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IDENTITY

Capacity to Invest

idinv1pr effectiveness 1 ______
idinv2pr Work – ambition / goals 2 ______
idinv3pr Work – satisfaction 3 ______
idinv4 Recreation – sustained interest 4 ______

Capacity to Invest ______

1 Invests in depth, over time and consistently, in work/studies, and leisure activities
2 Invests in depth, over time and consistently in work/studies OR leisure activities with some superficiality in other domain
3 Investments lack depth, inconsistent or superficial, in work/studies and leisure; may have more solid investment in one area OR does make apparent investments but largely to meet narcissistic needs
4 Minimal investment in work/studies or leisure activities
5 No investment in work/studies or leisure activities

Sense of Self – Coherence and Continuity

idcc1 Self description – superficiality vs. depth 5 ______ Sense of Self - Description
idcc2 Self description - ambivalence 6 ______
idcc3 Consistent sense of self in present 7 ______
idcc4 Tastes / Opinions 8 ______
idcc5 Narcissistic supplies 9 ______
idcc6 Sense of self in intimate relationships 10 ______ Positive quality:
idcc7 Self-esteem 11 ______

Negative quality:

Sense of self - Coherence and Continuity ______

1 Self experience is very well integrated – coherent, complex and continuous across time and situations
2 Self experience is well integrated – coherent but with mild instability across time OR mild, relatively stable, distortion in sense of self (for example undervaluing self)
3 Self experience is somewhat poorly integrated – somewhat incoherent, superficial OR discontinuous and contradictory, with significant distortion (e.g., holds both somewhat idealized and devalued self representations; or consistently grandiose or consistently devalued views of self)
4 Self experience is poorly integrated, unstable, incoherent, extremely superficial, or consistently grandiose or devalued
5 Self experience is unintegrated - highly incoherent, especially superficial, discontinuous and chaotically unstable with little to no sense of having a core "self"
IDENTITY (continued)

Representation of Others

idso1 Most significant person in present life, Superficality / Depth 12 _____ Most important person in present life

idso2 Most significant person in present life, Ambivalence 13 _____ Positive quality:

Idso3 Shifting image of others 14 _____ Negative quality:

Idso4 Others’ feelings about the self 15 _____

Representation of others _____

1 Representations of others are very well integrated – coherent and stable across time and situations, complex and realistic
2 Representations of others are well integrated – coherent but somewhat superficial and/or mild instability across time of sense of others, or others’ view of the self
3 Representations of others somewhat poorly integrated – somewhat incoherent or vague and superficial, discontinuous, somewhat unstable and contradictory, with significant distortion in sense of others, or others view of self; descriptions may be self-referential
4 Representations of others poorly integrated – incoherent, superficial, discontinuous, unstable, and contradictory and with gross distortion; descriptions are largely self-referential
5 Representations of others are unintegrated – highly incoherent, superficial (caricature-like), discontinuous and unstable (chaotic), contradictory and extremely distorted (extreme and caricature like); descriptions are self-referential

OVERALL RATING OF IDENTITY _____

1 Consolidated identity - sense of self and others both well integrated and invests in depth in work and recreation
2 Consolidated identity, but with some areas of slight deficit – sense of self and others* for the most part well integrated but with mild superficiality, instability or distortion AND/OR some difficulty in investment in work or recreation
3 Mild identity pathology- sense of self and/or others somewhat poorly integrated (evident superficiality or incoherence and instability, at times contradictory and distorted)* with clear impairment in capacity to invest in work/school and/or recreation or invests largely to meet narcissistic needs
4 Moderate identity pathology—sense of self and others poorly integrated (significant superficiality, incoherence, markedly unstable, contradictory and distorted)* with little capacity to invest in work/school or recreation.
5 Severe identity pathology –sense of self and others unintegrated (extremely superficial incoherent, chaotic, grossly contradictory and extremely distorted)* with no significant investments in work or recreation.

*Note: if marked discrepancy between instability or superficiality in sense of self vs sense of others; greater instability or superficiality in sense of others vs self is suggestive of narcissistic pathology
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OBJECT RELATIONS

Interpersonal relationships

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obfr1</td>
<td>Interp friendship – presence</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obfr2</td>
<td>Interp friendship - closeness</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obfr3</td>
<td>Interp friendship - temporal stability</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obfr4</td>
<td>Interp – rels w/ colleagues / coworkers</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpersonal relationships

1. Has at least one or more good friendships; duration of at least two years; consistent contact with closest friends; depth of involvement and investment; conflict in friendships is irregular and understandable / realistic

