes for Isolation/Loneliness*

Avoiding	Fourth wheel
No girlfriends	Limited
Pack up	Few friends
Not allowed to have friends	Embarrassed
Threatened	Alone

Dependent partner E states,

> During the marriage, I did not have that many friendships. We were moving so, it was hard to startup relationships with people. Ah, the friends that we had were more his. Of course, we got divorced and, of course, they all went to his side. I was embarrassed for people, to have a friend. Because you felt like they were avoiding you. I have friends now. But, back then it was just embarrassing. Avoid saying something because he was so attention seeking, if I had a friend he would be competing for that female's attention, even if I had one. [DP-E/11]

Dependent partner E continues,

> I told him that I wanted to do this. Wouldn't do it. He wanted to be with (friends names) so he could have the attention. Totally ruined a special trip. And, when you go on a special trip, you are supposed to be with that significant other. No, he was with everyone else's significant other. Yeah. I dealt with that. [DP-E/17]

Dependent Partner E goes on to say,

> All I heard was (woman's name repeated) this and (woman's name) that and (woman and man's name) and how he hit on her in the parasail. And it was ha, ha, ha. And I am sitting here going, "I don't want to hear it." And all I could sit and think was, "Isn't (woman's name) a lucky woman, she's got the attention of two males and I'm sitting here like a fourth wheel." [DP-E/17-18]

Dependent partner A states,

> I have not had any close friends what so ever. I mean I put everything of myself into (husband's name), into our relationship. And, I really had no girlfriends to talk to at all. Just recently in the last year or so have kind a reconnected with high school friends. It's felt really, really good because when I'm with them it's like old times. I get that feeling and I feel that they have the same feeling. And, I just put all of the other bad stuff behind me and I don't even go there. I'm just with my friends. However, I guess because of all the things that have happened thru the years. I do find myself sometimes when I'm sitting with them and we're talking and having fun, I feel myself (expressive sound) pulling back. For some reason, I cannot be totally in that friendship like I was years and years ago. I'm too afraid. [DP-A/19]

Dependent partner B adds,

> My friendships have been very limited. There was never time made available to keep those friendships going and when I did make time to keep friendships going it was very, very challenging at home because he felt threatened by them. He didn't like it. So, lots of times there weren't that many friendships unless they were work related. [DPB/6]

Dependent partner H states,

> I moved out into my camper. There were a couple of times prior to that I would actually leave and go camping. Just by myself, I would pack up and go camping by myself. Just because I couldn't deal with it. And then, um, I moved out into the camper. And then I found out that she had been cheating on me. Tried to reconcile after I found out that she had been cheating on me. Tried to reconcile, then I found out that, I moved out earlier. I moved out one other time. [DP-H/8]

Dependent partner H adds,

> I noticed over the course of time that we were there, that the friendships started dwindling down. Some of the other friends, my old friends, stopped really coming around and I don't know if it was because of my ex-wife or what it was. It was more of a whenever we were around them, it just usually had to be that they would invite us over. But they stopped coming around us. And then, the friends we had, we had just a couple of really close friends that's who we hung out with most of the time. [DP-H/12]

Dependent partner G states,

> I had a few friends. There wasn't very many because she would, she really wanted
> to monopolize my time. And honestly with four kids and then one on the way, my
> daughter, there wasn't a lot of time for that. Because she would work different
> shifts, if she was really working those shifts. There was question there if she was
> saying she was working there. She would bring home money but I didn't see a
> pay stub. So I never really knew what she was doing. When we separated I had
> her followed and found out a lot that way. [DP-G/8]

Dependent partner G reveals

> I had a few friends that would hang out. But, it was always you have to come over
> here to watch the ballgame or whatever but y'all will have to come over here. I
> got kids, you know, I can't, she's working so I never really had time to do
> anything that I wanted to do. [DP-G/8]

Dependent partner D states,

> Actually no personal relations on my part. Physical isolation. I actually think he
> went into (branch of service) so he could have more time of me away from my
> friends and family. So we would have to be stationed somewhere else. I had work
> friends. And that was it. You know at work. And you know, when you have
> children and it kind a comes naturally, you can explain it away. We had a couple
> of other friends. A few other military couples that we did some things with. I was
> never allowed to have friends outside of him. And, too, I think that's where the
> trouble came. [DP-D/13]

Change and/or Growth/Values

The fifth axial code is Change and/or Growth/Values. This code is supported by the open codes

that are listed in Table 14 *Axial Codes for Change and/or Growth/Values*.

Table 14 *Axial Codes for Change and/or Growth/Values*

Totally Disengaged	Grew up fast
Didn't get it	Process
Gradual	Contentment
Happy	Wiser
Anxiety	Focus

Dependent partner E states,

> I can't get near him. I refuse to get near him, totally disengaged. I can't stand to
> hear the sound of his voice. My anxiety will shoot up if I even look him in the
> eyes. [DP-E/6]

Dependent partner E continues,

> It was a process. And, of course I was going (to counseling) and I was reading. He
> was actually going to marriage counseling by himself. I didn't want to go to that
> counselor because it was someone he knew. I don't think even if I went it would
> had worked anyway. He would have heard my side of the story and got mad at
> me. [DP-E/32] …..(I want) Being happy. Being contentment. Just getting the
> basic needs met. I like the people in my life. I value family. I value my health.
> [DP-E/32]

Dependent partner A states,

> It was a gradual thing. I think, maybe the biggest thing that changed my thinking was
> finding out about affairs. I think that led me to start thinking otherwise, more so. But,
> maybe even before that though. I guess even before that. I just started noticing things. I
> started noticing the way he was around me versus the way he was in the beginning. [DP-
> A/1]

Dependent partner A responds,

> When I had cancer, he was like a hero person, you know, very caring,
> very…always at the hospital with me. Always at the doctor's office and, you
> know, made it very clear that he was deeply in love with me and so worried about
> me and so caring. And all the nurses and doctors saw that. But now I see that
> differently, I see that as him wanting to give that impression. I don't know if he
> even felt that about me. I doubt it. Just becoming aware of who he is. [DP-A/23]

Dependent partner A reveals,

> I grateful for the fact that I do have the ability to live in my house and pretty much
> do my own thing. I guess I'm happy with that. I value my time alone. I value the
> things I do when I am alone, my hobbies, that is what I focus on. [DP-A/27]

Dependent partner A adds,

> I think I have learned that a lot of things have lead me to this relationship. A lot of
> things that happened to me in the past that I didn't probably deal with probably in

the right way. I just chose to bury it and keep going. But I feel like that it affected me always. [DP-A/29]

Dependent partner A continues,

> I think it has opened my eyes a lot. And dealing with (husband's name) and the kind of person he is has made me aware of those kind of people and never did I know that before. But it has also taught me a lot about myself. And, so, you know, do I regret it? I can't fully say that I do regret it. Because there is so much that I have gained from it. I think that, that, it's made me a different kind of, (pause) it's just made me a different person. I am more aware of other people. I'm more aware of even how I feel. And I think about how I have responded to things and responding to him. But I know, I know what it is. [DP-A/31]

Dependent partner C states,

> Surprisingly, today, I would say that I have a positive feeling about our relationship. I have a positive outlook. I see some change. And I see myself as being stronger and more able to set boundaries with less effort. Like its becoming more natural. [DP-C/2]

Dependent partner B reveals,

> He will try to find something that will trigger an emotion, or that will trigger some conflict or in some way portray me, I guess, in a bad way. And, I have learned to just be to the point and blunt. And a few times that he has tried to force me into decision making that I wasn't comfortable with or things he tried to get an argument out of me, I just disclosed that we would have to go to a third party concerning our attorneys and it shut down real quickly and he changed the manner in which he spoke to me. [DP-B/4]

Dependent partner B adds,

> Now, I have a lot more social interaction with people. I may not have as much time to just have one-on-one friends but I have a lot more contacts that I make. A lot more conversations just whenever, wherever I can. It's a role that I am actively getting back into. To have more friends, have more contacts and to be more social. [DP-B/6]

Dependent partner B continues,

> It used to mean everything. It used to mean, you know, stability and love and growing old together, and the white picket fence, and having the kids together,

and vacations until I figured out the real him. And honestly, this has been, this has shaken me to my core. Cause I for a long time I couldn't figure out what was wrong with me to stay with someone like this. And now, I have to take it as a big learning experience and realize that I did everything I could but he, at the root of whatever he is or will be, is not gonna change. And if he does change it's just a game. [DP-B/14]

Dependent partner H states,

I know now that I'm older and a little bit wiser. I feel like you cannot base a relationship on physical aspects alone. There's got to be some kind of emotional, some kind of a, I feel like, I feel like I need…I want to find my best friend. I want to find somebody I can do stuff with. That I can talk too. That has the same, that can do some of the same things, have the same mindset I do. But I tend to look for the opposites. I 'm attracted to the opposites of that. I'm still the knight in shining armor. I can't get out of that. I don't know how to get out of that. I don't know how to get out of that. [DP-H/1]

Dependent partner G adds,

I have children now. So, you know what I mean. That was a part of my life that yeah. Back then I was young, dumb and I was wild. I mean I'm looking for, if something happened and I got divorced tomorrow, I would probably, if I ever did honestly get with someone again because after this, I pretty much told myself, you know. They say third time's the charm. My outlook on things are a lot different now. Especially with children, I mean, I've got two now. I have a son who is fixin' to be a year-old next month. [DP-G/25]

Dependent partner G continues,

I learned a lot as far as not to trust someone, you know, whole heartedly with something and that to cover your bases on everything. That's one thing, I mean, to make sure you've got everything situated. If it's an account that's got money in it that nobody knows about to where you're covered. Because it was one of those deals, when I made the decision to leave, I had to do it then. [DP-G/26]

Agreeableness/Conscientiousness

The sixth axial code is 15 Agreeableness/Conscientiousness. This code is supported by the open

codes. that are listed in Table 15 *Axial Codes for Agreeableness/Conscientiousness*.

Table 15 *Axial Codes for Agreeableness/Conscientiousness*

Care	Happy where I am
Understanding	Accepted
No conflict	Good wife
Encourage	Supporting
Promised	Follow him and obey

Dependent partner E states,

> And there I was with two kids, age…what was (child's name) age…(child's
> name) was three and (child's name) was eight. And I was doing childcare
> 24/7 and that wasn't including all the care previously that I had taken care
> of. His father, him and his father tag-teamed me whenever his father was
> dying. And it, then, how did I know there was no relationship? When I had
> (child's name) and he left within an hour, was in five hours after giving birth
> to his son he left to go help a woman in Tulsa, a widow, who needed him for
> her finances. Yeah. [DP-E/33]

Dependent partner A states,

> Yes, it is easier to stay than to leave. And I also fear how he would react and what he
> would do if I did try to leave. Because of financial reasons he would not want me to leave
> and I think would make my life miserable. And make me regret that I made that decision,
> so I feel like…… for myself, I can be a happy person wherever I am and, because that
> comes from what I do with (myself). And so I have to be happy where I am. [DP-A/4]

Dependent partner A responds,

> There were times I thought he lied, that he was lying to me about where he was
> going or why he couldn't see me for a week or so and I doubted that. But then he
> always, you know, appears to be this super busy, successful business person. So, I
> try to be very understanding of that and I accepted that. [DP-A/8]

Dependent partner A reveals,

> I just don't like it. I don't like confrontation. I don't like…I like everything to go
> smooth. No conflict, and it just makes my life better. [DP-A/19]

Dependent partner A adds,

> And as of now I have been a good wife to him. I take care of everything at home. I take care of him. I take care of all of that. Even though he rejected me long ago and you know, had girlfriends and everything. I still take care of him. Still. [DP-A/30]

Dependent partner B reveals,

> And as we were together and went thru life, I would push him and encourage him, "You can do this, you can do this, you can go talk to this new person, you can give a public speech, you can explain this new project". [DP-B/13]

Dependent partner B adds,

> I would say on a normal, everyday level, I encouraged him to be successful and to be a better person. And I think with the level of success that he achieved so young, that that kept pushing even more of these characteristics. I think I was doing what anyone else would look at as normal or average or healthy as a spouse supporting another spouse. And then I'm not for sure when something else took over. [DP-B/13]

Dependent partner B states,

> I'm dependable. I'm stable. I'm very motivated. I think I was his anchor. Like, he could go out in the world and have that double life and comeback and I loved him unconditionally. So he would hide whatever I would question or not like. If he ever really truly screwed anything up, I had the brains to figure out the best solution to change that or resolve that. He knew that I did love him that I loved him almost unconditionally and that he felt like or knew it would take very, very serious actions for me to ever dissolve our relationship. [DP-B/14]

Dependent partner B goes on,

> Um, in a lot of ways. I made him look normal or average, happy little wife, two great, healthy kids. I took care of everything so he could only focus on his career and whatever hobbies he felt like benefited his career. I was over all a very good cheerleader, very good business partner. I am emotionally stable to where I could reason things out. I could make situations better instead of worst. [DP-B/16]

Dependent partner H states,

> But I think with her it was more of a need to (pause) rescue her. I thought I needed to rescue her. I saw a situation that was terrible. And, I thought I can help

her. I can help her. And that was what I tried to do. And now looking back on it, of course…[DP-H/3]

Dependent partner H adds,

> I will help them out. I will go in and take care of them. Financially let them live with me, move them in, marry them, whatever I can do to help their situation out. [DP-H/10]

Dependent partner G states,

> I wanted my daughter to have a better life than what that was gonna be. I mean that was one thing that I thought about more than anything. Was the, I said, "You know. I'm looking at all this. I talked to my mom a lot about it. I said, "Here's the deal. I see what's going on. I see how these children are now. I am seeing how she wants to live. That's not what I want. So, I made a point to where I said, ok. I'm going to do this and I'm going to do it the way I know how to do it. [DP-G/26-27]

Dependent partner F reveals,

> It means that…it means that I promised my love and I do not break promises. And it matters to me what the other person does but it doesn't change my promise. [DP-F/12]

Dependent partner D states,

> I would see his, yeah, this is a need, he needs to feel important. And this is a man that I loved and I realized that and it's a flaw. You know. And maybe I'll do this for him. You know what I'm saying? Or he needs more of this because of that need. Acceptance. And I think that's it. I think he needed acceptance that is what I saw underneath. But I think what he wanted from me was to follow him and obey. And those scenarios, I think that was what he was trying to get me to do was to follow and obey. And what I was really doing was looking at the underneath part, of what was wrong. [DP-D/11]

Axial Code Cues

The seventh axial code is Cues. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed in Table 16 *Axial Codes for Cues*. This code looks at old, ongoing, and new cues or "warning signs" and red flags.

