Processes of Change in Psychotherapy for Narcissistic Personality Disorder

Pauline Maillard[1], Laurent Berthoud[1], Stéphane Kolly[2], Rainer Sachse[3] & Ueli Kramer[1,2,4]

[1] Institute of Psychotherapy, Lausanne University Hospital, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

[2] General Psychiatry Service, Lausanne University Hospital, University of Lausanne, Switzerland

[3] Institut für Psychologische Psychotherapie, University of Bochum, Germany

[4] University of Windsor, Canada

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Pauline Maillard, Institut Universitaire de Psychothérapie, Route de Cery, Bâtiment Les Cèdres, 1008 Prilly, Switzerland. E-mail: Pauline.Maillard@chuv.ch

Abstract

The present study aims at determining the role for outcome of potential processes of change in psychotherapy for narcissistic personality disorder (NPD). They were examined on three levels: the content, the process and the relationship. A total of $N = 161$ patients suffering with NPD were recruited in a naturalistic setting as part of the present study. They underwent a long-term clarification-oriented psychotherapy. Sessions 15, 20, and 25 were video- or audio-recorded and analyzed with an observer-rated instrument that measures the quality of the interaction processes from the patient's and therapist's perspective. Different self-report measures were used to assess therapy outcomes. In-session improvement was observed both in patient and therapist processes across sessions. Patient improvement in the three levels of processes was systematically related with outcome. Only partial relationships were found between therapist improvement and outcome. The present study represents the first systematic insight into core changes in NPD undergoing psychotherapy.

Keywords: narcissistic personality disorder, process-outcome study, mechanism of change, psychotherapy, Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy

Introduction

Pathological narcissism and Narcissistic Personality Disorder

Since the inclusion of Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) in axis II of the DSM-III (APA, 1980), psychiatry and psychotherapy have gained a growing interest in the conceptualization and treatment of narcissism (Kernberg, 1998; Ronningstam, 2005a; Sachse, 2019b; Young & Flanagan, 1998).

Patients presenting with pathological narcissism or NPD can exhibit arrogant and domineering attitudes, attention seeking, need for admiration, fluctuation in empathic ability, sense of specialness, or perfectionism and high standards (Caligor, Levy, & Yeomans, 2015; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2009; Ronningstam, 2010, 2011). This pattern of features is labeled under the term of *narcissistic grandiosity* (Cain, Pincus, & Ansell, 2008; Pincus & Roche, 2011). A somewhat different clinical presentation of narcissistic pathology is *narcissistic vulnerability*, marked by more insecure and hypersensitive traits, with a vulnerable and dysregulated self-esteem, intense feelings of shame and guilt, and social withdrawal (Cain et al., 2008; Caligor et al., 2015; Pincus & Roche, 2011). As Ronningstam (2009) notes, a narcissistic patient can present both themes of grandiosity and vulnerability, depending of the reaction, for example, to a threat to self-image that may either trigger the deployment of the grandiose part as a psychological defense, or may evoke insecurity and fragility in the self. Another difficulty related to narcissistic pathology the low capacity to identify and describe one's own feelings (Dimaggio et al., 2007; Dimaggio & Lysaker, 2015; Krystal, 1998; Taylor, Bagby, & Parker, 1997). The latter is connected with emotional dysregulation and strong variations in empathic functioning in patients with pathological narcissism, which is linked with interpersonal difficulties (Ronningstam, 2016).

In addition, pathological narcissism has been associated with other difficulties such as dysthymia and major depression, alcohol and substance use disorders, impulsivity and suicidality, interpersonal problems and risk factor for dropout (Links, Gould, & Ratnayake, 2003; Hilsenroth, Holdwick, Castlebury, & Blais, 1998; Ogrodniczuk, Piper, Joyce, Steinberg, & Duggal, 2009; Pincus & Lukowitsky, 2010; Ronningstam, 1996, 2005b).

The previous elements highlight the global complexity of narcissistic pathology, and the resulting difficulty in treating patients with pathological narcissism. Prevalence of NPD in the clinical population and in outpatient private practices is high (up to 20%, Ronningstam, 2009) and present general clinical issues in treatment such as the construction of a trusting therapeutic relationship or the management of in-session avoidance, as the focus on problematic and pivotal content may trigger fragile self-image within the patient (Caligor et al., 2015; Kramer, Berthoud, Keller, & Caspar, 2014; Ronningstam, 2012).

Taking into account these challenges, it is decisive to develop not only effective treatments for NPD and pathological narcissism, but also a better understanding of the mechanisms of change in psychotherapy they go through.

Mechanisms of change: Theoretical considerations and empirical evidence

Based on the clinical issues outlined, it is central to go beyond the mere demonstration of outcome in psychotherapy, but also to underlie processes at work in treatment (Clarkin, 2014; Kramer, 2017), similarly to the psychotherapy studies on borderline personality disorder (De Meulemeester, Vansteelandt, Luyten, & Lowyck, 2017; Fonagy & Bateman, 2006; Gratz, Bardeen, Levy, Dixon-Gordon, & Tull, 2015; Levy, Clarkin, Yeomans, Scott, Wasserman, & Kernberg, 2006). In NPD, these mechanisms are for now insufficiently understood.

Several categories of variables have been described and postulated as potential mechanisms of change in personality disorder (PD) treatments. Fernandez-Alvarez, Clarkin, del Carmen Salgueiro and Critchfield (2006) have reviewed the participant (patient and

therapist) factors influencing treatment outcome. Regarding patient factors, they mention the capacity to engage in treatment and the previous history of positive attachments. Regarding therapist characteristics, they suggest the ability to be open-minded, patient and flexible in the therapeutic approach practiced, to accept long-term and emotionally intense relationships, to tolerate his/her own intense uncomfortable feelings due to the therapeutic and relational processes, and to be trained and have experience with personality disorders. In terms of therapy relationship factors, Smith, Barrett, Benjamin and Barber (2006) mention among others good therapeutic alliance between the patient and his/her therapist, with an active therapist who sets clear limits, is flexible in his/her therapy protocol, focuses on deep issues, handles accurately alliance ruptures and avoids apparent expression of countertransference. Therapy outcome for patients presenting with PD is also enhanced with the elaboration of precise interpretations focused on deep relational issues for the patient (Smith et al., 2006). The authors also feature the need for further exploration of mechanisms of change in PD, especially concerning therapeutic relationship and its different aspects for the various PDs.

