Title

Reduced Frontal Cortical Tracking of Conflict between Selfish versus Prosocial Motives in Narcissistic Personality Disorder

Authors

Dipl.-Psych. David S. Stolz (1,2)[+], Dr. Aline Vater (3), Dr. Björn H. Schott (4,5), Dr. Stefan Roepke(3)*, Dr. Frieder M. Paulus (1,2)*, Dr. Sören Krach (1,2)*

[+] Corresponding author

*These authors contributed equally

Affiliations

1 Social Neuroscience Lab, Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Lübeck, Lübeck, Germany

2 Translational Psychiatry Unit (TPU), Department of Psychiatry and Psychotherapy, University of Lübeck, Germany

3 Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Campus Benjamin Franklin, Berlin, Germany

4 Leibniz Institute for Neurobiology Magdeburg, Magdeburg, Germany

5 Department of Psychiatry, University Medicine Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany

Corresponding author

David S. Stolz
Social Neuroscience Lab
Center of Brain, Behavior, and Metabolism (CBBM)
Universität zu Lübeck
Ratzeburger Allee 160
23562 Lübeck
Phone: +49 451 3101 7528
Email: david.stolz[at]uni-luebeck.de

Short title

Prosociality in Narcissistic Personality Disorder

Abstract

Narcissistic Personality Disorder (NPD) entails severe impairments in interpersonal functioning that are likely driven by selfish and exploitative behavior. Here, we investigate the underlying motivational and neural mechanisms of prosocial decision-making by experimentally manipulating motivational conflict between selfish and prosocial incentives. One group of patients diagnosed with NPD and a group of healthy controls (CTL) were scanned using functional magnetic resonance imaging while performing a prosocial decision-making task. In this task, we systematically varied the level of conflict between selfish and prosocial options on each trial. We analyzed choice behavior, response times, and neural activity in regions associated with conflict monitoring to test how motivational conflict drives prosocial choice behavior. Participants in the NPD group behaved less prosocially than the CTL group overall. Varying degrees of motivational conflict between selfish and prosocial options induced response variability in both groups, but more so in the CTL group. The NPD group responded faster than the CTL group, unless choosing prosocially, which slowed response times to a level comparable to the CTL group. Additionally, neural activity tracking motivational conflict in dorsomedial prefrontal cortex was reduced in the NPD group. Collectively, low generosity in NPD appears to arise from reduced consideration of prosocial motives, which obviates motivational conflict with selfish motives and entails reduced activity in neural conflict monitoring systems. Yet, our data also indicate that NPD is not marked by an absolute indifference to others' needs. This points to potentials for improving interpersonal relationships, effectively supporting the well-being of patients and their peers.

Introduction

Narcissistic personality disorder (NPD) is characterized by a pervasive pattern of grandiosity, need for admiration, and lack of empathy[1]. Relationships in patients with NPD are described as largely superficial and serving as a means for self-esteem regulation, rather than being motivated by mutuality and genuine interest in the other person[1]. Most of these descriptive interpersonal features derive from clinical observations. Laboratory studies that prove these concepts using experimental designs are lacking[2]. The aim of this study was to investigate selfish behavior, a key interpersonal pattern in NPD, on a behavioral and neural level.

"Narcissism" can be conceptualized as a dimensional personality trait including grandiose and vulnerable features[3,4]. Grandiose features are also reflected in the descriptive DSM-5 criteria set of NPD[1] and include an exaggerated sense of self-importance and need for admiration. Vulnerable features include traits such as anger, shame, and insecurity[3]. A pervasive motif of grandiose narcissism is to maintain an exaggerated self-esteem, which is reflected in social behavior[5,6]. Non-clinically grandiose individuals overestimate their abilities[7], tend to be extraverted[8], and display interpersonal skills like charmingness[9,10], which presumably facilitates making new acquaintances[6,11,12]. In the long run, however, non-clinical grandiosity predicts more detrimental outcomes[5,12] reflected in antagonistic and defensive behavior[9,13,14], vindictiveness[15,16], and dysfunctional relationships[17,18]. Non-clinical narcissistic vulnerability similarly relates to defensiveness and self-enhancement[10], but also to emotional instability, low extraversion[19], low self-esteem[20], and aggression[21]. Most behavioral studies on "narcissism" are performed in non-clinical samples using the Narcissism Personality Inventory (NPI) that mainly captures grandiose features of the construct[21], making the transferability of these data into clinical samples disputable[22]. Pathological narcissism likely represents a singular dimension, with NPD as an extreme[23] that is linked to reduced empathy[24,25], and distress of close others[26].