Table 16 *Axial Codes for Cues*

Control	Scary
Humiliated	Rescued
Pretended	Angry
Phony	Roller coaster
Confusion	Manipulate

Dependent partner E states,

> I would be scared to death. It would bring back too many, I cannot look at those steely blue eyes again looking at me. Cannot do it. The tone of his voice when he is trying to control you… Oh, it would feel scary. Let me feel anger now, because I understand what I have been thru and why he is out of my life. And how long the healing process has taken for me to get from point A to point B. You know? [DP-E/13]

Dependent partner E adds,

> All hell broke loose. Talked about how I had embarrassed him and humiliate him, him, him, him. And I was like……. He didn't ask me why. Did not ask me why. Yes. I knew I was gonna get it when he came back, knew I was gonna get it. [DP-E/15]

Dependent partner E goes on to say,

> Yeah. On another one, he, ah, told me to get to this banquet and I didn't know….it was a work banquet. Went there and he didn't show up, he was an hour and a half late. And, I had everybody asking me who I was. And I was so humiliated. I am kind a more of an introvert, if I know some people, I'm okay. But this was a…. because he moved so much. I was placed in situations where I don't know people very well. Now that I have gotten older, I don't think it would bother me. I would just in there and sit and people watch. But when I was younger I did not have that kind of confidence, and remember this man asking me, "Why are you here. Are you sure you are in the right place?" Well…(chuckle)…"Yes!" [DP-E/18]

Dependent partner E continues,

> Fix me, I was damaged goods. The way he treated me. I hated holidays with him, hated it. Birthdays weren't remembered. My first Mother's Day nothing, nothing at all. It was, I mean, but outside, people would sit there telling me how wonderful he was, how good a husband I had. And I would be sitting there going, "Are you kidding me?" [DP-E/22]

Dependent partner A states,

> In the beginning, it was, I was totally, totally in love with him, totally. And, then, as time went on and I started seeing that maybe he was not who he pretended to be. Then it just started fading and then I experienced his affairs. I mean that hurt me tremendously. Then the second time it happened. Hurt me a little but made me angry. Now, as time as gone on and I have been coming here and we have been talking about. I become more aware of who he really is. Now, I experience a lot of anger toward him. But he doesn't know that. [DP-A/3]

Dependent partner A responds,

> It's like watching a performance. And I know that performance so well. And it's difficult for me to be there. Very phony. It makes me angry. And he, especially when he appears to be a loving husband to me. If he thinks someone is watching, if we are public and like we go to dinner at the country club. He will, you know, jump out, run around and open my door. Someone might see that. When we have been to dinner with friends before and we are walking to our car in the parking lot. The friends are in the parking lot. He holds my hand, he grabs my hand and I just want to pull away. Because that is not our relationship, that's not who we are. It's all phony. It's <u>all</u> phony. It's all a show. It's all to make people think he is madly in love with me. He wants people to believe that he is like such a wonderful husband. And people even tell me how wonderful my husband is. And how much, people tell me how much he loves me and it's all not true. I do not buy it. That's the first thing that comes to my mind. He makes me angry. Because he misrepresented himself. He pretended to be someone he was not. He pretended to love me. He pretended (sound of disgust), he did all these things and then I felt like he pulled me into a trap. [DP-A/21-22]

Dependent partner A reveals,

> And, when I accidently caught him in an affair, I, actually, both times heard him on the phone saying all those oohey, gooey things to that person that he had said to me. So, I know that's how he operates. It's the same always. He pours it on like honey. [DP-A/24]

Dependent partner A adds,

> I was very vulnerable and I had not, I never been exposed to that in such a huge way. And then to live with it every day, I see that the person that is circulating around. I mean I can watch him perform in public and know that it is a performance. I can tell you how he is going to behave. I can predict it I know exactly. And I can see the pleasure just pouring out of him when he gets that attention. It's so visible to me but other people don't see it. And I can see it in other people. [DP-A/33]

Dependent partner C states,

> Um, here is a repeating thing that, um, if he gets caught up in what he is doing and yesterday it happened with the shop, it stood me up. And then when it came time to talking about it. He kept talking about his victory at work. He was all in this victory at work. That is a definite repeating pattern, just getting caught up with themselves at the exclusion of everybody. [DP-C/1]

Dependent partner C continues,

> I think it is both. There is safety in knowing what is going to happen. And, some of it, he does have good self -control with work and habits. But he needs to work on spending too much time on himself, for himself. I can live with predictable if it's healthy. [DP-C/2]

Dependent partner C says,

> He was controlling. I feel like he took all my money, I feel like he took my freedom. I feel like I did all the giving and he did all the taking. And it was the opposite of safe, it was very unsafe. It was taking away my identity, I was giving away my identity. I feel like I just kept trying harder and harder and harder to have him express gratitude and love and appreciation for me. And the harder I tried the bigger the hole got. It is far and away the un-safest relationship I have ever had with a significant other. [DP-C/3]

Dependent partner C reveals,

> At the time I didn't. I would blame a lot of it on communication. That I wasn't communicating my needs or I wasn't communicating. And I kept thinking that I would somehow I would hit the nail on the head one time and it would open up our lines of communication. I just kept thinking well I'm not communicating well or he isn't. Or, no, I didn't think he was doing it on purpose. [DP-C/4]

124

Dependent partner C goes on to say,

> True but he was very unsupportive of my career, me jugging the kids and the career and step-kids. You know, kind a belittling about it. Oh, absolutely. And we were at about the same place in our careers even though he's ten years older when we got married. It could have gone either way. I can't honestly tell you how it happened. [DP-C/6]

Dependent partner C adds,

> I was always the lead and the planner and it seemed that my husband depended upon me to make the friends. He didn't ever like girls night out. It was always a short leash! A red flag was that he was urgent to get married – hurried to marry. I thought I would drag him along—limited in seeing the big picture. [DP-C/8]

Dependent partner B adds,

> My father passed away and he put on a great performance of doing the politically correct things during the death of a loved one but behind closed doors it was a different situation. There were great highs and very great lows. It was almost like a roller coaster. [DP-B/1]

Dependent partner B states,

> Emotionally he would enjoy giving me great thrills or experiences when he had done something very despicable but on a day in, day out basis it would be a lot of mixed feelings. A lot of confusion. If I were to dwell on he and I, it would be a lot of despair. Probably a lot of darkness with like emotions concerning he and I. [DP-B/2]

Dependent partner B continues,

> If I had friends, there would be hell to pay at home. Because there would be accusations, there would be almost interrogations about "what did you talk about, where did you go"? [DP-B/6]

Dependent partner B says,

> I always thought he was confident and now I see otherwise. And that I thought he had genuine feelings. And I think he probably just pretended or played or acted feelings. There were a lot of warning signs that I thought well nobody's perfect. If you love them, you overlook things. Everybody has problems. So there were a lot of warnings that I just overlooked or I was just like is that what really happened? He would degrade it either rearranging them, the facts or putting doubt in your mind or…[DP-B/20]

125

Dependent partner H states,

> It just seemed like, it honestly seemed like I was more of her dad then I was her husband. She didn't work. She stayed at home. I felt, more times than not, I was pretty much carrying the relationship. Because I had worked, I paid for the bills and I also sometimes had to cook. When we had our first son, even though I got up and worked five days a week, I would still get up in the middle of the night with him every other night, to the point of if it was my night, she would wake me up to get up with him. It was never about her doing anything in the relationship, she just wanted to make sure I did it. [DP-H/2]

Dependent partner H adds,

> I still feel that at some point, I was kind uh... a knight in shining armor for her. I was upbeat, positive, had my life together she, as a matter of fact, she made the comment that after meeting me in a bar and having sex with me that night that a couple of days later, the next day we went on a date and that weekend she told her girlfriends that she was going to marry me. Like within three days of, no four days of knowing me, she actually told her girlfriends she was going to marry me. I don't think there was anything, I don't know if there was anything I could have done. She saw her lottery ticket. [DP-H/3]

Dependent partner H continues,

> She said that she was a housekeeper, a good housekeeper and she said that she wanted to be a mother and dah-ti-dah. She wanted a life. Everything that I said that I wanted, she completely agreed with me. And said that's what she was. She told me everything I wanted to hear. [DP-H/4]

Dependent partner H reveals

> It was always my fault. It I even tried to give her constructive criticism, it was my fault. If I said anything about her it was my fault. "Why are you trying to make me feel bad?" I'm not. It's always, god, always, everything. [DP-H/14]

Dependent partner H adds,

> One of the things, one of her personality traits that I really dislike the most, is that she would talk bad about everybody. I mean, if we had friends over when they left she would have something bad to say. "Oh, well she did this or they did that. Da-da-da." One of the times that I recall. She came to me and ask me if I thought that my ex-step father would sexually touch my daughter. And I'm like, "What are you asking me? Are you asking me

126

to accuse my step-father of being a pedophile?" "No, I'm just curious." I said, "No, you're not." That's not a question you ask just out of curiosity. So, I had a decision to make of either accusing my step-dad of being a pedophile or ignoring it. And the worst thing about that was there was no out for me. She put me in the position of me either accusing my step-father of being a pedophile or putting me in the position of well, you're a shitty father because you're not going protect your daughter if there is a sexual predator around. You know that was probably one of the worst things of my marriage. And it has since cost me my relationship with my step-dad. It did. I haven't spoken to my step-dad since that happened. Since the marriage…[DP-H/20]

Dependent partner H goes on,

I believed what she said to be true. What she is telling me is the truth. And then gradually, the truth started being revealed. You can only lie for so long. Sooner or later the truth is going to start being revealed. And the more truth revealed, the more I covered up. The more I accepted it. I kept accepting it. I kept accepting it. Ok, I can do that. I can do that. I could make it better or I could fix it or I could deal with it. [DP-H/21]

Dependent partner G states,

I never really, there was never a point where I would go, "Oh man, this is crazy." You know I mean, I pretty much made plans and she'd roll with that. If I said hey let's do this or let's do that or I hadn't done this in a while let's go… She would leave it up to me for that part. Eventually, we'd end up somewhere. She wasn't one of these let's go to a movie and dinner type people. She was hey, let's go to the bar and get shit faced. She was a party girl, I guess. [DP-G/9]

Dependent partner G continues,

It went from like this is great and it felt like it was but then you would get that feeling she's up to something or something's going on. And I was usually right 90% of the time. Catch her. You could look at her phone. She's sleeping in the middle of the night and she is texting random guys. You know and things like that. You know, that was just another reason why the things wouldn't work. [DP-G/2]

Dependent partner G adds,

(It was) just her attitude. You know, she, I can read people pretty good. You know you get that like she's thinking about something else or she's hiding something.

You don't leave your phone laying where people can get it. It goes off in the middle of the night randomly and you jump up real fast. Just things like that. [DP-G/3]

Dependent partner G goes on to say,

Very unhealthy. You know, it was one of those real stressful, real chaotic. You know. Kind a jumped into it real quick. We were only together a few months and she got pregnant. Now, looking back on it, I can now kind a see with the track history she had and everything else. I really didn't know that much about her until she got pregnant. It was one of those, honestly it was a trap type deal. [DP-G/3-4]

Dependent partner G reveals,

My ex wanted somebody to take care of her. I think that was the deal. She wanted to do whatever she wanted to do but she still wanted that financial security. And I think that was what she got from having kids. Because if you've got kids you have, at least, child support coming in if you are not with that person. And that's what I see even now. Since we've separated she's had one more after that. I honestly think she is pregnant now with another one. [DP-G/7]

Dependent partner G says,

As her stripper name, yeah. And people knew her as that, that's what was funny. I remember at the (strip club) when I first met her, that night I met her out there people were calling her by that name. And that's not her name. Her real name is this but they are calling her this because that is what they knew her by. Which should have been a red flag all in itself. [DP-G/13]

Dependent partner G continues,

She made it sound like she was the greatest mom in the world. And, there for a while she did. But I started seeing patterns with the children as far as how they acted. They would act out in anger. They would beat the walls off or beat the door off the walls. You know punching stuff. Punching holes in the wall. Ok, I kind a see that, you know. She takes her youngest, let's see, second to youngest son. He seems to be the one she favors more than any of them. For some reason, I don't know why. But, it used to be my daughter and after she got to that point, it reverted back to him. And it seems to be that kid she really looks at and goes, ah, he's, you know. For some reason, I don't know why but that's the one when she posts stuff on Facebook and everything else. That's the one that's always doing something now. [DP-G/19]

128

Dependent partner G revealed as a male throughout the interview a significant amount of anger and frustration with the aftermath of his divorce from his narcissistic type partner. This anger was expressed and reported as aggression which was an aggression which was not so typical for t female dependent types in this sample.

Dependent partner F states,

> I think she was intentionally trying to provoke me into hitting her so she could substantiate her claims that I was a monster. Yeah, she called me a monster on a regular basis. [DP-F/6]

Dependent partner F continues,

> I ignored the ones (cues) I seen and missed some due to lack of knowledge or experience. I missed how dangerous it was to marry someone based on a child instead of based on this or that. I didn't understand how dangerous that was. [DP-F/13]

Dependent partner D states,

> I think he was communicating to me and I was receptive to it but not in the way he wanted me too. I was seen under, you know…He was trying, yes. He would say things to manipulate me and I saw underneath a need he had. And that's what I saw, he didn't know it though I guess. [DP-D/10]

Dependent partner D adds,

> I remember someone saying, "He told me…." I remember he was outside one time. Everybody was outside on base. (He was) telling her about my mental problems. He was always trying to say I had mental problems. When we lived in (name of town), he tried to get me to go to a psychiatrist or psychologist. And I went once. And he told me to go to a group for women. I never went. When we lived in (name of town) there was no talk of it. I don't think. And when we went to the base in (name of state), he wanted me to go to the chaplain. All my problems that I ever wanted to discuss with him were intimacy problems with him. He always said it was me. That I needed to go. And that was even more so, (name of town) it was awful. And, I even left him twice, I believe, there. One time was even with a U-Haul when he was out of town for three days and with three little kids. But he was always about me being mentally ill. [DP-D/14]

Dependent partner D goes on to say,

You know, but then he would accuse me of, I'm anti-social. He brings up that, you know things like that. And, like I said, he told that woman next door that there was something wrong with me. (heavy sigh) [DP-D/15]

Dependent partner D adds,

He wanted to literally break me. And I don't think he sees the difference between someone that will, is a maybe gives in for another person in a compassionate way and a weak person that will break. [DP-D/24]

Axial Code Sex

The eighth axial code is Sex. This code is supported by the open codes that are listed

in Table 17 *Axial Codes for Sex*.