Kazdin (2009) emphasizes the importance of a better understanding of the key processes and mechanisms that lead to change in therapy, not only to obtain scientific explanations of how therapy works but also to directly enhance clinical change in patients. He presents and distinguishes between different useful concepts used in psychotherapy research to understand processes at work in treatments: moderators, mediators and mechanisms of change. While a mediator is “an intervening variable that may account (statistically) for the relationship between the independent and dependent variables” (Kazdin, 2009, p.429), a mechanism of change represents the theoretically anchored process that is responsible for the change. If the study of potential mediators is relevant, other principles are necessary to explore such as the gradient, which is the link between the amount of change in the studied variable and the amount of symptom change (Kazdin, 2009).

The empirical field focused on the mechanisms of change in NPD treatments is in its infancy. Two small exploratory studies have recently explored this question empirically. Kramer, Pascual-Leone, Rohde and Sachse (2016) carried out a process-outcome analysis with $N = 39$ PDSs (49% of the total sample presented with a NPD) undergoing Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy (COP). They found that emotional processing, i.e. the awareness, the regulation and integration of emotions (Greenberg & Pascual-Leone, 2006), predicted 18% of the change of the depression intensity in good outcome cases. The same research team explored the role of shame and self-compassion on depression and general symptoms in $N = 17$ patients presenting with NPD (Kramer et al., 2018). These results suggested that shame as a therapeutic target is useful in patients with NPD during the working phase of treatment. Indeed, the small decrease in shame that was found was linked with the decrease in the depression intensity across treatment.

Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy: Processes and clinical relevance for NPD

Because the present study focuses on Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy (COP), we will briefly review its theoretical and empirical underpinnings. COP is an integrative treatment based on person-centered psychotherapy, and is mostly practiced in private practices since years in German-speaking countries. It has been specifically developed for the treatment of NPD and other PD's (Sachse, 2019b). In COP, every patient's and therapist's manifestation can be understood in terms of difficulty or resource under three different angles: content, process and relationship. *Content* represents what patient and therapist express on the verbal level in the interaction. It involves patient openness and readiness to explore and clarify his/her internal determinants such as emotions, cognitions, assumptions and expectations related to the actual problem. For the therapist, it encompasses his/her ability to focus on the patient's central content and convey accurate understanding to the patient. *Process* concerns how the patient relates with his/her content and if this process is disturbed or not by avoidance. An example of

a process difficulty could be a patient who connects with relevant content but with a strong emotional arousal which is difficult to face, and thus changes his/her focus on a less or non-relevant topic easier to connect with. Here, the therapist's function is to address avoidance, notably through process guidance, which has shown to be helpful (Sachse, 1992; Sachse & Elliott, 2002). *Relationship* implies the relational aspects of the therapeutic relationship, as for examples the patient's manifestations of his/her interactional difficulties, the quality of the relationship and the understanding offered by the therapist, and how he/she deals with the patient's interactional difficulties. Therapeutic relationship with NPD patients is pivotal, and has to be the focus at least of the first part of therapy, compared to content and process levels (Ronningstam, 2012; Smith et al., 2006).

In the COP model, relationship manifestations may be understood on two different levels: the first is the authentic action system and represents the person's (resourceful) access to need satisfaction via authentic actions that are based on basic interactional motives such as appreciation and significance for others, and other motives. The second is the strategic action system which describes all the indirect (and more problematic) means (or interactional maneuvers) the patient uses for need satisfaction. Using these strategies cannot totally fulfill his/her needs and, on the contrary, can leave the patient dissatisfied with his/her interactions (Sachse, 2019b).

It is recommended that treatment is organized in several phases in the context of an iterative process. During the first ten to twenty sessions, the therapeutic focus is on the understanding and reducing the interactional maneuvers presented by the patient, notably by offering a specific therapeutic relationship complementary to (authentic basic) motives satisfaction (Caspar, 2007; Sachse, 2019). After the relational aspects have improved during the first months of treatment, the therapeutic focus can be moved onto the core working phase of COP, namely the clarification of internal determinants such as emotions, cognitions, motives and

expectations concerning interactional maneuvers, while containing and clarifying (i.e. rendering explicit) the patient's avoidance tendencies.

A few studies have examined the empirical validity of COP (Sachse, 1991, 1992; Sachse & Takens, 2004 ; Sachse, 2006). In a randomized controlled trial, Bamelis, Evers, Spinhoven and Arntz (2014) compared findings between Schema-Focused Therapy (SFT), COP and treatment as usual on different PDs, including mostly avoidant, dependent and obsessive-compulsive PD's (4.95 % of the study sample was composed by patients with NPD). The authors found that SFT and COP presented large recovery rates over three years of treatment with comparable drop-out rates. They also highlighted a superiority of SFT on different outcome measures compared with both other treatments. Nevertheless, methodological problems have to be noted, especially that no supervision was provided in COP was provided in the treatment named COP, and no adherence checks were undertaken. Therefore, it is unclear whether the treatment studied was COP or something else. Also, only a small portion of the sample presented with DSM-IV diagnosis of NPD. A small naturalistic trial (Sachse & Sachse, 2016; *N* = 29 NPD patients underlying COP) demonstrated an increase in self-efficacy and in action-orientedness, a decrease in interpersonal insecurity, expressed aggressiveness, and obsessional traits ($1.34<d<2.31$).

The present study

Considering the existing literature and current clinical considerations on NPD, we formulated the following hypotheses:

1. The quality of psychotherapeutic in-session processes assessed in patients and therapists improves across the working phase of therapy. We predicted that the quality of all three levels (content, process and relationship) increase (patient's perspective), and the quality of the therapist relationship, of the therapist understanding and the therapist process guidance improve during the working phase of COP.