In healthy subjects, laboratory studies have shown that higher trait narcissism predicts higher individual acquisitiveness but diminishes the group's total harvest in common goods games[27]. Similarly,

80 trait vulnerability predicts reduced generosity, lower sensitivity to potential punishment for low
81 generosity, and increased retaliation[28]. This coheres with classic findings that non-clinical grandiosity
82 predicted aggression, especially following self-esteem threats[29]. Yet, when prosocial motives gain
83 salience through empathizing or perspective taking, both selfishness[30–32] and aggression[31,33]
84 diminish in healthy individuals, and the arising arbitration between selfish and prosocial motives entails
85 slower reaction times (RTs)[34–37]. Habitually selfish/prosocial individuals respond quickly when behaving
86 selfishly/prosocially, whereas deviations from default behavior are slower[36]. Hence, to the extent that
87 individuals inform their behavior by reconciling opposing interpersonal motives, experimentally induced
88 conflict between such motives should slow down responses and potentially shift them away from default
89 tendencies[34,36].

90 Regarding NPD, this evidence from non-clincal samples stimulates divergent hypotheses: Either,
91 pronounced selfish behavior, as also frequently observed in non-clinical narcissism[27–29], could go along
92 with low motivational conflict if selfish motives trump prosocial motives. Alternatively, if interpersonal
93 deliberation in NPD entails motives like being perceived as likeable or attractive[9,10], achievable for
94 instance through generous actions, eventually selfish behavior should demand to first resolve conflict with
95 co-existing prosocial motives. In the first hypothesis, low motivational conflict should be reflected in fast
96 RTs, whereas the second hypothesis would predict slower RTs[34,36].

97 Neurally, motivational conflict should relate to activity in areas of medial prefrontal cortex, such
98 as dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC), anterior cingulate cortex (ACC), and the supplementary motor
99 complex (SMC, including supplementary motor area (SMA), and preSMA)[38]. These regions are commonly
100 associated with cognitive control[39,40], which also holds in the social domain[41–43]. Further, since
101 ventromedial prefrontal cortex (vmPFC) is associated with subjective value computations of competing
102 choice options[44] and action outcomes[45], activity in this region may also contribute to reduced
103 prosocial decision making in NPD. Moreover, the vmPFC tracks state self-esteem[46,47], social inequality
104 assessment[48,49], and guides prosocial behavior in concert with the temporoparietal junction

105 (TPJ)[37,50,51]. The TPJ includes regions at the border of temporal and parietal lobes including superior
106 temporal sulcus (STS) and angular gyrus (AG)[52], implicated in higher-level social-cognitive
107 processes[53,54] such as moral judgement[55] or perspective taking[30]. Last, the anterior insula (AI) is
108 involved in interoceptive awareness[56], empathic processes[30,57], detection of social norm
109 violations[42]. Together with ACC, it serves the neural processing of interpersonal motives[58].

110 Here, patients diagnosed with NPD and a group of healthy control subjects (CTL) were scanned
111 using functional magnetic resonance imaging (fMRI) during a prosocial decision-making task. On each trial,
112 participants had two options to split a monetary endowment between themselves and an unknown
113 recipient. The splits systematically varied to manipulate the level of conflict between selfish and prosocial
114 motives. Additionally, some trials allowed punishing the recipient by taking money from them. Concluding
115 from previous studies in non-clinical samples with narcissistic traits [27–29], we expected lower generosity
116 in the group of patients diagnosed with NPD than in CTL group, reflecting their decision making to be
117 eventually governed by selfish motives. Additionally, we expected activity in neural conflict monitoring
118 systems (i.e. dmPFC, ACC, SMC)[39] and differential RT patterns[34,36] to track the motivational conflict
119 implied in the offer, potentially allowing to differentiate patients with NPD from CTL subjects.