2. Has at least one or more good friendships; duration of at least two years; good relationship quality in at least one relationship similar to #1 above, but closest friendships either somewhat more conflicted, superficial or less invested than described in #1 above, as indicated by some variability in contact or disclosure; some conflict in friendships

3. Some seeking out of one or more friendships marked by superficiality as indicated by shorter duration, significantly diminished intimacy, or lack of reciprocal disclosure compared with #2; significant conflict in friendships

4. Has acquaintances, few if any friendships; relationships are impoverished, extremely superficial and marked by conflict

5. Absence of friends; description of friendships is grossly impoverished and entirely superficial; chaotic

Intimate Relationships and Sexuality

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>obint1</td>
<td>Intimacy – presence</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>obint2</td>
<td>Intimacy – intimacy / interdependency</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obint3</td>
<td>Intimacy – sexual activity</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obint4</td>
<td>Intimacy – sexual inhibition</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Obint5</td>
<td>Intimacy – combining sex and love</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Intimate and Sexual Relationships

1. Presence of satisfying, intimate relations involving interdependence; able to combine love and sexuality in relationships with significant duration (i.e., longer than 6 months);

2. Presence of intimate relationships, but somewhat flawed (e.g., inhibited or and stormy, or may be limited in terms of disclosure and intimacy); may report having loving attachments while being sexually inhibited with relationship partners; may report difficulty integrating sex and love;

3. Limited intimacy, may report trouble sustaining intimate relationships; relationships described are largely conflicted, relatively brief, and/or superficial; may report longer term relationships characterized by severe inhibitions of sexuality, infidelity and/or severe inhibitions of intimacy;

4. Superficial, non-invested, brief attempts at intimacy; severe inhibitions of sexuality and intimacy, and/or promiscuity;

5. Absence of intimate relations and no sexual activity
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Internal Investments in Others

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intinv1</th>
<th>Self centeredness</th>
<th>25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intinv2</td>
<td>Boredom</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intinv3</td>
<td>Dependency</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intinv4</td>
<td>Openness / disclosure</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intinv5</td>
<td>Economic view of relationships</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intinv6</td>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Internal Investment in Others

1. Easily sustains inter-dependence; does not view relationships in terms of need fulfillment; fully developed capacity for empathy and ability to appreciate the needs of the other independent of the needs of the self; easily sustains enduring interest in others over time;

2. Able to sustain inter-dependence: does not generally think of relationships in terms of need fulfillment, i.e., may think about what he/she is getting out of a relationship but this is not the central motivator for relationships; fully developed capacity for empathy with some mild difficulty viewing the needs of the other independent of the needs of the self in some domains (e.g., in sexual relations, competition within a friendship); able to sustain enduring interest in others over time;

3. Limited capacity to establish inter-dependence; either in caretaker or cared for role OR dominant, controlling or submissive role, pursuing or pursued, in important relationships (may oscillate between two positions) or detached; tends to view relationships in terms of need-fulfillment with limited capacity for empathy and limited capacity to appreciate the needs of the other independent of the needs of the self; limited capacity to sustain interest over time;

4. No capacity for inter-dependent relations; sees relationships predominantly in terms of need fulfillment; little capacity for empathy and no capacity to appreciate the needs of the other independent of the needs of the self; little to no capacity to sustain interest over time beyond need-fulfillment

5. No capacity for dependent relations; no capacity for empathy; sees relationships entirely in terms of need fulfillment with no interest in the needs of the other

Note: When we speak of “empathy” we refer to emotional empathy – caring about the emotional experience and needs of others rather than the capacity to accurately read the emotional experience of others

OVERALL RATING OF QUALITY OF OBJECT RELATIONS

1. Attachment are strong, durable, realistic, nuanced, satisfying and sustained over time; relationships not seen in terms of need fulfillment; fully developed capacity for inter-dependence and empathy; able to combine sexuality and intimacy;

2. Attachments are generally strong and durable, but may be somewhat less so than in #1 above or with some conflict; similar to # 1 across dimensions of need fulfillment; some degree of impairment or conflict in intimate / sexual relationships;

3. Attachments are present, but superficial, brittle, marked by conflict and lack of satisfaction; tends to view relationships in terms of need fulfillment; some capacity for concern for the other / empathy; limited intimacy in sexual relationships

4. Attachments are few and highly superficial; sees relationships in terms of need fulfillment; little capacity for empathy; may demonstrate efforts to seek intimacy, but few to no intimate relationships have developed