2. Change in quality in patient and in therapist processes are assumed to be linked with symptom change presented by patients at the end of therapy.

Method

Participants

Patients. A total of $N = 161$ patients presenting with a Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) participated in the present study. All were in treatment at a center specialized in personality disorders in Germany. One hundred and two (63.4%) were male. Their mean age was 38.35 years old ($SD = 11.42$; range = 18-73). The majority of the patients were married (52.1%), 40.4% were not, 5.6% were divorced and 1.9% were separated. Concerning their education level, 26.1% had a high school diploma ("Abitur", 12 years of formal education), 26.1% a secondary school level ("Mittlere Reife", 10 years of formal education, comparable to British General Certificate of Secondary Education), 21.7% had a main school level ("Hauptschule", 10 years of formal education, it offers Lower Secondary Education, according to the International Standard Classification of Education) and 14.9% had a university degree (16-18 years of formal education). Finally, 44.7% were employees (white-collar workers), 33.5% were unemployed, 5.6% had an independent status and 4.4% were workers (blue-collar workers). Patients were selected from a larger naturalistic trial sample, and the inclusion criterion was NPD according to SCID-II (DSM-IV-TR; First & Gibbon, 2004). The quality of the SCID-II diagnoses was guaranteed by regular clinical supervision at the center which encompassed 100% of the cases included in the present study. All patients were German-speaking and provided written consent concerning the use of their data.

Therapists. The therapists (n = 44) were psychologists and psychiatrists in post-graduate training to become psychotherapists according to the German law. They were 33 women and 11 men, with a mean age of 26.4 years (range = 23-34). They all were supervised by the developers of COP.

Treatment

Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy (COP) is based on client-centered psychotherapy and is an integrative treatment relevant for patients with PD (Sachse et al., 2011). It places emphasis on the identification of interactional maneuvers presented by patients and their decrease, and on the clarification of core schemas (beliefs, emotions and motives). On the one hand, COP aims at increasing patient awareness of interactional maneuvers and the internal awareness of the patient's representations and motives linked to their interpersonal difficulties. On the other hand, COP aims at modifying the internal determinants of the problematic interactional behaviors and to constructing new representations and experiences. In the present study, treatments were supervised and lasted between 40 and 90 sessions, depending on treatment indication.

Instruments

The *Bearbeitungs-, Inhalts- Beziehungsskalen [Process-Content- Relationship Scale] (BIBS)* is an observer-rated instrument assessing the quality of the clarification processes in patients and therapists on the levels of content, process and relationship (Sachse, Schirm, & Kramer, 2015; Sachse, Schülken, Sachse, & Leisch, 2011). It contains 54 items included in 9 subscales. Each item is rated on a 7-point Likert scale: the better the process quality, the higher the score on the Likert scale. Three subscales concern the patient: 1. *Content* (7 items): how the patient works on central themes (emotions, schemes), 2. *Process* (7 items): does the patient avoid (or not) to focus on affective arousal, 3. *Relationship* (6 items): it assesses the functional and dysfunctional aspects the relationship offered by the patient (including the interactional games).

The six other subscales concern the therapist: 1. *Therapist relationship* (6 items): the quality of the relationship offered by the therapist, 2. *Therapist understanding* (6 items): how the therapist understands the situation brought by the patient and how empathic he is with

him/her, 3. *Therapist process guidance* (8 items): the quality of the therapist's directivity, 4. *Treatment of patient avoidance* (2 items): how the therapist deals with patient avoidance, 5. *Treatment of interactional games* (6 items): the quality of the therapist's interventions aiming at dealing with interactional games, and 6. *Treatment of schemes* (6 items): how the therapist works on patient schemes. The last 3 scales were not used in the present study. The *Treatment of patient avoidance* and the *Treatment of interactional games* are two clinically helpful subscales but in the present study, they suffer from selection bias because only patients with a specific score on process or relationship subscales were rated on these therapist subscales. Therefore, the power in these two subscales is insufficient. Concerning the *Treatment of schemes*, the present study focused on the working phase of COP, that is represented by clarification processes which omits schemes treatment. Therefore, a floor effect (absence of reliability in BIBS scores) is expected. Cronbach's alpha for the patient sub-scales (current sample) averaged at .83, and Cronbach's alpha for the therapist sub-scales (current sample) averaged at .70.

Concerning the rater reliability, a total of 6 pairs of raters scored 60 cases (37% of total sample). Video- or audio-recordings of 10 minutes from the mid-session section (between minute 10 and 20) of the 15th, 20th and 25th sessions were used for both patient and therapist ratings. The total mean of Intra-Class Coefficients was .74 (SD = .10, range = .54-.83).

The *Beck Depression Inventory* (*BDI*) is a self-report questionnaire that measures the severity of depressive symptoms (Beck, Steer, & Brown, 1996). Each of the 21 items is rated on a Likert-type scale ranging from 0 to 3. It gives a global score, which is the sum of all items. This questionnaire was translated and validated into German (Cronbach's alpha = .76-.95; Hautzinger, Bailer, Worall, & Keller, 1995). Mean BDI at intake for the sample was 14.86 (SD = 8.16; range = 0-41) which indicates a mild depression intensity, and 8.29 at

discharge (*SD* = 7.13, range = 0-35) which represents a minimal depression intensity. Pre-post effect was significant ($t_{1,157}$ = 13.31, *p* = .000, *d* = 0.85).

The *Brief Symptom Inventory* (*BSI*) is a self-report instrument that evaluates psychological distress and symptoms (Cronbach's alpha =.70-.89; Franke, 2000 for the German version). It is composed of 53 items and 9 dimensions (somatization, obsessive-compulsive, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation and psychoticism). Each item is rated on a 5-point Likert scale, from 0 = not at all, to 4 = extremely. We used the Global Severity Index (GSI), which is the mean for all rated items. Mean GSI at intake for the sample was 1.22 (*SD* = 0.57; range = 0.25-3.22) and 0.81 at discharge (*SD* = .60, range = 0.02-2.96). Pre-post effect was significant ($t_{1,151}$ = 14.03, *p* = .000, d = 0.70).