Methods

Sample

A total of N=42 participants were included in the study. Participants belonging to the NPD group were recruited from Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, Campus Benjamin Franklin, and were both inpatients and outpatients, but were included in the study only after being discharged from treatment. CTL group participants were recruited by announcements in the press and via publicly placed advertisements. The study was approved by the local ethics committee at Charité Berlin (EA4/092/10). Participants gave written informed consent and received monetary compensation for participating in the study. Structured Clinical Interviews for DSM IV axes I and II Disorders (SCID-I; SCID-II; 60,61; German Versions: 62,64) were administered to all participants by a trained clinical psychologist to validate NPD diagnosis and assess comorbidity (Supplementary Table 1). Potential participants for the CTL group were excluded if completion of SCID-I or SCID-II indicated the presence of any mental disorder. As assessed in prior studies of our group, interrater reliability (κ=0.80) and internal consistency (Cronbach's α=0.86; sum of criteria) of SCID-II NPD diagnoses was acceptable [63]. Five participants were excluded from the analysis due to various reasons (Supplementary Methods), leaving a total of 37 participants (CTL: n=19, NPD: n=18) in the final analysis sample.

Procedure

Before the study, a set of paper-pencil questionnaires were sent to all participants (Supplementary Table 1). Upon arrival at the MRI facility, all participants were briefed about the study protocol and gave written informed consent. They were informed that inside the MRI they were going to repeatedly decide how to share an endowment of 1000 points (equivalent to 10 €) between themselves and another person (henceforth: recipient) by choosing between two alternative splits of this endowment. To ensure interpersonal relevance of the task, they were informed that after task completion, a number of their choices would be selected randomly, defining how much money would be paid to them and to the next

study participant (i.e. the recipient). Additionally, participants received money based on the choices of one other participant who was assigned randomly. All participants were tested alone and never met any other participant.

Experimental Task

Stimulus presentation was performed using the *Presentation* software package (Neurobehavioral Systems, Albany, CA). On each trial, one option was displayed on the left and the other on the right side of the screen, with the amounts for the participant and the recipient on the top and the bottom, respectively (Figure 1). Participants chose by pressing a button with either the index or the middle finger. In a baseline (BL) condition, both options assigned precisely 500 points to each person. In five other conditions the level of conflict between selfish and prosocial motives was manipulated by systematically splitting the endowment, with one option favoring the participant more strongly (selfish option) than the other option (prosocial option). In one condition, options were very similar, inducing low motivational conflict (low conflict, LC). On other trials, one option assigned a high payoff to the participant, leaving little to the recipient, whereas the other option proposed a fairer split (medium conflict, MC). Still other trials did not allow to resolve motivational conflict this way, because avoiding selfishness required to choose an extremely prosocial option (high conflict, HC). Further, one condition allowed participants to increase their gain by subtracting money from the recipient, or to resort to a fairer split (medium conflict punishment, MCP). Finally, one condition also allowed participants to increase their payoff at the recipient's cost, but the alternative would be to choose an extremely prosocial option (high conflict punishment, HCP). On each trial, following 500 ms fixation, a choice had to be made within the 3000 ms display of the options, otherwise the trial was coded as invalid. Each trial onset was triggered by an MRI pulse, and the inter-trial-interval (ITI) was jittered between 500 and 6500 ms in steps of 2000 ms (further information in Supplementary Methods).

170 **Statistical analyses of behavioral data**

171 Statistical analyses of behavioral data were performed using JASP[64], jamovi[65], and the
172 p.adjust() function in R[66]. We analyzed percentages of prosocial choices and median RTs for the different
173 experimental conditions using repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA) and nonparametric tests,
174 as appropriate. Since both choice options in the BL condition offered the same amount of 500 points to
175 the player and the recipient, no selfish or prosocial option was defined and BL choice data were not
176 analyzed. However, RTs from the BL condition were analyzed and it served as an explicit baseline for the
177 analysis of fMRI data. To test the effects of increasing motivational conflict on behavior and neural activity,
178 we compared HC trials against the average of LC and MC trials (LC&MC), because the latter both allowed
179 to resolve the conflict with the same pro-social option in which the participant still received more payoff
180 but amounts were rather similar (i.e. 550 and 450, respectively). This was not the case in the HC condition,
181 in which the pro-social option implied a relative loss for the participant and gain for the recipient (200 and
182 800, respectively). Last, to test the main effect of possible punishment, we averaged MCP and HCP trials
183 (PUN) and compared this to the average of MC and HC trials (noPUN).