Table 17 *Axial Codes for Sex*

Awful	Inappropriate conversations
Fireworks	Very detached
Lack of warmth	Not functional
Sexual molested	Threesome
Old fashioned	Awkward

Dependent partner E states,

(Sex) was horrible. Just not good. I mean, you cannot have sex with somebody who is not emotionally available to you. He has no emotions, he had no heart. And it's, he would tell me... I would say, you know, little things count. He never did the little things. You know the sexual or the…intercourse you get on Friday night begins with the nice suggestion you get on Monday. He totally didn't understand that but he was getting his accolades from these other female friends and then, he was coming to me trying to fulfill his sexual needs. I couldn't do it. I told him that I was a cook in the kitchen, I'm a maid in the house and I'm not going be your damn whore in the bed. Just not doing it. [DP-E/36-37]

Dependent partner E adds,

Because, when he was with the last woman, I would go to sleep at night only to wake up with him on me, touching my breasts, touching other things. I would knock him off of me. I elbowed him. I kneed him. Dreaded going to sleep. I just basically caught him in inappropriate conversations. He knew about one

secretary's sex life to the hilt. I am sitting here, I'm going why are you talking to your secretary about their sex life. That's weird. I don't go around…[DP-E/37]

Dependent partner A states,

> But we are not even roommates. I mean we don't even sleep……in the same bed. No not even in the same room, not even in the same part of the house. In his mind, I should be happy of all the things that I have. I don't have what I want. [DP-A/25]

Dependent partner C states,

> Rejection for him was a problem. He said he would not approach me for it, weird! 3 months with no sex even years ago. He told me several years ago that he would not be having sex during (a certain) season—extreme to me. Bizaare. I went along with that. Sex seemed old fashioned and boring. Weird. [DP-C/10]

Dependent partner B reveals,

> In the beginning it was a lot of fireworks, a lot of sparks, there was a lot of passion, there was a lot of intimacy, and then as it progressed it became almost like a job. Very detached, very non-emotional, no emotions, no feelings, lack of warmth, and it was all about him. [DP-B/4]

Dependent partner B adds,

> Um, pretty much it was just one sided. It was all about him. What he wanted, when he wanted it, what position, how long it would last, how often. There wasn't much outside of the bedroom as far as affection or flirtation. [DP-B/18]

Dependent partner B states,

> In the beginning it was fireworks, it was sparks, it was, you know, more than a partnership, it was an emotion, it was actions. We spent tons of time together until we got married. And I mean by times I we might spend 25 hours together and then after we were married we might spend 8 hours a week together. [DP-B/18]

Dependent partner H states,

> It was not functional. It was based on sex. I mean, the sex was pretty good. Personality wise, we really didn't click. We met in a bar. I was fun I was upbeat. I was positive. She was absolutely the opposite of all that. She was living at home with her mom and dad in a negative environment. I had never seen such negativity in my life until I walked into that house. That was such a dysfunctional relationship. [DP-H/3]

Dependent partner H adds,

> I was sexual molested at 13, a 36 year old, OBGYN doctor. She was a black
> female. After that I dated mostly older women. My mother didn't' even know
> about any of the, the, I mean I was a very sexually active kid. The sexual
> molestation didn't just happen one time, it was multiple times. I mean it was just
> about every chance I could get. Of course, I'm 13 years old and I think I'm a cool
> kid because I'm getting sex. Of course, now looking back on it, I didn't even
> know what I was doing. I mean looking back on it, it's just sick. But at the time, I
> was getting attention. I was getting attention I wasn't getting at home, from my
> mom or from anybody else. My mom pretty much let me on my own. So, when I
> talked earlier about the relationship with (significant other). I know that a lot of it
> is based on sex. I felt if you were having sex with me it's because you love me.
> That was one of the appeals that (significant other) and I had, was the sex, sex
> appeal. Same with my first wife. I was married once before (significant other), no
> kids. [DP-H/10]

Dependent partner H continues,

> At the start, it was very sexual. Um, we were, she is bisexual. We had
> relationships with other women during the marriage. I was pretty sexual, too but I
> wasn't, the threesomes that we had were her idea. And then, they were with a
> couple of different females. And, then, at one point, she was like, "When am I
> gonna get my turn". And, I'm like, "What do you mean your turn?" "When am I
> gonna get to go with another guy?" Hey, that's not what this is about. You know,
> I'm not gonna get any enjoyment out of being with another guy where you got
> enjoyment out of being with another woman. I won't get that. So, this kinda
> turned into a, I don't know. I guess to me, I felt we had a great sex life. I thought
> we had a really good sex life. I just didn't realize that her sex life was going in a
> different direction than mine was. I just wanted to be with her. She just wanted to
> be with anybody she wanted to be with. [DP-H/17]

Dependent partner H reveals,

> It (sex) went up and down. Starting off it was great. Then something happened,
> then it wasn't that great. Then it was to the point that I was trying to compensate
> for some of the issues in the marriage with sex. We would go off to the lake on
> our anniversary in December. And we would always, I mean that was always like
> a, supposed to our big sexual night. The anniversary of the wedding night. We try

to re-enact the excitement of that usually until porn and toys and stuff like that. For the most part, I felt like it was a great sex life. [DP-H/18]

Dependent partner H goes on,

> It was all based on a sexual relationship. And we never bonded. We never agreed. If she didn't agree with something I would say, then she just wouldn't do it. If she didn't want it, she didn't do it. [DP-H/19]

Dependent partner G states,

> I mean, it was passionate. It was aggressive. I mean it was wild, I guess is the word. She was always, it didn't matter, where, when or how. Hell, it was whatever. No, I think it was one of those, she knew what would get you going or whatever that's what she wanted to do. It wasn't so much authentic, I think it was just another, oh, you know… You're not gonna to find anyone like me. And that was one thing she said when we got divorced, "You're never gonna find anybody that will do what I did ", blah, blah, blah and all that. [DP-G/24]

Dependent partner F states,

> Well, from my understanding, it (sex) is or was extremely good. With exception of the last time and that was extremely horrible. In fact, so horrible that it is the most…It is THE thing that she has ever done that made me more mad and the most mad of anything and everything she's ever done in regards to me. [DP-F/18]

Dependent partner F continues,

> Because she made a, she had sex without intimacy, I guess. It's the simplest way I know how to put it. Or, sex in the absence of…Well, I guess my biggest, the thing that bothers me about myself concerning that is the fact that I didn't notice it until immediately after I got, as you put it on the street. But, yeah, I noticed it. I should have noticed it before. I should've not even, I should've not done it. I guess what I am saying is the only thing the mistake that I feel like I made is for not recognizing that and refusing to partake in it. [DP-F/19]

Dependent partner D states,

> Um, we had sex on our second date. And now that I think about it, it was kinda cheesy. It involved a hot tub and a massage but I liked him, so it was ok. Know what I'm saying? Not awkward necessarily, contrived now that I think about it. But at that age, maybe I just thought he was nervous or this or that. We did have a lot of sex. We were very sexual. [DP-D/33]

Dependent partner F goes on to say,

> Yeah, in the beginning and even periodically. Risqué things. I almost forgot about… We were dating, we had sex on a car parked in the street in front of my father's house in broad daylight. Where I was like sitting on the hood of the car and he was like up against me. [DP-D/33]

Selective Coding

Selective coding facilitates a specific and deep set of categories which were derived from analyzing and careful consideration of transcripts. A selected code is determined as it relates to previously established identified core variables. Categories essentially become variables because they represent dimensions of concepts or classified themes (Strauss & Corbin, 1994).

Selective coding for this study is discussed and explained as follows: Similar to the qualitative approach of Charmaz (2014), selective codes for this study were specifically and necessarily related to and derived from the axial codes. Then, as *selective coding* results in the saturation of all of the categories through theoretical sampling, these substantive codes are built up into a substantive theory as they are integrated into a cohesive structure by the emergent theoretical code or theory (Glasser, 1998).

In analyzing the data from the interviews specific to dependent partners, and arriving to a systematic process of coding, the following selective codes were determined. The selective codes for this study are: Injuring Emotionally, Changing Developmentally, Energizing Existentially and Traumatically, and Agreeing Perpetually.

Selective Code 1: Injuring Emotionally

The literature on narcissism is splattered with discussions about emotional and developmental wounded-ness and emotional injury. As the first thematic code, emotional injury is also a theme which appears from psychosocial data and specifically from the interview questions about family of origin. These are drawn and self-reported from old family stories and also from new stories of perpetrated wounds from the narcissistic types to the participants. The

clients indicated from the interviews that they felt "second" and "put down" by both their families of origin and their mates. Participants reported feeling "damaged" and "worthless". Overall, these feelings as presented were more related to current or recent relationship stories more than family of origin.

Masterson (1993) explained his view that both the narcissistic self-absorbed types and the dependent types were two different types of narcissism. He concluded that both were unhealthy in different ways and in different directions most easily represented on a continuum. In the discussions and responses from the participants, there was an open expression of feeling "limited" and "bound" in the relationship with the narcissistic types. These reports were specific to having a limited number of friends outside of the relationship or having no friends. The expression of feeling "sucked in" from the data indicated a sense of being pulled in and held down. In light of Masterson's approach, this represents the unhealthy status and history of the dependent partner. This concept suggests that the dependent types dwell in an oppressed state from a weakened ego. Also from the personal disclosures of the participants, there were expressions of feeling "detached" and "non-functional". All of these reflect wounded-ness or injury.

Emotional injury and narcissistic wounds were traits of development which appeared in this data. To an extent, they were brought into the relationship by the dependent participants. From the literature (Waska, 1997) described the dependent type as ones who set themselves as "drained" by the developmental process. Waska also added that the dependent types believe often that they "cause" all of the trouble in the home where they live. Within that, ultimately there exists a quiet and painful responsibility and a need for conflict avoidance, which is a passive experience.

The developmental and emotional wounds of the dependent participants documented in the transcriptions are similar to the roles described by Hoogstad (2008). These "roles" are the persecutor, the rescuer, and victim (p. 43 of Ch. 3). The evidence of these roles within these data is represented by DP-E who reported that she was "pre-conditioned" by her family to being treated as "second" and learned that being second was acceptable. DP-E, somewhat ironically, is a fraternal twin and though she viewed herself as stronger and more giving, she reported that her tendencies were always that of being the caregiving and an attending member of the family. She reports missing much of her senior year in high school to come home and take care of her dying mother (DP-E/28).

As drawn from the data, it was necessary to define wounded-ness and injury as it emerged from the data analysis. It is paradoxical in that the findings in this study show both the appearance and presentation of strength and weakness for the participants. Bornstein (1999) suggested that most clinicians from several domains view dependent people in a negative way. Wounded-ness of self was presented by the individuals and is represented in the data in a negative presentation. For this study wounded-ness and emotional injury came to be a construct of disappointment, disillusionment, minimization, emptiness, confusion, and deterioration. From the participants it was discovered that many of the eight reported a form of denial about the reality of the relationship over time. DP-A specifically stated that she arrived in the relationship after feeling "so bad" about herself for so long that initially the new partner was a "Boom! Here he is and everything that I could possibly want is in front of me and I didn't want to throw that away" (DP-A/13).

To be and feel emotionally injured for these members was also a functioning trait of bewilderment and a lack of awareness for these participants. DP-C disclosed that she was

"bewildered, I didn't even understand what a boundary was". She added, "I was too young and naïve to realize it... I was like a sitting duck" (DP-C/17). Crothers & Warren (1996) reported from his research that dependency and co-dependency appear to be a modeling effect. More specifically his theory suggested a strong possibility that a "controlling parent" could influence a child to regard other peoples as "objects" of attention. From the data this phenomenon is evident. DP-D specifically reported that she felt that she was in high objectified (DP-D/6). This reference meets a classic psychological representation of objectification (Sandler, et al., 2012, p.18-19). A controlling parent was evident from DP-E's story as her father made many controlled moves in his career which took the family moving to many new cities and towns. This significantly affected the family. The father was reported to have made many significant family decisions without consultation or discussion and often at the last minute. DP-A's mother was abandoning and unsupportive in moments of distress and DP-A's boyfriend's mother mandated and arranged for her abortion at age 19. She defined that event as the most life changing and self-deprecating event of her life (DP-A/19).

The male clients were not without wounds from childhood and family. DP-F reports his rigid and strict father (DP-F/16) to have caused him to "not understand other people" and that he thought he was left to deal with his own problems and that in a marriage, the other person (wife) was left to deal with her problems alone as well. That behavior, he reports, was modeled in his home by his parents. As the oldest of 12 children he reported that he was in a "go to" and assumed role of taking care of many things in the home. He was quick to note that he assumed that role more than it was put upon him (DP-F/17). This male participant indicated that he became increasingly non-compliant with his parents until he finally broke away in his late teenage years.

Participant DP-F also added that one of his close friends of many years made a statement about not liking his partner (narcissistic type) because she "put off a bad vibe" and made the hair stand up on the back of his neck. He reported that he heard this remark after he was in the marriage. DP-F admitted that on the third time he had a lengthy conversation with his narcissistic type, then the future, partner, "I concluded that a relationship between us would be hard if not impossible" (DP-F/10). When asked, why he married his partner, DP-F replied, "If I put a percentage on it, I would say that 75% of the reason I married her was because of (the daughter) which became stepdaughter... (for the wife) I ignored the cues--the ones I saw-- and missed some due to a lack of knowledge and experience" (DP-F/13). This disclosure represented as noted in the literature and the participant's disclosure, a significant lack of developmental healthiness. In effect it reflects a wounded and inadequately developed person less than ready for a healthy relationship. Emotional injury is a form of emotional ignorance for DP-F, which facilitated a somewhat desperate need to rescue a three year old child from a bad story. The attraction for the narcissistic type (wife) for DP-F was through the innocence and needs of a child. This may be no different than "meeting others' needs" behavior and the care taking he did for any one or more of his eleven siblings. He was the oldest child amongst many children and many needs.

Selective Code 2: Changing Developmentally

The participants in this study presented many references to their families of origin and the axial codes drawn specifically from questions about family history were extensive. The analysis was intriguing in consideration of both the effect of family relationships and roles within family systems for the development of dependent personality traits for this sample. In the interviews, family of origin questions brought forth a variety of contributing stories. Participant E, A, F, G, H and C specifically reported that their families were low in emotional support. These reports

were specific to feelings of abandonment and as Participant DP-A indicated, her mother told her in light of a planned abortion to go and "do something that she could live with" (DP-A/29). Participant E (DP-E/3) indicated that she felt very much that her family "did not meet my needs". She added, that her mother on her "death bed" told her directly that "I should have put you first more often". Participant E in the data collection reported that she came to realize within her family growing up that maybe "being second is normal for me" (DP-E/4). She discussed that after losing her mother, she experienced a new and strong anger toward her.

Dependent participant (DP-B) indicated that she felt strengthened by her family system growing up. She reported that she was "told I was too headstrong". DP-B also described herself as "prepared, a planner when given the chance, and I'm stable" (DP-B/14). Dependent partner DP-H reported that he "started out early taking care of himself (DP-H/11). At 12 and 13 years of age DP-H describes himself as cooking dinner and making lunch for his younger siblings. Dependent partner G (DP-G/ 6) reported that his father was nonexistent and his mother was involved in multiple relationships and he lived in many different homes and communities growing up. DP-G (male) and DP-E (female) presented similarities in development with fathers who were controlling. Developmentally they were affected to patterns of response in relationship.

Dependent partner F (DP-F/14) reported one of the more extreme stories as a male child and oldest child with many younger brothers and sisters. His family lived in isolation from any normal communication or community involvement. DP-F reports that he had an inappropriate relationship with two of his sisters growing up in an isolated rural home environment. DP-F was home schooled, at times home churched, and lived on a large plot of land growing food and animals. He reported that he internalized and hid his inappropriate touch with his sisters which

139

he reports was "mutual" inappropriate touch. His narcissistic type partner (wife) used his self-confessed story of his inappropriate behavior against him and ultimately openly revealed his secret to family and a legal divorce court. This case represents an extreme story and the effects of this family of origin data can only be viewed as a single case. The similarities between case DP-F and the other participants are none the less relevant and measurable. Like many of the other participants, DP-F was intimately connected to his partner and eventually struggled as many others did in a discovery self-absorbed attitudes and behaviors emanating from their spouse (DP-F/14, 16).

The data brought forth a theme of wounded-ness and emotional injury. The term "injury" was chosen as it depicts the result of narcissism within the broader definition. The literature supports fully *(Lee, Gregg & Park, 2013)* the concept that narcissistic behavior is a pathological energy which does not bring additional pain and trauma to the narcissistic types, but as in other fully blown personality disorders and behaviors, the behaviors of the narcissistic type inflicts damage and distress upon others. For these data, in part, the study was to determine how and why signs and cues may have been missed.

All three males within the data indicated that they brought to the relationship either childhood abandonment, parentification (adult responsibility) as a child, a memory of a rigid controlling parent, and often there were reports of a parent with weaker ego strength. From collected data, the men did not fall into the relationship for the same reasons as the females. Generally, the men were attracted to their partners more from external measures such as attractiveness, sex, and fun.

Two of female narcissistic type partners were described by the dependent males to have been free spirited open and promiscuous types. Narcissistic characteristics and behaviors for

females were manifested more strongly as related or core to distress (Grijalva, Newman, Tay, Donnellan, Harms, Robins & Yan, 2015). In a socio-bio approach it is suggested that one reason less women develop narcissistic traits is because women in Western culture and other cultures experience more of a backlash of social sanctions if they display dominance and aggression (Grijalva et al., 2015).