The *Inventory of Interpersonal Problems (IIP-D)* is a self-report questionnaire that assesses interpersonal functioning (Cronbach's alpha = .71-82; Horowitz, Strauss, & Kordy 1994). For the present study, the short form of the IIP-D was used, with 6 subscales containing a total of 12 items. Each item was rated on a 5-point Likert scale (from 0 = not at all to 4 = very much). Mean IIP at intake for the sample was 3.83 (*SD* = 1.33; range = .8-10) and 2.94 at discharge (*SD* = 1.31, range = 0-9). Pre-post effect was significant ($t_{1,157}$ = 9.96, *p* = .000, *d* = 0.67).

Procedure

Consistent with the sequential ordering of phases in COP, three sessions from the working phase were selected. The first study session was selected in the supposedly early working phase, i.e., session 15, then two subsequent sessions from the working phase were selected, i.e., session 20 and session 25 (thus three sessions per patient). Concerning the BDI, the GSI and the IIP-D, questionnaires were filled out by patients after the first and last session.

Statistical analyses

To test our first hypothesis, namely the improvement of processes in patients and therapists across sessions 15, 20 and 25, a three-level Hierarchical Linear Model (HLM; Bryk & Raudenbush, 1987) was conducted with processes on level 1 ($\gamma_{ij} = \beta_{oj} + \beta_{1j} * (\text{session}_{ij}) + r_{ij}$), patients on level 2 ($\beta_{oj} = \gamma_{00} + \mu_{oj}$; $\beta_{1j} = \gamma_{10} + \mu_{1j}$) and therapists on level 3 ($\gamma_{00} = \pi_{00} + r_{00}$; $\gamma_{10} = \pi_{10} + r_{10}$; $\gamma_{11} = \pi_{11} + r_{11}$).

To explore our second hypothesis i.e. the link between change in processes in patients and therapists across sessions 15, 20, and 25, and symptom change between pre-post therapy, symptom change was first computed in delta (score at pre – score at post). Then, a second three-level HLM was used, with COP processes on level 1 ($\gamma_{ti} = \pi_{0i} + \pi_{1i} * (\text{session}_{ti}) + e_{ti}$), pre-post symptom change on level 2 ($\pi_{0i} = \beta_{00} + r_{0i}$; $\pi_{1i} = \beta_{10} + \beta_{11} * (\text{pre-post symptom change}) + r_{1i}$. and therapists on level 3 (see above). Results with robust standard errors were chosen to be presented.

Results

Preliminary analyses

Preliminary analyses showed that the average means of all subscales of the BIBS obtained by patients and therapists at session 15 and are generally within one standard deviation from the means found in the validation study for patients presenting with a NPD (Sachse, Schirm, & Kramer, 2015). This is true for all subscales except for patients *Content* which is, in the present study, particularly low. For patients of the present study: mean *Content* = 1.44, *SD* = 1.31, range = 0-4 (for patients of the validation study: mean *Content* =2.90, Sachse et al., 2015); mean *Process* = 1.16, *SD* = 1.03, observed range = 0-3.67 (1.98); mean *Functional Relationship* = 2.09, *SD* = 1.53, range = 0-6.33 (3.33); mean *Dysfunctional Relationship* = 1.63, *SD* = 1.26, range = 0-5 (2.61). For therapists: mean *Relationship* = 4.54, *SD* = 1.30, range = 1.5-6 (4.20); mean *Understanding* = 4.49, *SD* = 1.34, range = 1-6 (4.07);

mean *Process guidance* = 3.43, *SD* = 1.19, range = 0-5.63 (3.26). Whereas patients' quality of *Content* is below the one found in Sachse et al. (2015), the treatment delivered by the therapists in the present study corresponds in an adherent way to the principles of COP.

Change in processes

In order to test our first hypothesis, the improvement of processes in patients with NPD across treatment (sessions 15 to 25), HLM analyses showed significant improvement for all patient process variables namely quality of *Content* (Coefficient = 3.23; *SE* = 0.28; *t*-ratio = 11.46; p <.001), quality of *Process* (Coefficient = 3.98; *SE* = 0.28; *t*-ratio = 14.13; p <.001), *Functional relationship aspects* (Coefficient = 2.25; *SE* = 0.13; *t*-ratio = 16.58; p <.001) and *Dysfunctional relationship aspects* (Coefficient = 2.37; *SE* = 0.14; *t*-ratio = 16.65; p <.001). Concerning the therapist, the improvement was significant for all variables, namely *Therapist relationship* (Coefficient = 0.69; *SE* = 0.07; *t*-ratio = 9.47; p <.001), *Therapist understanding* (Coefficient = 0.72; *SE* = 0.14; *t*-ratio = 5.08; p <.001), and *Therapist process guidance* (Coefficient = 1.61; *SE* = 0.21; *t*-ratio = 7.45; p <.001). All processes improved in the predicted direction.

Links between processes of change and outcome in treatments for NPD

In order to test our second hypothesis, the links between change in processes and symptom change presented by patients with NPD after treatment, HLM models were applied for each symptom change (pre- to post- change) and each process variables.

Concerning patient improvement and outcome change, significant correlations were found between all patient processes and BSI, IIP, and BDI, except for *Content* and BDI, and *Process* and BDI, as Table 1 shows.

A different pattern was discovered concerning therapist improvement and outcome change. Two significant correlations were found between the improvement of therapist processes and symptom change presented by patients, as Table 2 shows. *Therapist*

relationship change was linked with BDI change, and *Therapist process guidance* change was linked with BSI change. Non-significant relationships were found between change in *Therapist relationship* and BSI and IIP changes; between change in *Therapist understanding* and BDI and IIP changes; and between change in *Therapist process guidance* and BDI and IIP changes.