184

185 **FMRI data acquisition and preprocessing**

186 Echo-planar images (EPIs) were acquired on a Magnetom TrioTim Syngo (Siemens, Munich,
187 Germany). The entire run consisted of 600 EPIs (37 ascending slices; 20% gap; 3*3*3 mm voxels; TR=2000
188 ms; TE=30 ms; FA=70°; FoV=192; GRAPPA=2). Additionally, a high-resolution T1-weighted MPRAGE image
189 (176 ascending slices; 50% gap; 1*1*1 mm voxels; TR=1900 ms; TE=2.52 ms; FA=9°; FoV=256; GRAPPA=2)
190 was acquired to improve spatial normalization. All fMRI data were preprocessed and analyzed using SPM
191 12[67] in Matlab R2019b (The Mathworks, Natick, Massachusetts, USA). EPIs were corrected for
192 acquisition delay (slice timing), with the middle slice as reference, and for head motion (realignment). The
193 MPRAGE image was coregistered to the mean EPI obtained from realignment and segmented using the
194 unified segmentation algorithm implemented in SPM. EPIs were normalized to a common stereotactic

195 reference frame (MNI) space using the transformation parameters obtained from segmentation, and
196 smoothed using an 8 mm full-width-at-half-maximum isotropic Gaussian kernel.
197
198 **Statistical analysis of fMRI data**
199 All fMRI data were analyzed using SPM12[67], using a two-stage mixed effects model. The first-
200 level general linear model (GLM) contained six regressors of interest, one for the BL condition and one for
201 each of the Choice conditions, plus the six rigid-body movement parameters obtained from realignment
202 as regressors of no interest, to account for variance related to head motion, and a single constant. At the
203 second level, we constructed a full-factorial ANOVA model, which included the contrast images of each
204 Choice condition against the BL condition (e.g. HC>BL), separated by group, resulting in the within-subjects
205 factor *condition* with five levels, and the between-subjects factor *group* (CTL, NPD).
206 To test for within-subject effects of RTs and prosocial choices, respectively, we set up two
207 additional GLMs for each participant. Within each GLM, we modelled BL trials separately from Choice
208 trials, and parametrically modulated, in this order, the latter with dummy predictors that indicated
209 whether medium (MC, MCP) or high (HC, HCP) conflict trials were presented, and whether or not a given
210 trial was a PUN trial (i.e., MCP, HCP). Last, we included either a predictor indicating the participant's choice
211 (prosocial=1; selfish=-1), or the RT on each trial (log-transformed and z-scored). Parametric modulators
212 were orthogonalized. Additional regressors modelled invalid trials and head motion. One participant in the
213 CTL group and three participants in the NPD group never chose the prosocial option and were therefore
214 excluded from these analyses.
215
216 **Region-of-Interest Analysis**
217 Since our primary focus was to investigate how motivational conflict engages regions associated
218 with conflict monitoring, we used Neurosynth[68] to perform an automated meta-analysis of functional
219 neuroimaging studies by searching for the term "conflict" and obtaining the association test map

220 thresholded at $p<.01$ (false-discovery-rate-corrected; 337 studies). This map was then limited to include

221 only clusters of 5 or more contiguous voxels and used as a region-of-interest, largely covering dorsal ACC,

222 SMC, and aspects of bilateral AI (henceforth: *conflict mask*).

Results

Participants in NPD Group Acted More Selfishly, but Avoided Punishing Recipients

Across all Choice conditions, the NPD group (*MD*=9.80%, IQR=24.13%, *min*=0.0%, *max*=97.81%) chose the prosocial option less often than the CTL group (*MD*=45.20%, IQR=34.74%, *min*=0.0%, *max*=86.41%; Mann-Whitney-U test: *W*=260.5, one-sided *p*=.003, rank-biserial correlation=0.52, 90% *CI*=[0.26;0.72]; Figure 2 & Table 1).