The reports about these narcissistic type women presented from the dependent men's stories depicted partners who were aggressive, assertive, hyper-sexual, and fun in the beginning. Grijalva's conclusion that narcissistic traits are strongly related to distress for females is moderately supported in this study and eight participant sample. The narcissistic female partner types' data came from the men participants. Representations of this rich data are included in the following discussion.

Partner DP-F's female partner, he reported, came from a family of origin similar in lifestyle and personality to what she became, which was after divorce, a single mom at home with numerous abandoning or "banned" fathers. The history of the partner reported by the DP-F was that there were several children in his partner's family but no father actively involved for most of the time (DP-F/19). DP-G reported his female narcissistic type partner came from a dysfunctional history. DP-G disclosed in the interview that his partner had multiple children by several different men and had that she had been before and after the marriage under the "distress" of poverty or near poverty situations. Specifically reported was that the Department of Human Services was involved with his ex-partner for child neglect and a physically unacceptable home.

DP-H described his ex-partner in a somewhat different history. DP-H's female partner came more, he reports, from a sense and place of entitlement. The family was perceived and

reported by DP-H to be matriarchal. He reported that in the family very strong women, going back of three generations, were dominant. This perception of entitlement he interpreted for his partner to function as laziness, demandingness, lack of personal responsibility, and ultimate vengeance and "payback" DP-F/1, 2, 4, 15).

Research from the past decade supports that female narcissistic types are reported to make up only 25% of the total narcissistic types (Twenge & Campbell, 2009), and these women often use their sexuality to engage with partners in early stages of relationship connection (Foster, 2008). Foster also reported that narcissistic types do not make good lovers (Foster, 2008). It may be presumptuous to assume that all men enter all relationships just for sexual reasons, but it appears valid to suggest that narcissistic women types enter relationships and perform in relationships often, using sex for self-absorbed gain. Concurrent with Foster (2008) the data of this study were shown to also be valid. The male participants, DP-F, DP-G, and DP-H, had partners of the trait of promiscuity and hyper-sexual behavior. Partner F (DP-F) later realized after they were divorced that his ex-narcissistic type partner wanted another child. He reported that since their breakup she had a child out of wedlock (DP-F/19). DP-G was initially, from his self-report, attracted to his partner because of sexual cues and desires. He reported that it was her blonde hair, her body and "the whole package". DP-H also disclosed that his relationship... "It was based on sex. She told me everything I wanted to hear and I saw her as very charming" (DP-H/3).

All three of the male participants indicated in their interviews that they ignored, justified, or minimized their partners' cues and traits of self-absorbed behavior. Sexual attraction appears to have been a function of "blinded-ness" or denial for the male participants. Additionally, the male dependent types tended to give, to care, and to be needed. For the three males in the

sample, this was common as they all three indicated a severe and intense experience once

children became a battleground for conflict. All three of these male participants in the study were

actively involved in custody disputes with their narcissistic type female partners at the time of

data collection. Two of them had achieved primary custody of their children away from the

narcissistic type mothers.

Finally, true for this data set, similar to the report of Grijalva (2015), these male

dependent partners and their described mates could be described as Grijalva theorized:

> The manifestation of a sense of inner deadness at the loss of an external object
> was more highly linked to male distress. There was a greater prevalence of
> grandiosity, fantasies of unlimited success, and lack of empathy among males
> (Grijalva et al., 2015, p. 282).

In both contrast and agreement, the above quote represents the sample of this study in the

following ways. The manifestation of inner deadness and the loss of an external object (sex,

marital status, and children) were linked to distress. This is especially evident for the participants

as to their custody battles. The second statement of grandiosity and fantasy for huge success fits

the data in this study for the sample partners for the five female dependent types. This statement

hints to the causes of both dependency and narcissism in the male population. Since this is not a

generalizable study, no deductions or conclusions were made for the described males who were

partnered with the five female dependent participants.

The dependent partners (DPs) under the broader view of developmental change revealed

their psychosocial development within a family system and childhood with some detail. They

generally disclosed that either or both parents in effect *conditioned* them to engage with a

narcissistic type or contributed to their inability to recognize and avoid an unhealthy relationship

(DP-A/15, 16, 28); (DP-E/5,8,9); (DP-G/6,7); (DP-D/ 6,7,8,9); DP-F/2,4,7). The five women of

this study came from imbalanced parents where at least one of the parents was self-absorbed or

rigid, and some of them were notably absent physically and or emotionally. All three of the men had fathers who principally or generally were strong minded, military-type, rigid, controlling, and dominant of their wives. Some of the fathers were reported to be abandoning of their wives. It was impossible from this data to determine the personality status and personality types or disorders of the participants' fathers. The data was limited to knowing the most of the eight dependent types individually.

Selective Code 3: Energizing Existentially and Traumatically

The concept of energy emerged from the data. Energy from the process of analysis was determined best discussed in terms of existential trauma. Energy and discussions about it emerged not only in the form of participant expressed emotional energy but also as the energy of participant survival and the energy of narcissistic control. Key axial codes which emerged under this selective code were the codes of: "intimidating, pack up, gradual, roller coaster, fireworks, internally disengaged, change, and put down, confusion". Existential energy is a psychological term. The term is also rooted existential philosophy. It is comparable to libido, egocentrism, ego control and narcissistic supply. It was for the dependent participants also "collective control" for managing, caring, tolerating and enabling their partners and others. These term and concepts matched with the data analysis findings.

Existential thought and energy in a problematic way leaves individuals with both a binding experience of living with something or someone and also encourages a separate and *individual self* (McCormack, 2015; Montgomery, 2014). Montgomery (2014) added much to a discussion of existential energy and counseling. Montgomery saw Freud to be an "existential pioneer" (Montgomery, 2014, p. 249). Psychodynamic theory as an approach framed this study from the beginning. Montgomery (2014) also contributed a view of human relationship through

144

classical psychological theories and philosophies. He offered Spinelli's presentation of "uncertainty of uncertainty" (Montgomery, 2014, p. 245) and the human attempt to harmonize the opposites of positive and negative. Ultimately, the discussion led to a theory of love and hate (Montgomery, 2014, p, 246). Love and hate best describes the grinding relationship histories of these participants who reported their struggles in intimacy.

A discussion of psychodynamic energy in the methods section and those concepts reflected the need for balance between self-care and "other" care. The psychodynamic energy of love and hate (Montgomery, 2014) manifested in these participants both in the way they viewed and dealt with self and in self disclosure, the way in which the relationships functioned. The theme of love and hate fell along a conceptualized continuum for the participants.

All of the participants alluded that they felt naïve, stupid, blinded, duped, or 'missed it' as they actively reflected on their relationship story. Love and hate was a dissonant and self-critical view of self which was processed through a view of an "ideal" self. This psychoanalytic concept epitomized and interpreted the data of the participants. It was for these participants, as the data revealed, an experience of uncertainty as they stayed in the relationship. The relationship was uncertain and deteriorated and diminished for much of the time the relationship existed. The "uncertainty about uncertainty" grew as the relationship existed through time. It appears that during later stages of the relationships uncertainty often grew to necessary disengagement on the part of the dependent types. Through many expressions, the dependent participants reported that the relationship became unsustainable.

These dependent and narcissistic relationships were not entirely oppressive or totally destructive for the dependent types. Often many perks came with these relationships. Some perks included wealth and high income which is not uncommon for male narcissistic types (Lee,

Gregg, & Park, 2013, p. 336). Also found in the data was a significant the perk for all three men, sex. Sex and money both have their contributing energy in many relationships. This is not to say that the relationships noted in this data were all defined around sex and money. From these data, these external perks were not the driving force, but it was the internal needs and drives which manifested the relationship. Even for the men, sex was not the sustenance except in the very beginning. These relationships were mostly positive in the beginning and all were entirely negative later. Some of these relationships were described as euphoric in the beginning. At moments for the longer term, the relationships for the participants were occasionally positive, but existed under a shadow of ominous control and fear. Some of the relationships were for the males unmanageable and unbearable within a very few months (DP-F, DP-H)

Particular dependent types in the study revealed specific data which supported the above discussion. DP-A presented her story nothing short of a "knight in shining armor hero story" in the beginning. She indicated that she could not say no to "everything she needed and too good to be true" (DP-A/12). All of the participants reported a period of time in the relationship when they were uncertain about how sustainable they relationship could be. It is best summarized by saying that the participants after a stage of uncertainty became more convinced that the relationship was unsustainable. DP-H reported about his partner, "she was absolutely the opposite (of that of me)...personality wise, we didn't click. I was positive she was absolutely the opposite of that" DP-H/3).

DP-D In describing the self-concepts which she felt contributed to her connecting to the narcissistic type stated that she as an adolescent felt "objectified" (DP-D/6). DP-D further disclosed that she was naïve and her parents were strict and that she was weirdly drawn into pleasing and giving to her husband and being a "comforter" while he was blatantly minimizing

her and declaring to friends that she was mentally ill. She recalled being told by friends that "he

was controlling" (DP-D/9). This participant clearly presents existential crisis and energy in the

following self-report presentation:

> "...he needed to feel important. And this is a man that I loved and I realized
> that and it's a flaw. You know, and maybe I'll do this for him. You know
> what I am saying? Or he needs more this because of that need... Acceptance
> (that) I think that is it! I think he needed acceptance and this is what I saw
> underneath. But I think what he wanted from me was to follow and obey. And those
> scenarios, I think that he was trying to get me to follow and obey. And what
> I was doing was looking at the underneath part, of what was wrong" (DP-D/11).

For this participant, the dissonance between a naïve view of "meanness" and her caregiving

versus the reality of a self-absorbed minimizing husband was palpable in the interview. This

participant indicated that she was remembering things within the interview prompted by

questions that she had not recalled or processed in more than ten years. She became labile in the

interview. Her naïve and weakened ego was obvious with the event of interview. As a teacher,

became a romantic literary woman as she spoke of her memories and her analytical perspective.

For the selective code of Energizing, in summary, the code represents what participants

expressed about their experiences and awareness of themselves. This energy is individually

emotional and relational. This code also represents the conflict and friction between two

personalities, male and female differences, and to very different ways to experience love.

For the men, the energy may indeed sexual, especially in the beginning of the

relationship. The energy for the female participants for all eight participants was reported to be

more self-critical and internalized, but the energy was found to be deeply entangled in survival.

Masterson (1999) equated this energy to being a similar narcissistic energy for both the

dependent type and the narcissistic type. This data significantly supports the concept that the

energy of these type relationships changes dramatically over time. For the sample participants,

the energy is much more externalized an expressed and after time with the narcissistic type, the energy is internalized by fear and guilt. The negative guilt energy was large for many of these participants.

Selective Code 4: Agreeing Perpetually

Agreement is a fourth and final selective code from this analysis. Agreement reflects the work McCrae & Costa (2012), the creators of the standardized *NEO-FFI-R* used as criterion variable. Agreement is a domain of the personality of the Big Five Personality Theory. The data brought forth numerous references and revelations about agreement. The dependent type participants revealed themselves in self disclosure as "agreeable" in at least three different ways. 1) Foreclosure without protest. 2) Agreeing to deny self. 3) Agreeing as self-doubt. Agreeableness was specifically noted in the data of participant DP-D (female). This participant with narcissistic type described herself as "waiting for him" while he went to professional school and she worked (DP-D/5). She added, "I did not like to be manipulative and play (social) games in high school" (DP-D/6. Additionally DP-D said that her husband wanted to be rich and famous and compared himself and his future to a presidential candidate. She explained by saying that "not that I agreed with that, but neither here nor there for me—went along with it". In effect the DP-D reported that she foreclosed to his ideas without discussion. Later in the interview DP-D indicated that she "didn't even have a car—I just sat there with the kids" every day (DP-D/15). This indicates a denying of self through agreement.

Additionally, DP-A indicated that as one still being in relationship with the narcissistic type, that she "just need(s) to ride this out whatever to the end." She made it clear in the interview that she had no intentions of leaving mostly due to the lack of pressure and the fact that her husband travel extensively. This wife chose to agree to remain in the relationship because she

148

fears the consequences if she tries to leave (DP-A/4.2). She added, "So I have to be happy where

I am" DP-A/4.4). This represents agreement in foreclosure. DP-A also disclosed:

> "There were times I thought that he lied, that he was lying to me about where he was
> going or why he couldn't see me for a week or so and I doubted that. But then always,
> you know appears to be this super busy, successful business person. So I try to be very
> understanding of that and I accepted that" (DP-A/8).

This represents agreement without protest. It also reflects some self-doubt. DP-C disclosed that

"I was worried about everyone else's feelings, So, I wouldn't voice, "Hey you hurt my feelings."

This represents both a foreclosure without protest and denying of self. DP-C is one of two of the

eight participants who remain engaged and involved in a relationship with the narcissistic type.

The male participants in similar ways revealed their compliance and agreeableness with

their narcissistic type women mates. DP-G indicated that he, "For the most part, just bent

(complied)" (DP-G/2). He added much later in the interview that he, "... had to pick her up and

get all the kids together, I was coaching football and everything else, doing that. So, I was

always busy and she was always doing what she wanted to do". These examples of foreclosure in

agreement are indicative of many of the participants. Most all of the participants foreclosed in

agreement revealed both in the childhood and adolescent years as well as in the adult relationship

in question.

DP-E indicated that she faced the challenge either by default or choice to be an extreme

caregiving type,

> "So, here I am with a twin sister who had lung issues. A mom who had colon
> Cancer, a Dad who was out of town constantly, my older sisters were not there
> To help and my Mom had to go in for cancer treatment. And I, was working and
> Going to school and taking care of everything" (DP-E/10).

Participant DP-E reported much data about her family of origin. Her expressed data about her

family of origin was slightly more than her reports of her significant narcissistic type partner.

149

It appears from the analysis that significant events of being used and neglected play much to contribute to her ultimate connection, experience and divorce from her partner. In her report of "working and taking care of everything", there is a sense of foreclosure and agreeableness or settling to suffer or an assumption of having no other choice.

Agreeableness for male participant DP-F was expressed in the data in several ways. When asked what his feelings were with this significant other, DP-F revealed, "That didn't happen very much. (chuckle) Because it was easier to outside and or to go to another room and play with (daughter or stepdaughter)" (DP-F/7). DP-F responded when asked how he felt about his expression of a "failed marriage", DP-F responded by saying that,

> "Well, initially, I felt like I was kind a the stuff she called me, an ass, someone who didn't care about other people. I basically just adopted her accusations of me...well, once our relationship started going south or downhill, or having whatever, it was all negative" (DP-F/8).

As a male participant, this partner was at times stoic and carefully contemplative in his disclosures. He seemed to ponder the questions and answer them with forethought. His agreeableness was not as perpetual as was for some other dependent types. DP-F expressed estrangement and disconnect from his controlling and rigid family of origin. But he foreclosed to agree or let go many of the behaviors of his partner as evidenced by his disclosure. By "basically adopting" his wife's accusations of him, he gave in and foreclosed to adopt her opinion of self.