5. No true relationships (may have acquaintances); may be severely isolated, lacking even acquaintances; relations that do exist are based exclusively on need-fulfillment; no demonstrated capacity for empathy; no capacity for intimacy and/or no attempts at intimacy.
LOWER-LEVEL (PRIMITIVE) DEFENSES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pdef1</td>
<td>Paranoia</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdef2</td>
<td>Idealization / devaluation I</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdef3</td>
<td>Black and white thinking</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdef4</td>
<td>Externalization</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdef5</td>
<td>Idealization / devaluation II</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pdef6</td>
<td>Narcissistic fantasy</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Lower-level ("Primitive" Defenses) ____

1. No evidence that lower-level defenses are employed;
2. Some endorsement of lower-level defenses, with clearly elaborated examples in at least some cases; clearly NOT the predominant defensive style of the respondent and limited to no impairment in functioning due to use of lower level defenses; may be limited to idealization / devaluation;
3. Mixed pattern of endorsement of lower-level defenses; shifts in perception of self and others are present, some impairment in functioning due to use of lower level defenses;
4. Consistent endorsement of lower-level defenses, shifts in perception of self and others are relatively severe and pervasive; clear evidence of impairment in respondent's life due to use of lower level defenses;
5. Pervasive use of lower-level defenses across situations, severe, radical shifts in perception of self and others to a degree that grossly interferes with functioning, multiple examples

HIGHER-LEVEL DEFENSES (Coping vs. Rigidity)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Defense</th>
<th>Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>hld1</td>
<td>Higher-level defenses – anticipation / planning</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hld2</td>
<td>Higher-level defenses – suppression</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hld3</td>
<td>Higher-level defenses – flexibility</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hld4</td>
<td>Higher-level defenses – perfectionism</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Higher-level defenses (coping and rigidity) ____

1. Flexible, adaptive coping; stress resilience in most areas; consistent use of a variety of adaptive coping strategies;
2. Evidence of adaptive coping strategies; strategies are used, however, with less consistency or efficacy, or in some areas but not others; largely resilient to stress;
3. Inconsistent use of adaptive coping strategies, with subsequent vulnerability to stress; rigid coping;
4. Few examples in which adaptive coping strategies are used; rigid, maladaptive coping;
5. Pervasively inflexible, maladaptive coping, with severe consequences in terms of respondent’s functioning in response to stress
AGGRESSION

Self-directed Aggression

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>sag1</td>
<td>self neglect</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sag2</td>
<td>risky behavior</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sag3</td>
<td>self injury</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sag4</td>
<td>suicidality</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-directed Aggression _____

1. No, or extremely minor, self-directed aggression, e.g., minor cuticle biting;
2. Minor self-destructive behavior e.g., occasional participation in excess drinking, casual sex, as well as minor neglect of own health such as poor diet, poor dental hygiene, failure to complete a course of prescribed medication (e.g., antibiotic);
3. More significant self-destructive behavior e.g. placing oneself in potentially risky situations such as engaging in unprotected sex, casual “hook ups,” reckless driving, as well as pulling out hair or eyelashes, picking at cuts interfering with healing or leading to infection, failure to follow medical recommendations or poor medication compliance with potentially serious consequences;
4. Significant self-directed aggression, e.g. placing oneself in high-risk situations with frequency and participating in high-risk behavior such as engaging in unprotected sex with a stranger, “hooking up” in overtly dangerous settings, DWI, as well as non-lethal attacks on own body including cutting or burning, or severe neglect of health, placing oneself in high-risk situations with frequency and high risk behavior; suicidal gesture(s), non-lethal
5. Severe self-directed aggression in multiple areas, most or all with serious potential for self-harm; one or more suicide attempts.

Other-directed Aggression and Hostility

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>oag1</td>
<td>Temper</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oag2</td>
<td>Envy</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oag3</td>
<td>Attacks on Others</td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>oag4</td>
<td>Enjoyment of Suffering of Others</td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oag5</td>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other-directed Aggression and Hostility _____

1. Control, of anger and aggression;
2. Loss of control with outbursts of verbal aggression; followed by guilt and reparation of relationship; may involve good control but increasing hostility
3. Loss of control with verbal aggression; some pleasure in controlling and intimidating others, endorses envy; may involve good behavioral control but significant hostility
4. Vicious verbal attack; physical attacks on others; sadistic control of others, e.g., through intimidation, threats to self, prominent envy; significant to severe hostility
5. Physical attack intended to harm, enactment of revenge fantasies, pervasive envy and/or hostility
OVERALL RATING OF AGGRESSION _____

1  Control of aggression; may include episodes of anger and verbal aggression but these appear to be appropriate to the situation;

2  Relatively good of aggression; maladaptive expressions of aggression limited to minor self-destructive behaviors or neglect, controlling interpersonal style or occasional verbal outbursts; verbal aggression is more frequent and/or hostile than #1; may involve good behavioral control of aggression, but with increasing hostility