For exploratory purposes and to understand which process variables was associated with the decrease of depression, we made simple correlations between *Therapist Relationship* at session 15 and change in BDI, between *Therapist understanding* at session 15 and change in BDI, and between *Therapist process guidance* at session 15 and change in BDI. A small significant correlation ($r = .16$, $p = .04$) was found between *Therapist understanding* and change in BDI. No other process variable was related to BDI change.

Links between therapist interventions and patient processes

For exploratory purposes, we tested predictor models between patient and therapist processes.

First, a linear regression model was used with therapist processes (*Relationship*, *Understanding* and *Process guidance* were entered into the model, in a single block) at session 15 as independent variables and patient processes (*Content*, *Process*, *Functional* and *Dysfunctional Relationship aspects* were entered into the model) at session 20 as dependent variables. All therapist processes together at session 15 predicted patient *Process* at session 20: $F(1, 160) = 4.27$, $p = .003$). All therapist processes together at session 15 predicted patient *Functional Relationship aspects* at session 20: $F(1, 160) = 3.66$, $p = .007$. And all therapist processes together at session 15 predicted patient *Dysfunctional Relationship aspects* at session 20: $F(1,159) = 5.71$, $p = .000$. This model was non-significant for patient *Content* at session 20: $F(1,160) = 2.25$, p =.06. A second linear regression model was used with therapist processes at session 20 as independent variables and patient processes at session 25 as

dependent variables. All therapist processes together at session 20 predicted patient *Content* at session 25: $F(1,160) = 12.78$, $p = .000$, patient *Process* at session 25: $F(1, 160) = 17.21$, $p =.000$), patient *Functional Relationship* at session 25: $F(1, 160) = 13.39$, $p = .000$, and patient *Dysfunctional Relationship* at session 25: $F(1,160) = 22.25$, $p =.000$.

Second, a linear regression model was used with patient processes at session 15 (*Content*, *Process*, *Functional Relationship aspects* and *Dysfunctional Relationship aspects* were entered into the model in a single block) as independent variables and therapist variables at session 20 (*Relationship*, *Understanding* and *Process guidance* were entered into the model) as dependent variables. All patient processes together at session 15 predicted therapist *Relationship* at session 20: $F(1,160) = 3.49$, $p = .009$. All patient processes together at session 15 predicted therapist *Understanding* at session 20: $F(1,160) = 2.91$, $p = .023$. And all patient processes together at session 15 predicted therapist *Process Guidance* at session 20: $F(1,160) = 4.53$, $p = .002$. A second linear regression model was used with patient processes at session 20 as independent variables and therapist processes at session 25 as dependent variables. Here again, all patient processes together at session 20 predicted therapist *Relationship* at session 25: $F(1,159) = 6.33$, $p = .000$, therapist *Understanding* at session 25: $F(1,159) = 5.29$, $p = .001$, and therapist *Process Guidance* at session 25: $F(1,159) = 5.60$, $p = .000$.

Discussion

The present study examined the role for outcome of potential change processes on three different levels (content, process, and relationship) in the working phase of Clarification-Oriented Psychotherapy (COP), in a large sample of patients presenting with carefully DSM-IV diagnosed Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD). Although the study was realized in a naturalistic context, we can nonetheless say that the treatments delivered were adherent to the COP model. First, treatments were supervised by COP developers,

which allow us to hypothesize a good treatment adherence. Second, the high average quality of patients processes found supported this hypothesis (see the validation study; Sachse, Schirm, & Kramer, 2015).

Three key points were highlighted. First, in accordance with our hypothesis, significant improvement of all therapist and patient processes were observed through sessions 15, 20 and 25 of treatment. Second, the improvements presented by patients in terms of content, process and therapy-relational aspects were significantly linked with every outcome, with two notable exceptions (depressive symptoms and content, depressive symptoms and process). Third, whereas the therapists improved their abilities in terms of relationship, understanding and process-guidance, this improvement was only partially linked with outcome.

Improvement in quality of patient's and therapist's processes

Our results showed that the quality of in-session processes in patients (*Content*, *Process* and *Relationship*) and therapists (*Relationship*, *Understanding* and *Process guidance*) increased significantly between session 15 and 25, over the course of working phase of psychotherapy. In parallel, we found a pre-post-therapy reduction of symptoms reported by patients presenting with NPD. More precisely, we found a significant decrease in terms of intensity of depression, in psychological distress and symptoms, and in interpersonal problems during the entire therapy, which demonstrates the effectiveness of COP in a large sample of patients with NPD. Even if they presented with a somewhat lower quality of processes at session 15 compared to Sachse et al. (2015) sample, patients of the present sample had a positive evolution both in terms of centrality of content, reduction of avoidance, quality of relationship, and in terms of outcome.

Links between quality of change processes and outcome

As Kazdin (2009) states, one of the main identifiers of a mechanism of change in psychotherapy is the relationship between the amount of change in the processes and the amount of change in symptoms. We tested this criterion with hypothesis 2 in the present study.

We found that patient improvement in terms of centrality of content, quality of the relationship offered and avoidance reduction, seems to be a pattern responsible for change, notably regarding the decrease in general and interpersonal symptoms presented by patients. In other words, the more the patients presenting with NPD progress over time in COP, the more the quality of content, relationship and process has a positive impact on their relational problems. This is a key finding, as patients presenting with NPD suffer from interpersonal difficulties, which can occur in the therapeutic relationship (Ogrodniczuk & Kealy, 2013; Ronningstam, 2012). Interestingly, if the therapist's contribution to the relational mechanisms of change in PD treatments has been described and explored, little is known and discussed about the patient's contribution (Kramer et al., 2016, 2018; Smith et al., 2006). Our study offers elements for a better understanding of the contribution of patients with a NPD to the relational mechanisms of change in therapy. We can mention for example the trust the patient can show towards the therapist and the possibility for him/her to be confronted (functional relationship), or the control and the interactional manoeuvres he/she uses in the relationship (dysfunctional relationship).