DP-F further revealed in the interview that he carried a family secret of inappropriate sexual touch between him and two of his sisters. More disclosure indicated that this was never legally reported and became inconsequential. This was moderately admittedly rationalized by DP-F as somewhat understandable for many children slept in rooms and beds together. This family secret was in trust revealed to the wife, as DP-F reported,

"I didn't want my family secret to be a family secret to start with. Which is how I found out so quickly that my ex-wife (then wife) would not forgive me. Because I asked questions because I wanted to know if I could tell her my hidden secret. And that's how I found out on that third phone call I couldn't tell her. So, she (long pause) so I continued the relationship got stronger with both of them, actually. And the my ex-wife offered sex and I started thinking nothing was wrong with it. I think that is best way to explain what happened (DP-F/21-22).

Selective codes of foreclosure without protest as well as denying of self are evident in this disclosure for DP-F.

Summary of Agreeing Perpetually

Conclusions about agreeableness suggested that most of the dependent participants in various ways practiced a pattern of behavior of agreeableness and conflict avoiding with their partners. These participants retrospectively admit and knew of this trait. A majority of the dependent types, both male and female, indicate in the interviews that they operated in agreeableness both in their family of origin as well as their intimate partnered relationships. Agreeableness also matches the findings of the standardized assessment of the *NEO-FF-R* (See Tables 7 and 9).

Summary of Chapter Four

Overall, the dependent types within the data saw their partners as lacking in honesty, being heavy in impression management, active in attention seeking, and somewhat exploitive. Some of the partners saw their narcissistic counterparts as having some need for control, but the need for control as a perceived trait of the narcissistic partner was not significant in this data set.

CHAPTER FIVE

Interpretation and Analysis of Data and Results

Introduction and Organization of the Chapter

Chapter five is a discussion of discovery. The data set from eight participants presents eight individual personal stories and specific data. From the review of literature, these data appear to rarely have a platform for disclosure. A view of human relationships through lenses of evolutionary theory, psychodynamic theory, existential psychology, and psychological pathology were core to the development of the research. There are many ways to discuss and study human relationship. At times, discussions of intimate relationships are limited to the glory and the wonder of euphoric love. At other times, intimate relationships are viewed mostly as sexual and lustful. At another conjuncture, human intimacy is brushed off as complicated. Although this study was focused ultimately on "damage" and dysfunctional situations, there was a plan and a hope to find data which could help these and future individuals to avoid "bonding in the bad" or mating with the maladjusted. It is through not only an awareness of self, but of "the self with someone else" that was the concern for a study. Personality types and personality disordered states affect intimate relationships dramatically. Proverbial archetypes of love and marriage and love and trauma are pervasive in the language, media, and minds of Western culture. This study found deeper and abundantly intense stories. The standardized quantitative criterion measures provided a grounded understanding for going deeper into the experiences and minds of eight wounded and surviving participants.

The premise and research focus was on a dependent type personality connected intimately with a self-absorbed person. Preliminarily, it was observed that particular narcissistic dependent functioning relationships are often relationships of disillusionment, betrayal and

several forms of abandonment. The individuals reported that there were often cues and signs that something in the relationship or the person was seemingly uncomfortable, incomplete, or simply not right. One of the research concepts of the study was to determine what specific personality traits for the dependent types may have caused them to "miss" the signs, discount their intuition, or ignore obvious cues. Without more complete data it appeared that dependent type individuals believed and lived a lie, the question became, why.

Concepts of dependent types, which include individuals who are labelled co-dependent, have been controversial for decades (Dear et a., 2005). One of the definitions is a characteristic of "extreme focus outside of self" (Spann & Fischer, 1990). Additionally, the dependent type is one who lacks much open expression of feelings. Fear and guilt is an energy defined as the need to protect the relationship which is in effect a dependence on others for happiness (Spann & Fischer, 1990). The sample of participants in this study came to be more defined in this way through analysis. This was also viewed as "other focus/self-neglect" (Hughes-Hammer, Martsolf, & Zeller, 1998).

Six of eight of these marital relationships were legally broken at the time of the data collection. Two of the female participants were still with the partner, one for the most part, living in separate rooms of the home and another with legal documents filed, but working to make progress in reconciliation.

Ultimately the research question hones in to find confessions and disclosures that may only and best be prompted by asking the right questions. The research data from the semi-structured interviews were the results of a concerted and contemplated effort to discover the data of loving, trying, searching, enduring, longsuffering, and surviving with a narcissistic type person. It became apparent that the dependent types at times, isolate from the narcissistic types

even though they physically co-exist with them. All of these individuals in the study were

intimate lovers, at least for part of the time, with the narcissistic individual who was far less

capable of authentic love. A self-loathing reality for the dependent type, who had signed on to

give the total self, is phenomenal in many ways. For many of these clients, in the beginning, they

gave their total and authentic self and their "all."

What was found was that there was psychological wounded-ness for all parties. The

wounded-ness in manifested nature was internalized, stifled and avoided. Therefore, energy

emerged in polarized ways. This study was among other things about that energy. For this study,

this is called existential energy. Existential psychology or existential counseling is a complicated

and controversial concept within itself. The data delivered some powerful concepts which reeked

of both *internalized* energy and blatantly *externalized* energy. This energy is similar to, but more

than the Freudian libido. Freud's libido, as a reference to intimacy, especially sex, permeates

modern language. Freud was documented in a text, *On Narcissism*, (compiled and re-published

2012) (Sandler, Person & Fonagy, 1991, 2012, p. 4-5) a definition of narcissism in a relationship

> What happens when the libido is withdrawn... this megalomania characteristic
> of these states points the way...This megalomania has no doubt come into
> being at the expense of object-libido. The libido that has been withdrawn
> from the external world has been directed to the ego and thus gives rise to an
> attitude which may be called narcissism. p. 4-5.

This brief explanation refers us to the energy which no matter what it may be called, is inevitably

powerful and obvious within the relationship in question. This energy in its many possible forms

is the essence of all relationships. If we adhere to the sage reports that a relationship should

reflect back to us the real self, then in these stories, it may be determined that a reflection back of

self is impossible, as for the narcissists, all energy is directed back to himself.

154

Restating the Research Question

The research question prompted a method and analysis for discovery. The research question was, "What psychosocial and developmental traits and patterns in personality and behavior emerge from dependent individuals partnered with narcissistic personality types?" Answers to the research question were revealed from this data collection and analysis. The data was deemed rich enough and the clients self-disclosing enough to answer adequately the question. Specifically, these data suggest the following.

1) From this sample, the female and male dependent types (DPs) expressed significant experiences from their family or origin which they came to realize and report as contributory to their gravitation to intimacy with narcissistic types. Those experiences involved: strained parental relationships; past negative romantic relationships; traumas such as abortion; death of a parent as well as having an absent father; an absent mother; teenage naïveté; young adult naïveté; adolescent disillusionment; sex and sexual arousal; rigid parents from family of origin; child "parentification" or growing up too fast; conditioned caregiving: a parental desire, attraction or bond to a partner's child. Family of origin issues came forth fluently from the interviews. The interview experience for the researcher was notable as the participants most all of them, talked with less stress and were more ease in talking about their family history as opposed to talking about themselves. Even when asked questions about their view of self or psychosocial development, they typically would talk about the effects of the family of origin or the effects perpetrated and experienced from the narcissistic type partners. This supports much of the literature which alludes that the dependent types tend to focus on externals rather than internal cues and feelings (Dear, et al., 2005).

2) Traits of personality for these participants (DPs) gathered from both the qualitative data and the standardized testing data, revealed that most, six out of eight, were high in the personality trait of agreeableness. The participants described both their experience with family of origin and with narcissistic partners to be a role of agreeableness. Both male and female members reported that they internalized negative energy and anger and rarely challenged or disagreed with their partner. Conflict avoiding is best understood from these data as a behavior and personality traits as the research question prompted. What appears to be different and more extreme for the participants is their inability in fear and guilt to express to their partner their frustration, fear, and pain.

3) The DPs revealed overall in both quantitative and qualitative data that they were high in conscientiousness. This was true for male and female members. Conscientiousness came through in the data both from the standardized criterion measure and the interviews. Conscientiousness in these data matched McCrae & Costa's (2010) definitive domain. These individuals tend to be compliant rule followers. They value order, control and doing things right. They are externally focused and do not like to be in trouble. Being in trouble or discussions about problems is often viewed by these individuals as conflict and condemnation. This may explain why for many the why of staying for long periods of time. The male members stayed significant less time in the relationships than the females within this small sample. The battle and conflict between the male members and their ex-partners though was extended. One male participant has been fighting over custody and post-divorce issues for seven years. Another male member has been fighting for nearly three years after divorcing. Most of these problems focus on children and parenting issues. The actual marriage for the male members was shorter than the length of marriage

time for the females. The female marriage data shows the marriages to have been longer in duration. One female participant has been married for 20 years and together for 25 years. Another member has been married for 19 years. Another was married for more than 18 years. Average length of marriage for the females in this study = 17.2 years. For length of marriage or intimacy for the males = 4.1 years.

4) The males in the study (N=3) reported a quicker awareness of a relationship problem. DP-F reported that he knew before he married within weeks of the relationship development that there was a strong potential for bad. DP-H indicated specifically that he knew two weeks into the relationship that there was something different, a problem. He indicated he stayed because he had a "son coming" (pregnancy with her). The third male participant BP-G reported that his relationship history with the partner was approximately two and one half years. He has been in a custody battle for more than two years which is ongoing. As notes previously, all of these males at the time of data collection retained or in a process secured custody of a child or children. All of the female narcissistic type partners of male participants lost custody of the children of the marriage.

5) The dependent types (DPs) in this sample viewed themselves as very giving people and viewed their partners as very taking or selfish. This data reflected numerical values within the criterion variable which were visually represented on a continuum nearly exactly equal from center. Giving and taking was a concept and data collection dependent designed to bring forth perception and awareness from the DP's about self and partner.

6) The DPs viewed their narcissistic type partners as low in self –regulation or self-control

7) The DP's reported a view of self, which represented a form of disillusionment evidenced by concepts of "How did I miss it" "I fell for it" "I was told..." "I feel stupid".

8) The DP's saw their partners as heavy into impression managing behaviors and generally behaving as entitled and empowered.

9) Nearly all of the DP's from the interviews reported their narcissistic partners to be high in deception or to be liars.

10) All but one (N=7) of the DPs in this study had been divorced either from the narcissistic partner viewed within the study or from a previous marriage. The eighth one had filed for divorce at the time of data collection.

11) From the interview data, it was found that all of the DP's in the study were significantly impacted emotionally and mentally by their experience with the narcissistic type partner. This was generally reported as "worst thing I ever did" "I no longer trust myself" "I was naïve" "I missed that she was a straight up liar".

12) The female participants tended to report their past and present experience with the narcissistic partners more in terms of fear. The male participants tended to report their experience with their partners in terms of anger and a strong concern for their child or children. The child focus issue for the male participants was a surprising finding from this small sample.

13) The disclosed data from the interviews with the dependent types expressed a polarity in experience of marriage and cohabitation. DP-B/2 reported that in the beginning of the relationship it was a lot of "flowers" and extreme affection. Then, she stated, it became from her partner much a mantra of, "I am busy, I am busy, I don't have time for this."

14) All eight of the DPs, both male and female, alluded in the interview that they had limited friendships outside of the marriage. These reports were specific with terms such as "very limited friendships" and "none", (no friendships). BP-B/6 stated that "If I had friends,

there would be hell to pay at home." BP-E/11 disclosed that during the marriage she "did

not have many friendships... the friends we had, they were his. Even if I had a friend, he

would be competing for that female's attention, even if I had one." BP-F, a male member

in the data collection, indicated the most outside of the marriage friendships. He

disclosed that he talked with his partner's brother from time to time and an older adult

male friend to which he "vented". He expressed a sense of guilt in stating that "they

remained friends even though I did (vented) that".

These traits and behaviors are helpful to answering the research question. Personality traits and

behaviors in relationship were assumed to reveal what goes on or had been going in a dynamic

way. These data are revealing. These traits and behaviors are viewed as the dynamics of the

dysfunction. They are also the evidence of energy. Energy became a means of discussion about

what has been going on with these striving individuals.

Discussion of Theory

The goal and objective of this study was to determine more about what happens in extreme

relationships from a qualitative method. The value of the data was derived from a step one

scientific approach of observation. Clinical experience brought forth a considerable amount real

awareness of the wounded-ness which drove the self-absorbed types to attract nurturing and

giving lovers. The same experience brought forth awareness as well of some of the extreme and

destructive effects of these relationships. The question needing empirical support was the

question of why and how and for what reasons do partners get as one participant stated, "sucked

in" to the story. Psychodynamic theory provided a view of the story and the world of

relationships in general. On the surface it may look to be just nice people who want to love and

be loved. On a deeper level, which was the purpose of this investigation, it was found as suspected, to be much more.

The selective codes helped in understanding that not all energy is good energy, and that relationships are appropriately viewed as forms of energy. There is energy in trauma as well as in euphoric love. These participants experienced both trauma and euphoria in extreme ways. The extreme experiences often happened in a steady story but an unstable relationship with a long term partner. It is apparent from these data, that these individuals are themselves in some way wounded or injured. This matches the concepts and theories of Masterson (1993) and assortative mating theory (Jiang, 2013) both discussed in chapter one. This is difficult for the dependent participants to accept. It is the same kind and degree of difficulty that great enablers experience in a relationship centered in addiction.

It appeared from this sample that these individuals covered their personal emotional wounds with an objectification of their partners and a focus on externals. It appears easier for the dependent types to get busy, to give, to do and to attend to the care of others. It was consistently difficult to facilitate these participants to share the internals. They tended to drift into discussions focused on their wicked, neglectful or failing parents. Or they tended to enjoy, it seems, or at least benefit from talking about the narcissistic partners' badness. This can be viewed as "affirmation" that may manifest in the process of either therapy or data collection experience. It is difficult and inappropriate from this data to fully suggest that the participants as dependent persons like to malinger and immiserate in their trauma. It does appear appropriate to suggest that these individuals in their tendencies of giving and loving genuinely want, need, and long for an authentic partner. As DP-A suggested, "people think I have everything, but they don't know... because I don't talk about... that I don't have the one thing I want... and I never will have it...that

160

is a faithful partner who can truly love me and be trusted." DP-A was the oldest of the participants and reported her resolve to not leave and to not seek to get out. She resolved that she mostly did not trust herself and feared getting it wrong again. She indicated additionally that her quality of life was good enough otherwise. She viewed her narcissistic type partner as a not very trustworthy friend, and not a husband. She indicated that it was more tolerable as she set boundaries. Her set boundaries were more internalized within and not so much outwardly expressed.

Most likely not embraced by these participants, but they can be viewed as involved in "defensive collusion" (Solomon, 1989, p. 74) as also discussed in the literature review. They may be viewed as within the discussions of (Klein, 1995, p. 14-15) who suggested that the dependent types are actually closet narcissists (p. 17 Ch. 2). From the data analysis this is appropriate concept for some of these participants. Klein indicated that the closet narcissistic types make an emotional investment in the "object" of their affection and in effect their defense mechanisms break down and they simply are no longer able to keep up with the demands and drains of their energy from the narcissistic type. Data in this study supports and reveals this to be true for most of these clients. All of them divorced the narcissistic type and revealed their exhaustion and disillusionment within the interviews. Many of them, away from the narcissistic types, still suffer with a depleted supply of emotional and relational energy. This was reported in the interviews.

For the men of this study, it is not known if demographics of higher socio-economic status levels would have changed the data. None of the men met the reported levels of income and status of the narcissistic type partners described by the dependent women. Physical attraction and sex was for all three the strongest draw. It is appropriate to suggest from these data that the

161

literature and the outcome of these relationships for the men strongly suggest that narcissistic type women are often using sex and physical attraction in extreme ways to draw dependent and giving men into their space. This information supports the mantra in paraphrase of two of the participants by saying, "It seemed to be too good to be true, and in the end it wasn't good."