3  Moderately poor control of aggression; maladaptive expressions of aggression include significant self-destructive or higher-risk behaviors, self-neglect or non-compliance, AND/OR frequent tantrums or outbursts of hateful verbal aggression, chronic hostile control of others, and/or deriving sadistic pleasure from others’ discomfort or misfortune; may be characterized by good behavioral control of aggression, but with significant hostility

4  Poor control of aggression; if self self-directed, aggression is severe to lethal but somewhat less pervasive, chronic (i.e., more episodic) and/or life-threatening than in #5; if other-directed episodic but frequent hateful verbal abuse of others, frequent verbal and physical threats to hurt self or other, physical intimidation may involve physically threatening or assaulting the other, pleasure in hurting and/or hostile control of others; suicide gestures, non-lethal; significant to severe hostility

5  Little to no control of aggression; pervasive tendency towards chronic, severe, lethal expressions of aggression; frequent vicious, sadistic and hateful verbal abuse, physical attack on others and/or self intended to cause physical harm and pose a serious danger to the safety of others and/or self; sadistic pleasure in torturing and controlling others; suicide attempts, may include multiple attempts with intent to die
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MORAL VALUES

mv1 Moral action 50
mv2 Internalized moral values 51
mv3 Guilt 52
mv4 Deceit 53
mv5 Illegal activity 54
mv6 Exploitation 55

OVERALL RATING OF MORAL VALUES _____

1 Internal moral compass is autonomous, consistent and flexible; no evidence of amoral or immoral behavior; mature and appropriate sense of concern and responsibility for potentially hurtful or unethical behavior; no exploitation of others for personal gain; experiences guilt

2 Internal moral compass is autonomous and consistent, with rigidity and/or ambiguity involving questionable opportunities for personal gain; no evidence of frankly amoral or immoral behavior; some rigidity (either excessive or some laxity) in sense of concern and responsibility for potentially hurtful or unethical behavior; experiences guilt, but in such a way that ruminative self-recrimination is more prevalent than proactive efforts to make amends

3 Some sense of internal moral standards, which are excessively rigid and/or lax; may include some unethical/immoral behavior, e.g., plagiarism, cheating, lying, tax evasion, with no confrontation of victim; some sense of internal moral standards, which are excessively rigid or lax, but may demonstrate considerable difficulty using these standards to guide behaviors; can be exploitative, with difficulty taking responsibility for behaviors that are hurtful to others; lacks appropriate experience of guilt and concern and/or may experience “guilt” in the form of sadistic self-recrimination / lacks remorse.

4 Moral values and internal standards are weak, inconsistent and/or corrupt; May include presence of aggressive antisocial behavior such as robbery, forgery, blackmail; may involve, confrontation of victims, but absence of assault and if violent it is generally not premeditated; moral orientation is towards not getting caught; ego syntonic exploitation and freely pursues opportunities for personal gain at the expense of others; moral values and internal standards are weak, inconsistent and corrupt; lacks guilt / remorse.

5 No comprehension of the notion of moral values; Presence of violent, aggressive antisocial behavior (assault, battery, premeditation) OR, frank psychopathy (no comprehension or the notion of moral values) with or without violent behavior; no sense of guilt / remorse

OVERALL RATING OF NARCISSISM _____

1. Absence of narcissistic features; good social and occupational functioning;

2. Some narcissistic features; impairment in intimate relations, but with the ability to sustain friendships over time; may have some difficulties in occupational functioning, but able to sustain meaningful engagement in primary role;

3. Presence of significant narcissistic features, characterized by some of the following: sense of self dependent on admiration from others; chronic conflict and disruptions in intimate and social relationships which may involve exploitation; difficulty sustaining intimate and/or social relationships over time; significant occupational difficulties, e.g., difficulties advancing, a lack of responsibility, or chronic functioning below level of ability; difficulties with self-esteem regulation (severe fluctuations) volatility in self-esteem, perhaps related to failures to live up to self-standards, feelings of envy, and/or preoccupation with comparison with others

4. Severe narcissistic features characterized by more extreme versions of the above, with the addition of overt hostility and internally or externally-directed aggression, may involve some deterioration of moral functioning and values systems, i.e., some self- or other-directed aggression, overtly exploitive object relations, lack of concern over one’s aggression.

5. Severe narcissistic features as characterized above, but with the addition of some of the following features: paranoia, severe self and other-directed aggression, ruthless exploitation of others with total lack of concern over one’s aggression and the effects on others (lack of guilt / remorse); may include chronic suicidal tendencies or fantasies; deterioration of moral functioning.
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