If the improvement in therapist's variables was partially linked with symptom reduction presented by patients, we highlighted that it can be responsible for change concerning two different issues. First, the qualitative improvement in the relationship offered by therapist is linked with the depression reduction presented by patient. This means that by offering acceptance, respect, warmth, authenticity and congruence, the therapist may have an impact on the decrease in intensity of depression presented by patients with NPD. In addition,

the improvement of therapist process guidance was related to general symptom change. It should be mentioned that process guidance has been linked with outcome in previous studies on humanistic psychotherapies (Sachse 1992, 1993; Sachse & Elliott, 2002). This finding suggests that by internalizing the patient's perspective, by guiding him/her in a deeper understanding of his/her internal determinants such as emotions and representations related with the interpersonal problems, the therapist can have a direct impact on the general symptoms presented by patients with NPD. Clinically, our results suggest that therapists may intervene on depressive and general symptoms presented by patients with NPD by working on the quality of the relationship they can offer to the patient and by learning to use a process-directive position, as opposed to a more non-directive approach, or a content-directive approach which would advocate the explicit guidance on specific contents from the outset of treatment. Process-guidance means leaving the choice of the content to the patient, which can be highly important in the case of NPD, and at the same time guiding the content in a direct way, by focusing step-by-step on core and deep internal determinants.

While change in therapist understanding was not related to symptom change, we nonetheless found that therapist understanding at session 15 was correlated with outcome change. This result may underline that the case formulation must be of good quality and direct therapist interventions but for this, it is not necessary that the quality of the understanding increases during treatment.

Of note, our conclusions are supported by the results of the exploratory regressions analyses we made. They suggest that therapist interventions at session 15 predict patient processes at session 20 (except for *Content)* and that therapist's interventions at session 20 predict patient processes at session 25. Indeed, COP interventions realized by therapist seem to foster the progression of process and relationship levels between sessions 15 and 20. On a clinical level, this means that therapist impact on patient presenting with a NPD can be

maximize with interventions focused on process (Dimaggio, Montano, Popolo, & Salvatore, 2015; Ogrodniczuk, 2013; Krystal 1998; Sachse, 2019a; Taylor, Bagby, & Parker, 1997) and relationship (Colli, Tanzili, Dimaggio, & Lingiardi, 2014; Kernberg, 1998; Kramer et al., 2014; Ronningstam, 2012, Sachse, 2019b) levels. By prioritizing the work on process and relationship, therapist could also have an impact on the content level, in a second step. Interestingly, reversed linear regression analyses also suggest that patient processes at session 15 (and 20) predict therapist interventions at session 20 (and 25). This result can be interpreted as a mutual influence between therapist and patient, also called responsiveness (Stiles, Honos-Webb, Surko, 1998; Kramer & Stiles, 2015). This concept denotes that behaviors are influenced by context, which includes interaction partners. In the present study, not only therapist processes influenced patient processes (except for *Content*), but also patient processes influenced therapist processes, in the context of a treatment for NPD.

Limitations and future perspectives

A number of limitations have to be acknowledged for the present study. First of all, our study did not include a control group, which makes it difficult to distinguish between general and therapy-specific processes. Second, only self-report questionnaires were used and no disorder-specific questionnaire was included in outcomes, as the Narcissistic Personality Inventory (NPI; Raskin & Hall, 1979) or the Pathological Narcissism Inventory (PNI; Pincus, Ansell, Pimentel, Cain, Wright, & Levy, 2009), which will be relevant for future studies. Along with the previous limit, a further study could include the demonstration of changes in SCID-II NPD criteria or in other specific problems related to pathological narcissism at follow-up. Fourth, the impact of co-morbidities was not included in the analyses conducted.

In sum, the present study contributes to the understanding of potential mechanisms of change in therapy for patients presenting with NPD. We first found an improvement of the quality of processes in terms of content, relationship and process during the working phase of

COP. While change in patient processes was strongly linked with every outcome change presented by patients, including interpersonal symptoms, improvement in relationship and process guidance from the therapist's perspective had an impact on depression and general symptom remissions. If the present study represents a first step in the exploration of mechanisms of change in NPD, future research should focus on the other criteria proposed by Kazdin (2009) for the identification of change mechanisms in psychotherapy, such as specificity (the observed change is sufficiently different from other constructs) or experimental manipulation (the direct manipulation of the process has an impact on outcome). Moreover, it would be relevant to focus on different therapeutic frames, such as psychodynamic treatments for example, in order to develop a more precise understanding of mechanisms of change at work in different psychotherapy approaches for NPD.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders*. (3rd ed.). Washington DC: Author.

Bamelis, L.L., Evers, S.M., Spinhoven, P., & Arntz, A. (2014). Results of a multicenter randomized controlled trial of the clinical effectiveness of schema therapy for personality

disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *171*(3), 305-322. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.12040518.

Beck, A.T., Steer, R.A., & Brown, G.K. (1996). *Beck Depression Inventory manual* (2nd ed.). San Antonio. TX: Psychological Corporation.

Bryk, A.S., & Raudenbush, S.W. (1987). Application of hierarchical linear models to assessing change. *Psychological Bulletin*, *101*, 147-158. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.101.1.147

Cain, N.M., Pincus, A.L., & Ansell, E.B. (2008). Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of pathological narcissism across theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric diagnosis. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *28*, 638-656. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2007.09.006

Caligor, E., Levy, K.N., & Yeomans, F.E. (2015). Narcissistic personality disorder: Diagnostic and clinical challenges. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *172*(5), 415-422. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.14060723

Caspar, F. (2007). Plan analysis. *Handbook of psychotherapy case formulation*, *2*, 251-289.