Theory of Wounded-ness

The opportunity to discover and gather enough data to suggest a theory from this study and for its sample was purposed. From the data, there were many phenomenological moments, expressions, and themes as have been discussed. The theory of wounded-ness emerged strongly in the data. There were reports from the participants of awareness of individual family and childhood wounds which affected and facilitated the dependent types to see themselves and individuals as "drawn to the charm and charisma" of the narcissistic types. This was disclosed by and reported as disillusionment as the dependent types came to feel as if they had been "conned" and deceived by lies, selfishness and even trickery in these relationships. Wounded-ness theory from this data suggests that both the narcissistic types and the dependent types bring with them together at the beginning, degrees of maladjustment, pain, and for some, pathology.

With significant discussion about energy and injury, the question emerged in the end as to what specifically are those energies and injuries. And as the research question facilitated, what were the traits and behaviors that answer the question. The study brought forth much data from the sample. The energies as discussed were discussed as performing and watching and internalizing versus externalizing. Emotion was a deep energy for the dependent types and an outward performance of their self-serving partners as described by the dependent mates. Sexual energy was important and was pulled from the data. Sexual energy was described by the dependent participants in ways which defined it within this study as strong and at times "wild"

162

(DP-G) (DP-H) (DP-D) for relationships in the beginning. It emerged from the disclosed data of the narcissistic types being described as "less than" "phony" and "not good". As per the discussions and theory of Foster (2008), narcissists do not make good lovers was also concurring theme from these data. From the literature and these data it appears that for the narcissistic types, there is great fear that someone will come to know their weaknesses and their unauthentic image. Several of the reports in these data suggested that men with dependent women actually became less sexually involved overtime with their partners and more promiscuous outside of the marriage. This is also moderately supported in this study. One particular individual in this data collection reported that her husband's sexuality came into question through a perverted event which happened in the home. One theory which emerged from these data suggested that the narcissistic types sensed that the dependent partners knew the truth about them in many ways including their sexual self. From this study it appears that sexual behavior, sexual performance, and sexual orientation is only controllable in a marriage by the narcissistic types in this study, by avoiding it.

Further resolution to answering of the research question includes the following. These participants were assessed to determine from the beginning of the data collection that they were dependent types or dependent behaviorally. The question was about traits and behaviors specific which contributed to the getting in the intimate story with the self-absorbed person. Traits of family emotional injury were common. Traits were viewed in this study as pertaining to core personality tendencies. The concept of traits matched the psychology and personality theory of McCrae & Costa (2012). Traits of, or the ability to experience euphoric and abandoning trust and engagement were pulled from the data collection. A trait for the dependent members of having a

163

long deep ceded tendency to care for others more than caring for self also emerged. Traits of giving more than taking in all relationships were also found.

Additionally, personality and behavior appears to be influenced or affected by trauma and drama specifically during adolescence.

Recommendations for the Field of Counseling

It is viewed as inevitable that counselors in professional practice will encounter individuals who have been wounded by an emotionally destructive partner. These results and findings point to the need for awareness in therapeutic work. The considerations for counselors to gain and apply in their work are specifically the following:

1) Counselors should engage in assessment and psychosocial data gathering which includes relationship history and assess in general concepts of self-awareness for those clients. The data gathering from this effort in research indicated that both male and female clients can be dependent and function without adequate awareness of self and without awareness of others in relationship building.

2) This study required an awareness of personality theory and personality constructs. Counselors should increase their awareness as needed to conceptualize the dynamics of personality traits within an intimate relationship.

3) This study was also about intimacy. Counselors should increase as needed a more complete understanding of the theories of intimacy as a developmental construct and as a way to teach clients to and to assess relationship maturity of individuals and couples. It appeared from this exercise of analysis that clients often do not have their own awareness of this crucial concept of intimacy and its basic function and meaning. Counselors can become facilitators of intimacy awareness, attachment theories, as

well as prevention specialist for helping individuals avoid the tragedy of these very intense and destructive relationships in question.

4) The field of counseling should when possible scientifically research the problem of narcissism not necessarily for the treatment of narcissistic types, which is important, but to understand that these individuals in dependent personality at times need to be encourage to be avoiding, rejecting, distancing, and disengaging. This need and understanding cannot be accomplished for the counselor without more specific research. Though there is a mass amount of data for narcissistic behavior, there is very little for understanding the causes and dynamics of relationships which are severely pathological. Clinical psychology has traditional approaches to this topic, but counselors have an opportunity to bring the qualitative data to the research table. Qualitative data from counselors is missing and counselors are well poised to gather it.

5) Personality disordered individuals are not always the most common client for counselors, but they represent an extreme population when they reach pathological status. Counselors should work to understand the complete pathology of all disordered behavior as much as possible. There are many types of mental illnesses and adjustment disordered stories, but it important for mental health providers to enhance their understanding of the effects of a pathological perpetrator such as those indicated from these data in this study. There are no extensive or overbearing restrictions within the education and ongoing training for counselors in terms of specializing. There is a need in the counselor population for specialists, with or without licensing board addendums, to help patients through the aftermath of trauma

from this phenomenon. Dependent types are often damaged and struggle pervasively to heal. The counseling profession should promote "specializations" with or without licensing board formal requirements. Counselors are ethically responsible for knowing the best and most important research to aid their work and their clients.

6) A recommendation emerged from this collection of data and analysis. Highlighted in the analysis was the use of a mixed methods approach to a topic. This research project reminds the researcher of the significance of knowing and comparing both qualitative data and quantitative data. The research project required some use, awareness, and experience with standardized instruments. Though, this is a controversial topic often in the field of counseling, it is an important issue. Counselors should be encouraged more so to utilize assessment instruments in standardized form. These instruments are invaluable for counselors in specific moments with specific clients. The state board allows for this specialization and the requirements for specialization should be more readily accessible and affordable if possible for counselors who need and want that credentialing.

7) Counselors should read many things and read them often. Counselors are more so recommended to contribute to research in the most empirical and peer reviewed process possible within their domain and their increasing ability. These recommendations are broad and specific. In the broad way they represent a huge realization that counselors are called to do and be many, many things. In the specific way, counselors are called to empower and facilitate one patient at a time and to recognize soon and deeply how to help them. The doing and consuming of research is a necessary mandate.

Recommendations for Future Research

1) Future research specific to this topic should include research focused upon adolescent development and its role in dysfunctional relationships. Data about adolescent development became an important finding from this project. Adolescent developmental issues appear crucial to contributing to self-awareness for adults and for relationship choices in young adulthood. Adolescent research for counselors could provide needed insight to identity development.

2) Identity development should be a focus of research for counseling educators and contributors. Identity and an increased awareness of its application as a psychosocial construct would benefit counselors and their work. Research specific to counseling using the tenets of developmental psychology's theories could potentially enhance the quality of care and provide insight into the prevention of bad relationship collusion.

3) Research should increase and continue for counselors specific to all personality theories and disorders. Counselors have an opportunity to gather data from a significant number of counselor and counselee stories.

4) Data should be gathered formally and specifically to knowing more about counselor awareness of relationship work in general. Data should be gathered also specific to the number of and degree to which counselors may exist in or have personal experience with dysfunctional relationship models. This recommendation is generated from a research experience and a concern that some counselors may be at times effective or ineffective based upon their relationship experience quality and type.

5) Research is recommended to facilitate appropriate assessment of counselors in counselor training programs. These are recommended to determine ways most ethical

and effective to measure degrees of healthiness of and for counselors in training. Research is needed to establish a criterion and boundaries for counselors within relationship theories and as well to promote personal applications in self-awareness and relationship quality.

Concluding Summary

For many of the participants, seven out of eight, an extreme adolescent event appeared to shape their tendencies, thinking, and responding. These events of adolescent development included: the loss of a mother who died; an extreme boyfriend betrayal and condemnation; an abandoning and chaotic mother who married more than five times; such extreme naïveté that adolescence as an experience was traumatic; inappropriate sexual touch with an opposite sex sibling within an extreme and controlling family system and sexual abuse. These participants perceived these events to have contributed to their developed traits and behaviors. In the interview process it was difficult to determine how much the participants blamed themselves or blamed their families, or blamed the narcissistic mate. Many of these clients tended, it was found in analysis, to blame themselves which makes the effect of the bad relationship and their often traumatic developmental histories more powerful.

Additionally, for the research question, there was a distinction between behaviors and traits. The traits have been presented in summary. For the behaviors, this emerged from reported data in several manifestations. The behaviors of these dependent members reflected the following: Long or extended periods of "trying" very hard; behaviors of focusing more and more on externals and less on self; behaving and living in intimacy with isolation; very often foreclosing in agreement; refraining from pushing an issue with their mate; overly and extensively focusing

on children; for a short or long term period of time, sometimes years but not forever striving to compensate for relationship deficits; at time hyper in conscientiousness; enabling behaviors.

In a search for the *developmental* pieces of childhood for these participants to explain the bad situation of a narcissistic dependent marriage, the stories provided a cloudy and murky perspective from this data collection. There are very often discussions of nature and nurture and predisposed tendencies for personality theories. Developmentally, this study did not explore the situations of early bonding and attachment or the specific effects of divorce or sibling effects. Some of that data emerged, but this study asked for participants to report self-awareness and partner awareness. This process was revealing and the data suggested that the participants had significant insight of self and appeared to be deep thinking and analytic types mostly. Developmental traits in light of this process were viewed contextually to be as basic as individual temperament. In analysis, this was a helpful concept.

Often the dependent types ask in therapy and data collections may ask questions about how they came to get into the bad story. They often question what they missed, how did it happen, or why they were so deceived. To think about answering those questions, the concept of personality is nearly always a most common and maybe appropriate way to answer. What can be said strictly from this data is that the participants presented a trusted disclosure and their temperaments varied somewhere between intense and laid back or internalizing or externalizing, but fell in the analysis as deeply internalizing, often introverted more than extraverted, and more accepting, accommodating, and shrinking back. As Karen Horney, feminist personality theorist (1967) suggested, these individuals rather than being drawn to others often pull away. She indicated simply that there are basically only two types of people in the world, those that go to people and those that more often pull back. The caveat is that there was a shrinking back general tendency

169

for these individuals to not engage easily. This was evident from these data. It is also true that when the charming and impressive one appeared, they were drawn to that persona in a reckless abandonment of pent up restraint. It appeared in wonder or lust that their dream had come true and it appeared in that moment, irresistible. Months, years, and decades of giving and working on a relationship came to this data collection. Self-disclosure is the essence of intimacy (Solomon, 1989). The dependent types were eager to share and disclose. Ironically, they were quicker and pervasively more disclosing and focused upon the "object" of their dis-satisfaction, their dysfunction and their dismay, which is the narcissistic partner. All of these "who tended to be attending" ones shared deeply. What was learned, among many other things, was that the narcissistic types are fantastically self-focused and self-absorbed. More purposefully, it was learned that the dependent ones remain deeply focused on and affected by a mate, even a long gone mate, who is and was incapable of authentic love. This focus is not of their conscious choosing. It appears to be the unfortunate and tragic result of their authenticity and their more complete way of loving. They were conned. The narcissistic type is forever for them an enigma. The data from this gathering shows that they struggle for years, maybe forever to understand how it could be so.

REFERENCES

Adiv-Ginach, M. (2006). Analysis of a narcissistic wound: Reflections on André Green's "The Dead Mother." *Modern Psychoanalysis*, *31*(1), 45-57.

Akhtar, S. (2009). Love, sex, and marriage in the setting of a pathological narcissism. *Psychiatric Annals*, *39*(4), 185-191. doi:10.3928/00485713-20090401-01

American Psychiatric Association (2013). *The Diagnostic and Statistical Manuel for Mental Illness Fifth Edition.*

Ayer, A. J. (1959). *Logical Positivism.* New York: NY. The Free Press Simon and Schuster, Inc.

Back, M. D., Küfner, A. P., Dufner, M., Gerlach, T. M., Rauthmann, J. F., & Denissen, J. A. (2013). Narcissistic admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*(6), 1013-1037. doi:10.1037/a0034431

Bandura, A. (2001). Social cognitive theory: An agentic perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology, 52* (10), 1.

Behary, W. (2008). *Disarming the narcissists*. New Harbinger Publications.

Birks, M. & Mills, J. (2011). *Grounded Theory: A practical guide*. London: Sage Publications.

Blais, M. A., & Little, J. A. (2010). Toward an integrative study of narcissism. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *1*(3), 197-199. doi:10.1037/a0020573

Bleske-Rechek, A., & Buss, D. M. (2006). Sexual strategies pursued and mate attraction tactics deployed. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *40*(6), 1299-1311. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2005.11.014

Bloomberb, L. D. & Volpe, M. (2012). *Completing your qualitative dissertation: A road map from beginning to end*. Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Bornstein, J. (2013). Current trends in the treatment of narcissism: Spotnitz, Kohut, Kernberg. *Modern Psychoanalysis*, *38*(1), 25-49.

Bornstein, R. F. (1993). *The Dependent Personality*. New York: Guilford Publications, Inc.

Bornstein, R. F. & Languirand, M. A. (2003). *Healthy Dependency: Leaning on Others without Losing Yourself.* NY: Newmarket Press.

Bornstein, R. F. (1999). Criterion validity of objective and projective dependency tests: A meta-Analytic assessment of behavioral prediction. *Psychological Assessment (11).* 48-57.

Brodsky, A. E. (2008). *Negative Case Analysis* as found in Givens, L. Ed. *Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909

Brown, R. P., Budzek, K., & Tamborski, M. (2009). On the meaning and measure of narcissism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *35*(7), 951-964. doi:10.1177/0146167209335461

Burris, C. T. (1999). Stand by your (exploitive) man: Codependency and responses to performance feedback. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, *18*(3), 277-298. doi:10.1521/jscp.1999.18.3.277

Buss, D. M., & Malamuth, N. M. (1996). *Sex, power, conflict: Evolutionary and feminist perspectives*. New York, NY, US: Oxford University Press.

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. doi:10.1177/0146167202287006

Campbell, W. K., Rudich, E., & Sedikides, C. (2002). Narcissism, self-esteem, and the positivity of self-views: Two portraits of self-love. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 358– 368.

Campbell, W. K., Foster, J. D., & Brunell, A. B. (2004). Running from shame or reveling in pride? Narcissism and the regulation of self-conscious emotions. *Psychological Inquiry*, *15*(2), 150-153.

Carter, N., Bryant-Lukosius, D., DiCenso, A., Blythe, J., & Neville, A. J. (2014). The use of triangulation in qualitative research. *Oncology Nursing Forum*, *41*(5), 545-547. doi:10.1188/14.ONF.545-547

Cattell, R. B. (1966). *The Scientific Analysis of Personality*. Chicago: Aldine.

Carr, E., & Cortina, M. (2011). Heinz Kohut and John Bowlby: The men and their ideas. *Psychoanalytic Inquiry*, *31*(1), 42-57. doi:10.1080/07351690.2010.512847

Carver, C.S. & Scheier, M. F. (2008). *Perspectives in Personality Sixth Edition*. Boston: MA Pearson Education, Inc.

Charmaz, K., (2014). *Constructing grounded theory: A practical guide through qualitative analysis 2nd edition*. CA: Thousand Oaks. Sage Publishers.

Cohen D, & Crabtree B. (2008). *"Qualitative Research Guidelines Project."* http://www.qualres.org/HomeTria-3692.html

Comte, A. & Ferre', F., (1988). *Introduction to Positive Philosophy (Hackett Classics)*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing, Inc.