When motivational conflict was low, the CTL group behaved more prosocially than the NPD group (LC&MC, CTL group: *MD*=51.11%, *IQR*=59.53; NPD group: *MD*=3.97%, *IQR*=24.58; *W*=266.5, one-sided *p*=0.002, rank-biserial correlation=0.56, 90%, CI=[0.30;0.74]). When conflict increased, prosocial choices diminished in both groups (difference: LC&MC minus HC; CTL group: *MD*=29.69%, *IQR*=46.40, *W*=171.00, *p*<.001; NPD group: *MD*=1.20%, *IQR*=5.43, *W*=100.5, *p*=.003), and this effect was larger in the CTL group (*W*=288.50, two-sided *p*<.001, rank-biserial correlation=0.69, 95% *CI*=[0.43;0.84]). However, under HC, the CTL group still behaved more prosocially than the NPD group (CTL: *MD*=15.22%, *IQR*=25.65%; NPD: *MD*=0.00%, *IQR*=22.23%; *W*=229, one-sided, Holm-corrected *p*=0.046, rank-biserial correlation=0.34, 90% *CI*=[0.04;0.59]). Thus, the difference in prosociality between the groups was reduced, but still present, when prosocial behavior was very disadvantageous for the participant.

Across groups, prosociality increased when selfishness required to punish the recipient (difference PUN minus noPUN, CTL: *MD*=26.37%, *IQR*=48.80, *W*=158, one-sided *p*<.001, rank-biserial correlation=0.85, 90% *CI*=[0.67;0.93]; NPD: *MD*=1.63%, *IQR*=32.15, *W*=87, one-sided *p*=.016, rank-biserial correlation=0.66, 95% *CI*=[0.28;0.86]). This increase was descriptively, but not significantly, larger in the CTL than in the NPD group (*W*=219, one-sided *p*=.074, rank-biserial correlation=0.28, 90% *CI*=[-0.03;0.54]). Hence, having to punish others for one's own benefit led to more prosocial behavior.

Responses in NPD Group were Fast, but Slowed Down for Prosocial Decisions

RTs did not generally differ between groups (ANOVA with factors trial type [BL, Choice] and group [CTL, NPD]: $F(1,35)=3.39$, $p=.074$, $\eta_p^2=.09$). However, there was a significant main effect of trial type ($F(1,35)=37.15$, $p<.001$, $\eta_p^2=.52$), that was modulated by group (trial type*group interaction: $F(1,35)=11.09$, $p=.002$, $\eta_p^2=.24$; Figure 2). Post-hoc tests showed that the CTL group responded slower during Choice trials ($t(54.2)=3.21$, two-sided $p_{\text{Holm}}=.009$), but there was no difference during BL trials ($t(54.2)=0.02$, two-sided $p_{\text{Holm}}=.987$). Moreover, motivational conflict slowed RTs in the CTL group (Choice>BL: $t(35)=6.76$, $p_{\text{Holm}}<.001$), but not in the NPD group ($t(35)=1.93$, $p_{\text{Holm}}=.186$). Thus, both groups responsed comparably fast unless interpersonal motives needed to be reconciled, which slowed responding only in the CTL group.

Median RTs did not differ between selfish and prosocial decisions across groups (ANOVA with factors decision [selfish, prosocial] and group [CTL, NPD]: no main effect of decision: $F(1,31)=4.03$, $p=.054$, $\eta_p^2=.12$; factor group: $F(1,31)=2.91$, $p=.098$, $\eta_p^2=.09$). However, the effect of decision differed between groups (decision*group: $F(1,32)=8.56$, $p=.006$, $\eta_p^2=.22$; Figure 3), showing that the CTL group was slower than the NPD group during selfish choices (CTL>NPD: $t(49.2)=2.93$, $p_{Holm}=.026$; Figure 3), but not during prosocial choices (CTL>NPD: $t(49.2)=0.03$, $p_{Holm}=1.000$). Moreover, RTs within the CTL group did not differ between decisions ($t(31)=0.68$, $p_{Holm}=1.000$), but the NPD group was faster for selfish than for prosocial decisions ($t(31)=-3.34$, $p_{Holm}=.013$), which was not due to group-specific effects of the experimental conditions (Supplementary Table S4).

RTs were insensitive to level of motivational conflict across groups (ANOVA with factors level of conflict [LC&MC, HC] and group [CTL, NPD]: $F(1,35)=1.86$, $p=.181$, $\eta_p^2=.05$). Yet, we found a main effect of group ($F(1,35)=8.53$, $p=.006$, $\eta_p^2=.20$), that was driven by the HC condition (CTL>NPD: $t(35)=3.21$, $p_{\text{Holm}}=.017$). The interaction of both factors was not significant ($F(1,35)=3.50$, $p=.070$, $\eta_p^2=.09$). Thus, when prosociality was disadvantageous for the participants, responses in the CTL group were slower than in the NPD group.