Colli, A., Tanzilli, A., Dimaggio, G., & Lingiardi, V. (2014). Patient personality and therapist response: An empirical investigation. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *171*(1), 102-108. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2013.13020224

Clarkin, J.F. (2014). Raising the bar in the empirical investigation of psychotherapy. *Journal of American Psychiatry*, *171*(10), 1027–1030. doi:10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.14060792

De Meulemeester, C., Vansteelandt, K., Luyten, P., & Lowyck, B. (2018). Mentalizing as a mechanism of change in the treatment of patients with borderline personality disorder: A parallel process growth modeling approach. *Personality Disorders: Theory, Research, and Treatment*, *9*(1), 22. doi:10.1037/per0000256

Dimaggio, G., & Lysaker, P.H. (2015). Metacognition and mentalizing in the psychotherapy of patients with psychosis and personality disorders. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *71*(2), 117-124. doi: 10.1002/jclp.22147

Dimaggio, G., Procacci, M., Nicolò, G., Popolo, R., Semerari, A., Carcione, A., & Lysaker, P.H. (2007). Poor metacognition in narcissistic and avoidant personality disorders: Four psychotherapy patients analysed using the Metacognition Assessment Scale. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *14*(5), 386-401. doi: 10.1002/cpp.541

Fernandez-Alvarez, H., Clarkin, J.F., Salgueiro, M.D.C., & Critchfield, K.L. (2006). Participant factors in treating personality disorders. In L.G. Castonguay, & L.E. Beutler (Eds.), *Principles of therapeutic change that work* (pp.203-218). New-York: Oxford University Press.

First, M.B., & Gibbon, M. (2004). *The Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV*. New York: Biometrics Research Dpt.

Fonagy, P., & Bateman, A.W. (2006). Mechanisms of change in mentalization-based treatment of BPD. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *62*(4), 411-430. doi:10.1002/jclp.20241

Franke, G. (2000). *Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI) von L.R. Derogatis (Kurzform der SCL-90)*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Gratz, K.L., Bardeen, J R., Levy, R., Dixon-Gordon, K.L., & Tull, M.T. (2015). Mechanisms of change in an emotion regulation group therapy for deliberate self-harm among women with borderline personality disorder. *Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *65*, 29-35. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2014.12.005

Greenberg, L.S., & Pascual-Leone, A. (2006). Emotion in psychotherapy: A practice-friendly research review. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *62*(5), 611-630. doi:10.1002/jclp.20252

Hautzinger, M., Bailer, M. Worall, H., & Keller, F. (1995). *Beck-Depressions-Inventar (BDI), Testhandbuch*. Göttingen: Verlag Hans Huber.

Hilsenroth, M.J., Holdwick Jr, D.J., Castlebury, F.D., & Blais, M.A. (1998). The effects of DSM-IV cluster B personality disorder symptoms on the termination and continuation of psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, Practice, Training*, *35*(2), 163. doi:10.1037/h0087845

Horowitz, L.M., Strauss, B., & Kordy, H. (1994). *Inventar zur Erfassung Interpersonaler Probleme*. Deutsche Version Manual. Weinheim: BeltzTest.

Kazdin, A.E. (2009). Understanding how and why psychotherapy leads to change. *Psychotherapy Research*, *19*(4-5), 418-428. doi:10.1080/10503300802448899

Kernberg, O.F. (1998). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical background and diagnostic classification. In E. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical and empirical implications* (pp. 29-51). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Kramer, U. (2017). Personality, personality disorders, and the process of change. *Psychotherapy Research*, 1-13. doi:10.1080/10503307.2017.1377358

Kramer, U., Berthoud, L., Keller, S., & Caspar, F. (2014). Motive-oriented psychotherapeutic relationship facing a patient presenting with narcissistic personality disorder: A case study. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy*, *44*(2), 71-82. doi:10.1007/s10879-013-9251-y

Kramer, U., Pascual-Leone, A., Rohde, K.B., & Sachse, R. (2016). Emotional processing, interaction process, and outcome in clarification-oriented psychotherapy for personality disorders: A process-outcome analysis. *Journal of Personality Disorders*, *30*(3), 373-394. doi:10.1521/pedi_2015_29_204

Kramer, U., Pascual-Leone, A., Rohde, K.B., & Sachse, R. (2018). The role of shame and self-compassion in psychotherapy for narcissistic personality disorder: An exploratory study. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy*, *25*(2), 272-282. doi.10.1002/cpp.2160

Kramer, U., & Stiles, W.B. (2015). The responsiveness problem in psychotherapy: A review of proposed solutions. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, *22*(3), 277-295. doi:10.1111/cpsp.12107

Krystal, H. (1998). Affect regulation and narcissism: Trauma, alexithymia and psychosomatic illness in narcissistic patients. In E. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical and empirical implications* (pp. 299-326). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Levy, K. N., Clarkin, J.F., Yeomans, F.E., Scott, L.N., Wasserman, R.H., & Kernberg, O.F. (2006). The mechanisms of change in the treatment of borderline personality disorder with transference focused psychotherapy. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *62*(4), 481-501. doi:10.1002/jclp.20239

Links, P.S., Gould, B., & Ratnayake, R. (2003). Assessing suicidal youth with antisocial, borderline, or narcissistic personality disorder. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, *48*(5), 301-310. doi: 10.1177/070674370304800505

Ogrodniczuk, J.S. (2013).

Ogrodniczuk, J.S., & Kealy, D. (2013). Interpersonal problems of narcissistic patients. In J.S. Ogrodniczuk (Ed.), *Understanding and treating pathological narcissism* (pp.113-127). Washington: APA.

Ogrodniczuk, J.S., Piper, W.E., Joyce, A.S., Steinberg, P.I., & Duggal, S. (2009). Interpersonal problems associated with narcissism among psychiatric outpatients. *Journal of Psychiatric Research*, *43*(9), 837-842. doi:10.12740/APP/90328

Pincus, A.L., Ansell, E.B., Pimentel, C.A., Cain, N.M., Wright, A.G., & Levy, K.N. (2009). Initial construction and validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, *21*(3), 365. doi: 10.1037/a0016530

Pincus, A.L., & Lukowitsky, M.R. (2010). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder. *The Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, *6*, 421-446. doi:10.1146/annurev.clinpsy.121208.131215

Pincus, A.L., & Roche, M.J. (2011). Narcissistic grandiosity and narcissistic vulnerability. In W.K. Campbell, & J.D. Miller (Eds.), *The handbook of narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Theoretical approaches, empirical findings, and treatments* (pp.31-40). Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Raskin, R.N., & Hall, C.S. (1979). A narcissistic personality inventory. *Psychological Reports, 45*(2), 590. doi:10.2466/pr0.1979.45.2.590

Ronningstam, E. (1996). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder in axis I disorders. *Harvard Review of Psychiatry, 3*(6), 326-340. doi:10.3109/10673229609017201

Ronningstam, E. (2005a). *Identifying and understanding the narcissistic personality*. New-York: Oxford University Press.