Connelly, J., (1989, August 28). The CEO's second wife. *Fortune ,* 52-66.

Consolini, G. (1999). Kenberg versus Kohut: A (case study in contrasts). *Clinical Social Work Journal*, *27*(1), 71-86.

Coolidge, F. L. & Anderson, L. W. (2002). Personality profiles of women in multiple abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *17*(2), 117–131. Retrieved from http://www.springer.com/medicine/journal/10896.

Corbin, J. M., & Strauss, J. M. (2007). Basics of qualitative research: Techniques and procedures For developing grounded theory (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches*. Los Angeles: Sage Publishers.

Creswell, J. W., & Miller, D. L. (2000). Determining validity in qualitative inquiry. *Theory into Practice*, *39*(3), 124.

Cohen D, Crabtree B. "Qualitative Research Guidelines Project." July 2006. http://www.qualres.org/HomeProl-3690.html

Cooney, A. (2010). Grounded theory choosing between Glaser and Strauss: an example. *Nurse Researcher*, *17*(4), 18-28.

Costa, P. T., (1991). Clinical use of the Five Factor Model: An introduction. *Journal of Personality Assessment 57,* 393-398.

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1998). Six approaches to the explication of facet-level traits. Examples from Conscientiousness. *European Journal of Personality, 12.* 117-135.

Costa, P. T. & McCrae, R. R. (1998). Personality in adulthood: A six year longitudinal study of self-reports and spouse ratings on the NEO Personality Inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 54*. 853-863.

Costa, P. T. & Widiger, T. A. (Eds.). (2002) *Personality disorders and the Five-Factor Model of personality (2nd ed.).* Washington DC: APA.

Costa & McCrae, 2010. *NEO Inventories Professional Manual*. Lutz, FL: PAR, Inc.

Crocker, J., & Park, L. E. Park. (2004). The costly pursuit of self-esteem. *Psychological Bulletin, 120* (3), 392-414.

Crothers, M., & Warren, L. W. (1996). Parental antecedents of adult codependency. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *52*(2), 231-239.

Dear, G. E., Roberts, C. M., & Lange, L. (2004). Defining codependency: An analysis of published definitions. In S. Shohov (Ed.), *Advances in psychology research* (Vol. 34, pp. 63–79). Huntington, NY: Nova Science Publishers.

Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (Eds.). (2011). The SAGE handbook of qualitative research (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Dick, B. (2007). Action research as an enhancement of natural problem solving. *International Journal of Action Research*, *3*(1/2), 149-167.

Dickson-Swift, E. L., James, E. L., Kippen, S., & Liamputtong, P. (2007). Doing sensitive research: what challenges do qualitative researchers face? Q*ualitative Research Journal 7* 327.

Felluga, D. (2012). *Terms used by psychoanalysts: Introductory guide to critical theory*. https://www.cla.purdue.edu/english/theory/psychoanalysis/psychterms.html

Foster, J. D., Shrira, I., & Campbell, W. K. (2006). Theoretical models of narcissism, sexuality, and relationship commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *23*(3), 367-386. doi:10.1177/0265407506064204

Foster, J. D., (2008). Narcissists don't make love. *Psychology Today.* October, 2008. NY: New York Sussex Publishers, LLC.

Foster, J. D. (2008). Incorporating personality into the investment model: Probing commitment processes across individual differences in narcissism. *Journal of Social & Personal Relationships*, *25*(2), 211-223. doi:10.1177/0265407507087956

Freud, S. (1949). *An outline of psycho-analysis: The James Strachey Translation*. London: W. W. Norton, Inc.

Fromm, E. (1947). *Man for himself*. New York: NY. Rinehart Publishers.

Gabbard, G. O. (2009). Transference and countertransference: Developments in the treatment of narcissistic personality disorder. *Psychiatric Annals*, *39*(3), 129-136. doi:10.3928/00485713-20090301-03

Galicano, T. (2013). *An example of how to perform open coding, axial coding and selective coding.* https://prpost.wordpress.com/2013/07/22/an-example-of-how-to-perform-open-coding-axial-coding-and-selective-coding/

Gangestad, S. W. & Simpson, J. A. (1990). Toward an evolutionary history of female sociosexual variation. *Journal of Personality,58,* 69-96.

Gardner, H. (1987). The theory of multiple intelligences. *Annals of Dyslexia*, *37*19-35.

Giles, S. J. B & Foo, G. (2010). Schizotypal and dependent personality characteristics and managerial performance. *Australian Psychologist 45* (4): 209-298.

Given, L., (2008). *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods Sage Publications.*Los Angeles: Sage Publishing Company. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909

Given, 2008, Ed., (2008). *The Sage Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research*. London:SAGE.

Gjerde, L. C., Czajkowski, N., Røysamb, E., Ørstavik, R. E., Knudsen, G. P., Østby, K., & ... Reichborn-Kjennerud, T. (2012). The heritability of avoidant and dependent personality disorder assessed by personal interview and questionnaire. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica*, *126*(6), 448-457. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0447.2012.01862.x

Glaser, B. G & Strauss, A. L. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory: Strategies for Qualitative Research*, Chicago, Aldine Publishing Company.

Goldman, L. (1989). Moving counseling research into the 21st century. *The Counseling Psychologist 17*:81-85.

Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. New York, NY, US: Bantam Books.

Gore, W. L., Presnall, J. R., Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., & Widiger, T. A. (2012). A five-factor measure of dependent personality traits. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *94*(5), 488-499. doi:10.1080/00223891.2012.670681

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*(2), 261-310. doi:10.1037/a0038231

Haigler, E. D., & Widiger, T. A. (2001). Experimental manipulation of *NEO-PI-R* items. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *77*(2), 339-358.

Harvard University Strauss (2015). *42 Basics of Qualitative Research Theoretical Sensitivity* isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic536759.files/Strauss.

Hendin, H. M. & Cheek, J. M. (1997). Assessing hypersensitive narcissism: A re-examination of Murray's narcissism scale. *Journal of Research in Personality, 31*, 5580599.

Hoogstad, J. (2008). Choice theory and emotional dependency; Grounded theory review: An International Journal 3. Vol. 8. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, *28*(1), 63–68.

Horney, K., (1967). *Feminine Psychology: Previously Uncollected Essays*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Hughes-Hammer, C., Martsolf, D. S., & Zeller, R. A. (1998). Development and testing of the codependency assessment tool. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, *12*(5), 264-272.

Irwin, H. J. (1995). Codependence, narcissism, and childhood trauma. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *51*(5), 658-665.

Jaffe, A. M., Goller, H., & Friedman, A. F. (2012). Psychology and the law: Dependent personality disorder as an affirmative defense. *Journal of Forensic Psychology Practice*, *12*(3), 189-210. doi:10.1080/15228932.2012.676325

Jennings, P. (2007). East of Ego: The intersection of narcissistic personality and Buddhist practice. *Journal of Religion & Health*, *46*(1), 3-18. doi:10.1007/s10943-006-9087-9

Jiang, Y., Bolnick, D. I. & Kirkpatrick, M. (2013). Assortative mating in animals. *The American Naturalist, Vol 181*, No. 6, pp.E125-E138.

Jonason, P. K., & Kroll, C. H. (2015). A multidimensional view of the relationship between empathy and the dark triad. *Journal of Individual Differences, 36 (*3), 150-156.

Jonassaint, C. R., Siegler, I. C., Barefoot, J. C., Edwards, C. L., & Williams, R. B. (2011). Low life course socioeconomic status (SES) is associated with negative *NEO PI-R* Personality Patterns. *International Journal of Behavioral Medicine*, *18*(1), 13-21. doi:10.1007/s12529-009-9069-x

Jung. T. A. & Bono, J. E. (2000). *Personality Types.* Princeton, NJ: University Press. (Original work published in 1923).

Kanai R, Bahrami B, Duchaine B, Janik A, Banissy M, Rees G. Brain Structure Links Loneliness to Social Perception. *Current Biology* [serial online]. October 23, 2012;22 (20):1975-1979. Available from: Academic Search Premier, Ipswich, MA. Accessed April 28, 2016.

Kaufman S. the Peacock paradox. (Cover story). *Psychology Today* [serial online]. July 2011;44(4):56-63. Available from: Academic Search Premier, Ipswich, MA. Accessed July 11, 2015.

Kealy, D., & Rasmussen B. (2012). Veiled and vulnerable. The other side of grandiose Narcissism. *Clinical Social Work Journal, 40* (3), 356-365.

Kernberg, O. (1976). *Object relations theory and clinical psychoanalysis.* New York, NY: Jason Aronson.

Keller, P. S., Blincoe, S., Gilbert, L. R., Dewall, C., Haak, E. A., & Widiger, T. (2014). Narcissism in romantic relationships: A dyadic perspective. *Journal of Social & Clinical Psychology*, *33*(1), 25-50. doi:10.1521/jscp.2014.33.1.25

Klassen, A. C., Creswell, J., Plano, V. L., Clark, K. C. S., & Meissner, H. I. (2012). "Best practices in mixed methods for quality of life research." *Quality of Life Research: An International Journal of Quality of Life Aspects of Treatment, Care & Rehabilitation 21*(3): 377-380. *PsycINFO*, EBSCO*host*.

Klein, R., (1995). *Closed Narcissistic Disorder: The Masterson Approach a Viewer's Manual.* New York: Newbridge Communications, Inc.

Kluger, J. (2015). Why Men Are More Narcissistic Than Women. *Time.Com*, N.PAG.

Kohut, H. (n.d). *Analysis of the Self: A Systematic Approach To The Psychoanalytic Treatment of Narcissistic Personality Disorders*, Available from: SocINDEX with Full Text, Ipswich, MA.

Kupfer D. M. &, Regier D. (eds.) (2002). *A research agenda for DSM-V*. Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Association,

Lansky, M. (1981). Treatment of the narcissistically vulnerable marriage. In M. Lanksy, M., (Ed.), *Family therapy and major psychopathology* (pp. 163-182). New York: Grune & Stratton.

Lee, S. Y., Gregg, A. P., & Park, S. H. (2013). The person in the purchase: Narcissistic consumers prefer products that positively distinguish them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *105*(2), 335-352. doi:10.1037/a0032703

Lerner, R. (2009). *The object of my affection is in my reflection: Coping with narcissists*. Deerfield Beach, FL: Health Communications, Inc.

Levin, J. D. (1993). *Slings and arrows narcissistic injury and its treatment.* Northvale, NJ: Jason Aronson, Inc.

Levine, A. B., & Faust, J. (2013). A psychodynamic approach to the diagnosis and treatment of closet narcissism. *Clinical Case Studies*, *12*(3), 199-212.

Levy, K. N. (2012). Subtypes, dimensions, levels, and mental States in narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *68*(8), 886-897.doi:10.1002/jclp.21893

Lewis-Beck, M. S., Bryman, A. & Liao, T. F. (Eds.). (2004). Trustworthiness. *In Encyclopedia of social science research methods* (p.1144-1145).

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic Inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lowen, A. (1985*). Narcissism denial of the true self*. New York, NY: Touchstone Simon & Schuster, Inc.

Lukowitsky, M. R., & Pincus, A. L. (2013). Interpersonal Perception of Pathological Narcissism: A Social Relations Analysis. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *95*(3), 261-273. doi:10.1080/00223891.2013.765881

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (2011). *Designing Qualitative Research (5th ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Masterson, J. F. (1993). *The emerging self: A developmental and object relations approach to the treatment of the closet narcissistic disorder of the sel*f. New York, NY: Brunner Mazel.

McBride, K. (2012) *Will I Ever Be Good Enough?: Healing the Daughters of Narcissistic Mothers*. Atria Books.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. J. (2012). *NEO Personality Inventory-3 FFI I R-3.*

McCormack, D. (2015). Review of Existential psychotherapy and counselling: Contributions to a pluralistic practice. *British Journal of Guidance & Counselling*, *43*(4), 510-513. doi:10.1080/03069885.2015.1059406

McMahon, S., (1994). *The Portable Therapist: Wise and Inspiring Answers to Questions People in Therapy Ask the Most.* New York: Random House.

Meacham, J. A. (1989). Autonomy, despair, and generativity in Erikson's theory. In P. S. Fry, P. S. Fry (Eds.), *Psychological perspectives of helplessness and control in the elderly* (pp. 63-98). Oxford, England: North-Holland.

Mehrabian, A. (1994). Evidence bearing on the affiliative tendency (MAFF) and sensitivity to rejection (MSR) scales. *Current Psychology*, *13*(2), 97.se.

Mellody, P. & Freundlich, L. S. (2003). *The intimacy factor: The ground rules for overcoming the obstacles to truth, respect, and lasting love.* New York, NY. Harper Collins.

Merikangas, K. R., & Spiker, D. G. (1982). Assortative mating among in-patients with primary affective disorder. *Psychological Medicine*, *12*(4), 753-764. doi:10.1017/ S0033291700

Miller, A. (1981). *The drama of being a child*. London: Virago.049059.

Miller, J. D., Lynam, D. R., & Jones, S. (2008). Externalizing behavior through the lens of the five-factor model: A focus on agreeableness and conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *90*(2), 158-164. doi:10.1080/00223890701845245

Miller, J. D., & Campbell, W. (2010). The case for using research on trait narcissism as a building block for understanding narcissistic personality disorder. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, And Treatment*, *1*(3), 180-191. doi:10.1037/a0018229

Miller, J. D., Widiger, T. A., & Campbell, W. K. (2014). Vulnerable narcissism: Commentary for the special series 'Narcissistic personality disorder—New perspectives on diagnosis and treatment'. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *5*(4), 450-451. doi:10.1037/per0000083

Miller, R. S. (2012), *Intimate Relationships 6th Edition*. New York: McGraw Hill.

Millon, T., & Davis, R. D. (1996). *Disorders of Personality*. New York, NY: John Wiley and Sons, Inc.

Millon, T., (2011). *Disorders of personality: Introducing DSM/ICD spectrum from normal to abnormal 3rd edition.* Hoboken, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, Publishers, Inc.

Montgomery, M. R. (2014). Love and hate: existentialism and psychoanalysis – a personal perspective. *Existential Analysis: Journal of the Society for Existential Analysis*, *25*(2), 244-256.

Murray, H. A., (2007). *Explorations in Personality Seventieth Edition*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press. (Original work published in 1938).

Nelson, M. L., & Quintana, S. M. (2005). Qualitative clinical research with children and adolescents. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34,* 344–356.

Newman, K. M. (2013). *In: On Freud's 'Inhibitions, symptoms and anxiety'* Arbiser, Samuel (Ed); Schneider, Jorge (Ed); Publisher: Karnac Books. pp. 133-141. [Chapter], Database: PsycINFO.

Oltmanns, T. F., & Turkheimer, E. (2009). Person perception nd personality pathology. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, *18*, 32– 36.

Paris, J. (1999). *Nature and Nurture in Psychiatry: A Predisposition-stress Model of Mental Disorders*. Washington D. C.: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.

Paris, J. (2013). *Psychotherapy in an Age of Narcissism.* New York: Pelgrave Macmilllan.

Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative Research "& Evaluation Methods: Integrating Theory and Practice 4th Edition*. CA: Thousand Oaks. Sage Publishing Company.

PDM Task Force. (2006). *Pyschodynamic Diagnostic Manual (PDM).* Silver Spring, MD: Alliance of Psychoanalytic Organizations.

Peck, M. S. (1978;1992). *The Road Less Traveled*. New York: Arrow Books.