Last, the option to punish did not impact reaction times across groups (ANOVA with factors punishment [noPUN, PUN] and group [CTL, NPD]: $F(1,35)=0.00$, $p=.983$, $\eta_p^2=.00$). Again, the CTL group responded slower than the NPD group (main effect of group: $F(1,35)=8.30$, $p=.007$, $\eta_p^2=.19$), which was due to noPUN trials (CTL>NPD: $t(43.2)=3.06$, $p_{Holm}=.023$). No significant interaction was found (punishment*group: $F(1,35)=1.06$, $p=.311$, $\eta_p^2=.03$).

Conflict-Related Neural Activity During Prosocial Decision Making Was Reduced in NPD Group

Across groups, presence of motivational conflict (Choice>BL) elicited activity in right dorsal midcingulate cortex (MNI x,y,z: 6,30,42; $T=5.79$, $k=68$, $p_{FWE}=.001$; whole-brain), right dorsolateral prefrontal cortex (dlPFC; 46,34,22; $T=6.45$, $k=146$, $p_{FWE}<.001$), bilateral parietal cortex (right: 28,-60,44; $T=9.32$, $k=1833$, $p_{FWE}<.001$; left: -26,-70,32; $T=9.63$, $k=1349$, $p_{FWE}<.001$), and further regions (see Supplementary Information for full activation coordinates). This effect was stronger for the CTL than the NPD group in left dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC; -6,30,38; $T=3.86$, $k=29$, $p_{FWE}=.023$) and left preSMA (-4,12,52; $T=4.44$, $k=10$, $p_{FWE}=.003$; -corrected inside the *conflict* mask, Figure 4), while the opposite comparison (i.e. Choice>BL * NPD>CTL) did not yield any significant results, indicating that considering potential interpersonal consequences is linked to conflict-related neural activity particularly in the CTL group.

Contrasting HC against the average of LC and MC (HC>LC&MC) to test for effects of increasing motivational conflict on neural activity did not yield any significant effects or interactions.

When selfish behavior required punishing others (PUN>noPUN), activity increased in right AG (34,-68,52; $T=5.35$, $k=73$, $p_{FWE}=.006$; whole-brain), right inferior temporal gyrus (ITG; 54,-56,-10; $T=5.24$, $k=19$, $p_{FWE}=.009$), and right superior parietal cortex (26,-72,54; $T=4.84$, $k=1$, $p_{FWE}=.043$). The effect in right ITG was significant when performing this analysis in the CTL group alone (48,-56,-8; $T=5.20$, $k=33$, $p_{FWE}=.004$; whole-brain), which also showed significantly stronger activations for PUN vs noPUN trials in left AI (-32,18,-14; $T=5.25$, $k=14$, $p_{FWE}=.009$), right inferior frontal gyrus (50,20,16; $T=4.89$, $k=3$, $p_{FWE}=.037$), and right middle temporal gyrus (62,-44,2; $T=5.26$, $k=35$, $p_{FWE}=.008$). However, despite no significant effects in the