Ronningstam, E. (2005b). Narcissistic disorder. In M. Maj, H.S. Akiskal, J.E. Mezzich, & A. Okasha (Eds.), *Personality disorders* (pp. 277-327). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Ronningstam, E. (2009). Narcissistic personality disorder: Facing DSM-V. *Psychiatric Annals*, *39*(3), 111-121. doi: 10.3928/00485713-20090301-09

Ronningstam, E. (2010). Narcissistic personality disorder: A current review. *Current Psychiatry Reports*, *12*(1), 68-75. doi:10.1007/s11920-009-0084-z

Ronningstam, E. (2011). Narcissistic personality disorder: A clinical perspective. *Journal of Psychiatric Practice*, *17*(2), 89-99. doi: 10.1097/01.pra.0000396060.67150.40

Ronningstam, E. (2012). Alliance building and narcissistic personality disorder. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, *68*(8), 943-953. doi:10.1002/jclp.21898

Ronningstam, E. (2016). Pathological narcissism and narcissistic personality disorder: Recent research and clinical implications. *Current Behavioral Neuroscience Reports*, *3*(1), 34-42.doi: 10.1007/s40473-016-0060-y

Sachse, R. (1992). Differential effects of processing proposals and content references on the explication process of clients with different starting conditions. *Psychotherapy Research*, *4*, 235-251. doi:10.1080/10503309212331333004

Sachse, R. (1993). The effects of intervention phrasing of therapist-client communication. *Psychotherapy Research*, *3*, 260-277. doi :10.1080/10503309312331333839

Sachse, R. (2019a). Case conceptualization in clarification-oriented psychotherapy. In U. Kramer (Ed.), *Case formulation for personality disorders: Tailoring psychotherapy to the individual client* (pp.113-135). London: Elsevier.

Sachse, R. (2019b). *Personality Disorders: A clarification-oriented psychotherapy treatment model*. Boston: Hogrefe Publishing.

Sachse, R., & Elliott, R. (2002). Process-outcome research on humanistic therapy variables. In D. Cain, & J. Seeman (Eds.), *Humanistic Psychotherapies. Handbook of Research and Practice*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sachse, R., & Sachse, M. (2016). Effekte Klärungsorientierter Psychotherapie bei Klienten mit narzissistischer Persönlichkeitsstörung. In R. Sachse, & M. Sachse (Eds.). *Forschung in der Klärungsorientierten Psychotherapie* [*Research in clarification-oriented psychotherapy*] (pp.76-80). Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.

Sachse, R., Schirm, S., & Kramer, U. (2015). *Klärungsorientierte Psychotherapie systematisch dokumentieren: die Skalen zur Erfassung von Bearbeitung, Inhalt und Beziehung im Therapieprozess (BIBS)*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Sachse, R., Schülken, T., Leisch, M., & Sachse, M. (2011). Effektivität Klärungsorientierter Psychotherapie: Erste Ergebnisse. In R. Sachse, J. Fassbender, J. Breil, & M. Sachse (Eds.), *Perspektiven Klärungsorientierter Psychotherapie II* (pp. 239-276). Lengerich: Pabst Science Publishers.

Sachse, R. & Takens, R. J. (2004). *Klärungsprozesse in der Psychotherapie*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.

Smith, T.L., Barrett, M.S., Benjamin, L.S., & Barber, J.P. (2006). Relationship factors in treating personality disorders. In L.G. Castonguay, & L.E. Beutler (Eds.), *Principles of therapeutic change that work* (pp.219-238). New-York: Oxford University Press.

Stiles, W.B., Honos-Webb, L., & Surko, M. (1998). Responsiveness in psychotherapy. Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 5(4), 439-458.doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2850.1998.tb00166.x

Taylor, G., Bagby, R., & Parker, J. (1997). *Disorders of affect regulation: Alexithymia in medical and psychiatric illness*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press.

Young, J., & Flanagan, C. (1998). Schema-focused therapy for narcissistic patients. In E. Ronningstam (Ed.), *Disorders of narcissism: Diagnostic, clinical and empirical implications* (pp. 239-268). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Table 1.

Relationship between Client's processes and outcomes (N = 161)

Client's variables	**Coefficient**	***SE***	***t*-ratio**	***p* value**
Content				
BDI	-0.02	0.03	-0.56	.57

BSI	-1.35	0.4	-3.7	<.001
IIP	-3.06	0.58	-5.24	<.001
Process				
BDI	-0.06	0.03	-1.93	.055
BSI	-0.78	0.26	-2.96	.004
IIP	-2.07	0.41	-4.99	<.001
Functional Relationship				
BDI	-0.05	0.01	-3.19	.002
BSI	-0.78	0.18	-4.25	<.001
IIP	-1.61	0.27	-5.79	<.001
Dysfunctional Relationship				
BDI	-0.03	0.01	-2.04	.04
BSI	-0.48	0.17	-2.76	.006
IIP	-1.48	0.23	-6.36	<.001

Table 2

Relationship between Therapist's processes and outcomes (N = 161)

Therapist's variables	**Coefficient**	***SE***	***t*-ratio**	***p* value**
Therapist relationship				
BDI	-0.02	0.01	-3.26	.001

BSI	0.12	0.29	0.43	.66
IIP	-0.83	0.53	-1.57	.19
Therapist understanding				
BDI	-0.01	0.01	-1.08	.28
BSI	0.05	0.3	0.18	.85
IIP	0.05	0.3	0.18	.85
Therapist process guidance				
BDI	-0.02	0.02	-0.73	.46
BSI	-0.70	0.32	-2.16	.03
IIP	-0.73	0.54	-1.36	.18