Phillips, D. (2011). The individual and the social: A comparative study of quality of life: Social quality and human development approaches. *International Journal of Social Quality*, *1*(1), 71-89. doi:10.3167/IJSQ.2011010107

Piedmont, R. L. & Weinstein, H. P., (1993). A psychometric evaluation of the new NEO PI-R facet scales for agreeableness and conscientiousness. *Journal of Personality, 60* (2), 302-318. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Pincus, A. L. & Gurtman, M. B. (1995). The three facets of interpersonal dependency: Structural analyses of self-report dependency measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 69,* 199-222).

Pincus, A. L., Pimentel, C. A., Cain, N. M., Wright, A. C., Levy, K. N., & Ansell, E. B. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the pathological narcissism inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*(3), 365-379. doi:10.1037/a0016530

Quenqua, D. (2013). *Seeing narcissists everywhere*. New York, NY: New York Times Publishing Company. August 5, 2014.

Rabinovich, M., & Kacen, L. (2013). Qualitative coding methodology for interpersonal study. *Psychoanalytic Psychology*, *30*(2), 210-231. doi:10.1037/a0030897

Ramklint, M., Van Knorring, A., Von Knorring, L., & Ekselius, L. (2003). Child and adolescent psychiatric disorders predicting adult personality disorder: A follow-up study. *Nordic Journal of Psychiatry*, *57*(1), 23.

Rinsley, D. B. (1989). Notes on the developmental pathogenesis of narcissistic personality Disorder. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology* 1, 355-380.

Ronningstam, E. (2011). Narcissistic personality disorder in DSM-V--in support of retaining a significant diagnosis. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *25*(2), 248-259. doi:10.1521/pedi.2011.25.2.248

Roche, M. J., Pincus, A. L., Lukowitsky, M. R., Ménard, K. S., & Conroy, D. E. (2013). An integrative approach to the assessment of narcissism. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *95*(3), 237-248. doi:10.1080/00223891.2013.770400

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. doi:10.1027/1016-9040/a000100

Rossiter, S. (2005). Narcissism and codependency. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*, 6672.

Russell, G. A. (1985). Narcissism and the narcissistic personality disorder: A comparison of Kernberg and Kohut. *British Journal of Medical Psychology 58*, 137-149

Sandler, J., Person, E. S., & Fonagy, P. (2012). *Freud's "On narcissism: An introduction".* London: Karnac Books International Psychoanalytical Society.

Sbaraini, A., Carter, S. M., Evans, R. W., & Blinkhorn, A. (2011*). How to do a grounded theory study: A worked example of a study of dental practice*s. BMC Medical Research Methdology (11): 128.

Sieber, J. E. (1998). *Planning ethically responsible research*, In J. Creswell Research Design (4th ed.). 14, 92, 100, 103. Thousand Oaks, CA. Sage.

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1992). Socio-sexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, *60*(1), 31-51. doi:10.1111/1467-6494.ep9203303858

Solomon, M. F. (1989). *Narcissism and Intimacy: Love and Marriage in an Age of Confusion.* New York: W. W. Norton, Inc.

Spann, L., & Fischer, J. L., (1990). Identifying codependency. *The Counselor, 8*, 27.

Stinson, F. S., Dawson, D. A., Goldstein, R. B., Chou, S. P., Huang, B., Smith, S. M., & ... Grant, B. F. (2008). Prevalence, correlates, disability, and comorbidity of *DSM-IV* narcissistic personality disorder: results from the wave 2 national epidemiologic survey on alcohol and related conditions. *The Journal of Clinical Psychiatry*, *69*(7), 1033-1045.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1994). *Grounded theory and explanation of process and procedure* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sullivan, H. S. (1947). *Conceptions of Modern Psychiatry*. Washington D. C.: William Alanson White Institution.

Symington, N. (1993). *Narcissism: A New Theory*. London: Karnac Books.

Theissen, D. D., & Gregg, B. (1980). Human assortative mating and genetic equilibrium: An evolutionary perspective. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 1*, 111-140.

Trull, T. J., Verges, A.. Wood. P. K., Jahng, S., & Sher, K. J. (2012) The structure of Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders (4th edition, text revision) personality Disorder symptoms in a large national sample. *Personality Disorders: Theory Research and Treatment, 3* (4), 355-369.

Twenge, J. M. & Campbell, W. K. (2009). *The narcissism epidemic.* Living in the age of entitlement. New York, NY: The Free Press Simon and Schuster.

Twenge, J. M., & Foster, J. D. (2008). Mapping the scale of the narcissism epidemic: Increases in narcissism 2002-2007 within ethnic groups. *Journal of Research in Personality*, *42*(6), 1619-1622. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2008.06.014

Waska, R. T. (1997). Precursors to masochistic and dependent character development. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis 57*(3), 253–267. doi:10.1023*/* A:1024619931808

Widiger, T. A., Trull, T. J., Clarkin, J. F., Sanderson, C., & Costa, P. T. (2002). A description of *DSM–IV* personality disorders with the five-factor model of personality. In P. T. Costa & T. A. Widiger (Eds.), *Personality disorders and the five-factor model of personality (*2nd ed., pp. 89–99*)*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Willig, C. & Stainton-Rogers, W., Eds. (2008). *The Sage Handbook of Qualitative Research In Psychology.* London: SAGE Publications.

Wink, P. (1991). Two faces of narcissism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *61*(4), 590-597. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.61.4.590

Winnicott, D. W. (1990*). Home is where we start from: Essays by psychoanalysis by D. W. Winnicott*. New York, NY. W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Winston, J. S., Strange, B. A., O'Doherty, J., & Dolan, R. J. (2002). Automatic and intentional brain responses during evaluation of trustworthiness of faces. *Nature Neuroscience*, *5*(3), 277-283. doi:10.1038/nn816

Wolcott, H. F. (2009). *Writing up qualitative research (3rd ed.).* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yin, R. K. (2011). *Qualitative Research from Start to Finish.* New York: The Guilford Press.

Zimmerman, M., Rothschild, L., & Chelminski, I. (2005). The prevalence of DSM-IV Personality disorders in psychiatric outpatients. *The American Journal of Psychiatry, 16* (10).

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Standardized Instrument Criterion *NEO-FFI-R*

(Copyrighted)

APPENDIX B: Structured Clinical Interview Questions and Format

Semi-Structured Qualitative Interview

DPD Dependent Type Questionnaire

(formatted for notes)

Research Question: "What psychosocial and developmental traits and patterns in personality and behavior emerge from dependent individuals partnered with narcissistic personality types? "

Questions about significant other, (his or her traits), **to be utilized by research therapist in clinical setting** data collection. Interview prompts for research therapist.

Questions for dependents of narcissistic personality individuals in relationship.

Question 1:   Opening Interview Question: Give your best description of your significant other's personality. Personality defined as "patterns of behavior which seem consistent over time in similar situations"   (Tell me more)

Question 2:   Opening Interview Question 2: Describe the quality of the relationship with your significant other.

Question 3:   Tell me about your emotional experience with your partner

Question 4:   Describe to me the history of this relationship

Question 5:   Describe to me the present status of this relationship

Question 5b: Briefly describe your intimate relationship history

Question 6:   Tell me about your role in your family of origin

Question 7:   Tell me about your friendships outside of this relationship since you have
                been partnered in this relationship

Question 8:   Describe how you feel in the presence of your significant other when you are
                alone with him/her

Question 9:   Describe how you feel in when you are with your significant other in a large
                or small social setting

Question 10:   How does your partner make you feel (generally)?

Question 11:   What do you think or know about what other people outside of your family
                think of your partner?

Question 12:   How long have you been in this relationship?

Question 13:   Describe what a relationship means to you

Question 14:   What does your partner value?

Question 15:   What do you value the most?

Question 16:   What do you think is your partner's greatest motivation?

Question 17:   Describe the sexuality of this relationship

DPD SELF REPORT OF PARTNER DATA TO VALIDATE NARCISSITIC TYPE PARTNER IN RELATIONSHIP: Criterion Instrument

This form to be completed by DPD participants.

Respond to the following items and indicate by circling the number of which you believe appropriately describes your significant other partner.

SCALE:	1 never	2 rarely	3 often	4	very often	5 excessively

Q1   Sloppy with the truth

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q2   Loose cannon

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q3   Pathological liar

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q4   Avoiding of accountability

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q5   Can do smear campaigns

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q6   Projects him or herself on you if confronted

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q7   Presents a false self

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q8   Initially makes or made you feel like you are the chosen one

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q9   Lacks conscience or shows a weak conscience

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q10   Presents an inflated and grandiose impression of self

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q11   Seeks attention

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q12   Goes "ga ga" with or for attention

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q13   Practices self-impression management or spends energy thinking about what others think them.

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q14   Likes to see and be seen

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q15   Shows entitlement or sense of feeling entitled (i. e. "I deserve much or more")

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q16   Wants to be seen as unique

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q17   Is envious and uncomfortable around others who have more of anything he or she sees as
        valuable

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q18   Fails to know how to act in some public situations

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q19   Will often scapegoat a partner if confronted, challenged, or attacked

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q20   Can be critical of others in the workplace

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q21   Never or rarely discusses how good or capable someone else is

1 never   2 rarely   3 often   4 very often   5 excessively

Q22   Does "story stopping" or budding in with a one up story in a conversation

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q23   Fails to recognize the gifts and talents of others even their children

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q24   Does not ask questions about other people's lives—talking about their own

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q25   Presents "I am unique and special" statements

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q26   May display a loud or defensive demeanor in social settings

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q27   Projects an aura of "what do you think of me?"

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q28   Superficially charming

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q29   Convincingly charming

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q30   Machiavellianism (ends justify the means) (Lau & Marsee, 2012)

1 never   **2 rarely**   **3 often**   **4 very often**   **5 excessively**

Q31   Hypersensitive to criticism

1 never   *2 rarely*   *3 often*   *4 very often*   *5 excessively*

Letter of Invitation

Greetings and Attention:

You are cordially and formally invited to participate in a study exploring your experience and awareness of yourself and your awareness of relationships with others. The reason you have been invited is due to either your past verbally expressed interest in being in a study or your past involvement in treatment specific to counseling and consultation about your relationships. It is possible that you are receiving this invitation because a friend or family member referred you.

What and who is needed for this study: Individuals who have partnered with or have history of intense relationship with others for at least one year. Secondly, your partner has presented personality traits of or for ego-centeredness, co-dependency, emotional sabotage, emotional abandonment, or traumatic narcissistic relationship with you.

If you are interested, please contact Gregory Roberts MS LPC to set up a time, date, and location for screening and interviewing. I will work to secure an appropriate time that meets the demands of your schedule. The testing/screening and the interview process will require approximately two and one half hours of your time. There is no charge to you for this process and there is no compensation or payment for participation. Participation in this study is entirely voluntary and entirely confidential. This process has the potential to benefit you through increased self-awareness and increased partner awareness through participation. There are no known or expected harmful effects from your participation in this study.

If you are interested, please contact Gregory Roberts

~~Call xxx xxx xxxx~~

~~Call xxx xxx-xxxx~~

Thank you for your considerations!

Informed Consent

Title: Developmental Traits and Patterns Emerging form Dependent Nurturing Individuals in Narcissistic Relationships

Researchers:	*Administrators:*
Gregory D. Roberts, M. S., Doctoral Candidate	Ro Windwalker, Director
University of Arkansas	Research Compliance
Counselor Education Program	University of Arkansas
121 Graduate Education Building	109 MLKG, 1424 W.
Fayetteville, AR 72701	Martin Luther King, Jr.,
	Fayetteville, AR 72701

Emal: irb@uarkk.edu 575-2208

Description: The current study will explore dependent individual adults who meet a criterion for inclusion and a diagnostic impression of dependent personality disorder. Specifically, this study will interview and assessment individuals specific to history and involvement in relationship with a significant other. This study will examine individuals and data collected from them to determine self-awareness and perspectives of themselves in a hurtful and dysfunctional relationship. Participants will be asked to answer a questionnaire and process and take standardized personality assessment and participate in a semi-structured clinical interview with the researcher therapist.

Risks and Benefits: The benefits include additional self-awareness and a better understanding of individual and personal tendencies and relationships functions for participants in the study. The benefits may also include personal insights which contribute to the repetition of dysfunctional behavior. The risks of this participation is that individuals may encounter mild to moderate stress as they are facilitated to self-discovery of personal dysfunctional history and new or old awareness of dysfunction from past relationships. No other risk or harm is anticipated for participants in this study.

Voluntary Participation: Your participation in the research is completely voluntary. Your participation in this research does not require payment and no compensation is given to participants.

Confidentiality: All collected data will be kept confidential through security of a password protected data file in a password protected computer. All documents will be locked a secure file and secured room within a secured building. All audiotapes will be destroyed after they have been analyzed. All personal information and any identifying information will be kept confidential. To ensure privacy, code names will be assigned to the actual names of participants. Code words will be applied to references, characteristics, or descriptions that may compromise confidentiality. All personal information and any identifying information will be kept confidential to the extent allowed by law and University policy. To ensure privacy, code names will be assigned to the actual names of participants. Code words will be applied to references, characteristics, or descriptions that may compromise confidentiality.

Right to Withdraw: You are free to refuse to participate in the research and to withdraw from this study at any time. Participation in this study is not a form of treatment. It is a form of research only. The process is one of data collection and it not intended or formatted to be therapeutic.

Informed Consent: I have read and understand the informed consent. _____(Initial) I agree to participate in this study. _____(Initial) I agree to be audio or videotaped_____ (Initial)

Signature _____   Date _____

APPENDIX F: IRB Letter of Approval

UNIVERSITY OF
ARKANSAS

Office of Research Compliance
Institutional Review Board

November 11, 2015

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gregory Roberts
                             Kristin Higgins

FROM: Ro Windwalker
                             IRB Coordinator

RE: New Protocol Approval

IRB Protocol #:   15-10-174

Protocol Title: Development Traits and Patterns Emerging from Dependent
                             Nurturing Individuals in Narcissistic Relationships

Review Type: ☐ EXEMPT   ☒ EXPEDITED   ☐ FULL IRB

Approved Project Period: Start Date: 11/10/2015 Expiration Date: 10/19/2016

Your protocol has been approved by the IRB. Protocols are approved for a maximum period of
one year. If you wish to continue the project past the approved project period (see above), you
must submit a request, using the form *Continuing Review for IRB Approved Projects*, prior to the
expiration date. This form is available from the IRB Coordinator or on the Research Compliance
website (https://vpred.uark.edu/units/rscp/index.php). As a courtesy, you will be sent a reminder
two months in advance of that date. However, failure to receive a reminder does not negate
your obligation to make the request in sufficient time for review and approval. Federal
regulations prohibit retroactive approval of continuation. Failure to receive approval to continue
the project prior to the expiration date will result in Termination of the protocol approval. The
IRB Coordinator can give you guidance on submission times.

This protocol has been approved for 8 participants. If you wish to make *any* modifications
in the approved protocol, including enrolling more than this number, you must seek approval
prior to implementing those changes. All modifications should be requested in writing (email is
acceptable) and must provide sufficient detail to assess the impact of the change.

If you have questions or need any assistance from the IRB, please contact me at 109 MLKG
Building, 5-2208, or irb@uark.edu.

109 MLKG • 1 University of Arkansas • Fayetteville, AR 72701-1201 • (479) 575-2208 • Fax (479) 575-6527 • Email
irb@uark.edu
The University of Arkansas is an equal opportunity/affirmative action institution