297 NPD group, PUN>noPUN did not differ between groups. Hence, when selfish behavior was possible only
298 by punishing others, this induced stronger activity in brain regions like right AG and ITG, which was driven
299 by the CTL group.
300
301 **Opportunities to Punish Increased Conflict-Related Neural Activity Across Groups**
302 To predict task-related neural activity with individual differences in prosociality, we regressed the first-
303 level Choice>BL contrast images on the participants' mean percentages of prosocial choices while
304 controlling for group differences. Across groups, higher prosociality predicted increasing activity in right
305 dlPFC (36,38,14; T=5.80, k=3, p_{FWE}=.040; whole-brain), but no group differences were found. Regressing
306 the contrast HC>LC&MC on the corresponding difference in prosociality (i.e., HC minus LC&MC) did not
307 yield any significant effects. However, increasing prosociality from noPUN to PUN trials predicted
308 corresponding increases in neural activity in right SMA (6,6,48; T=6.16, k=3, p_{FWE}=.018; whole-brain) across
309 groups. Thus, higher overall prosociality predicted neural activity in right dlPFC, and increased prosociality
310 in order not to punish others was linked to increased SMA activity across groups.
311 Since participants in the NPD group showed low overall prosociality and responded more slowly
312 during prosocial than during selfish choices, we expected stronger trial-by-trial conflict-related neural
313 activity for prosocial choices in the NPD than in the CTL group[34,36,39], but no such effect was found.
314
315 **Reaction Times Predicted Conflict-Related Neural Activity Within and Across Participants**
316 Last, under motivational conflict, slower participants showed higher activity in right mid cingulate gyrus
317 (Choice>BL: 4,32,36; T=5.37, k=53, p_{FWE}=.001; corrected inside the *conflict* mask), left AI (-38,18,2; T=5.87,
318 k=22, p_{FWE}<.001), and left SMA (-4,14,50; T=5.37, k=111, p_{FWE}=.001). Similarly, slower RTs due to increasing
319 conflict were associated with higher neural activity in SMA (HC>LC&MC: 2,16,44; T=6.56, k=224, p_{FWE}<.001;
320 corrected inside the *conflict* mask), and left (-32,16,2; T=5.9, k=16, p_{FWE}<.001) and right AI (40,16,0; T=4.73,
321 k=6, p_{FWE}=.008). Additionally, slower trial-by-trial RTs predicted neural activity in ACC, bilateral AI, and

322 lateral prefrontal and parietal cortices, and an exploratory *F*-test indicated that trial-by-trial RTs were less

323 predictive of mid cingulate neural activity in the NPD than in the CTL group (-6,26,36; F=18.05, k=1,

324 p_{FWE}=.048; corrected inside the *conflict* mask).

Discussion

In the present study we investigated how prosocial decision making and underlying neural processes in patients diagnosed with NPD are shaped by conflicting interpersonal motives. Compared to control subjects, the NPD group behaved less prosocially, responded faster, and showed less neural activity in regions associated with conflict monitoring such as the SMA and cingulate cortex[38,39]. When prosociality was disadvantageous for the participants, it diminished in both groups, although control subjects still behaved more prosocially than the NPD group. Both groups were similarly affected by the requirement to punish others for one's own benefit, which shifted behavior away from selfishness, and increased neural activity in right AG and ITG. Last, when participants in the NPD group acted prosocially, thus deviating from their selfish mode of behavior, this slowed responding to a level comparable to the CTL group.

Our finding of low generosity in participants diagnosed with NPD is well in line with existing literature from non-clinical narcissistic samples[27,28]. We hypothesized that this may either result from more readily available tendencies towards selfishness[35] or, alternatively, from cognitively effortful arbitration between conflicting interpersonal motives; i.e. either to selfishly increase one's own gain or to behave prosocially in order to be seen in a good light by others[9,10]. Our findings speak to the former hypothesis, as the mainly selfish responses in the NPD group were generally fast, which was paralleled by comparably low conflict-related neural activity[38,39], and rare prosocial choices were considerably slower. Participants in the CTL group more readily utilized the fairness information provided in each trial to guide their decisions, causing motivational conflict and the need to engage in cognitive control[34,39]. In sum, our data nicely coincide with earlier research showing that deviations from selfish or prosocial habits are marked by slowing RTs[36]. Thus, using response times one may reveal individual differences in social value orientations[35], with participants in the NPD group being more strongly oriented toward selfishness.

349 Notably, behavior in the NPD group was not fully insensitive to its potential social consequences.
350 Similar to the CTL group, participants in the NPD group acted more selfishly when prosociality was believed
351 to be highly detrimental, and acted more prosocially when their own benefit was conditional on punishing
352 others. Prosocial behavior can be shaped by inducing prosocial motives[58], and explicit instructions to
353 consider others' perspectives can increase prosocial responding in non-clinical narcissistic individuals[69].
354 Although we did not provide such explicit instructions, our task was effective for pitting selfish against
355 prosocial motives. Notably, recipients were anonymous, which is known to impact behavior in prosocial
356 decision games[70], and did not have an option to reciprocate, invalidating any potential economic
357 repercussions of unfair behavior. Despite these circumstances, patients diagnosed with NPD showed some
358 responsiveness to others' potential needs, underlining that pathological narcissism does not equate to an
359 absolute incapacity, but perhaps a reduced propensity to act prosocially[71]. This finding points to the
360 potential of empathy interventions to increase perspective taking[72] for increasing prosocial
361 behavior[58], which could be reflected in neural activity in networks mediating interpersonal
362 motivations[32,58,71]. Such interventions could entail practicing to actively consider how one's social
363 behavior affects others, and to imagine how others will respond during interpersonal interactions. In
364 consequence, such therapeutic interventions could elicit higher prosociality and more favorable
365 evaluations from others, stabilizing self-esteem[46,73] and overall well-being[74].

366 Our findings also speak to neural underpinnings of prosociality more generally. Precisely, neural
367 activity in SMA, which is linked to cognitive control of behavior[38], was higher for participants who
368 favored prosociality over punishing others for their own benefit. When such punishment was possible, this
369 increased activity in AG, which may reflect more specifically social-cognitive processes like moral
370 reasoning[55], or domain-general cognitive processes like attentional reorienting[75] that may also be
371 engaged during social behavior. In addition, ITG was activated when punishment was possible, which has
372 previously been associated with fairness considerations[42]. Last, participants with higher overall levels of
373 prosociality showed increased activity in dlPFC, which was also responsive to the general presence of

374 conflicting interpersonal motives, alongside other regions of the cognitive control network (i.e. dmPFC, AI,
375 ACC, SMA, and parietal cortex).

376 So far, few studies have investigated the neural correlates of interpersonal behavior in NPD using
377 experimental paradigms in combination with fMRI. By doing so, our data contribute to a more detailed
378 understanding of NPD in terms of impairments in interpersonal functioning, as introduced by DSM-5,
379 section 3 [1]. Collectively, our data indicate that selfish behavior in NPD relies on diminished consideration
380 of prosocial motives, which obviates the need to resolve conflict with selfish tendencies. However, this
381 may reflect a reduced propensity, not ability, to act prosocially[69,71]. Potentially, this reflects differences
382 between NPD and, for instance, antisocial personality disorder, which could be tested explicitly in future
383 studies. In terms of treatment implications, our results point to possibilities for enhancing prosocial
384 behavior and thereby improving social relationships and well-being in NPD. Regarding social cognition and
385 interpersonal behavior more broadly, our findings support the notion that these functions rely on domain-
386 general control processes [38–40], that draw on contextual social information to decide between generous
387 or selfish behavior[43].

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Sylvia Richter and Thomas Münte for helpful discussions during development of the task and Michael Scholz for his help with the optimization of the trial sequence for the fMRI task. We further thank Jürgen Baudewig, Ricardo Heydenblut, and Christian Kainz for assistance with MRI data acquisition. Research leading to this publication has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (Sören Krach; KR 3803/9-1; Aline Vater and Stefan Roepke; EXC 302; Björn Schott; SFB 779, TP A08).

Disclosures

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Supplementary Information

Supplementary information is available at MP's website.

401 **References**

402 1. American Psychiatric Association (2013): *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*, 5th
403 ed. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
404 https://doi.org/10.1176/appi.books.9780890425596
405 2. Roepke S, Vater A (2014): Narcissistic personality disorder: An integrative review of recent empirical
406 data and current definitions. *Curr Psychiatry Rep* 16. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11920-014-0445-0
407 3. Cain NM, Pincus AL, Ansell EB (2008): Narcissism at the crossroads: Phenotypic description of
408 pathological narcissism across clinical theory, social/personality psychology, and psychiatric
409 diagnosis. *Clin Psychol Rev* 28: 638–656.
410 4. Koepernik T, Jauk E, Kanske P (2021): Lay theories of grandiose and vulnerable narcissism. *Curr*
411 *Psychol*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-020-01296-w
412 5. Morf CC, Rhodewalt F (2001): Unraveling the paradoxes of narcissism: A dynamic self-regulatory
413 processing model. *Psychol Inq* 12: 177–196.
414 6. Campbell WK, Foster JD (2007): The Narcissistic Self: Background, an Extended Agency Model, and
415 Ongoing Controversies. In: Sedikides C, Spencer J, editors. *The Self*. New York: Psychology Press, pp
416 115–138.
417 7. Farwell L, Wohlwend-Lloyd R (1998): Narcissistic Processes: Optimistic Expectations, Favorable Self-
418 Evaluations, and Self-Enhancing Attributions. *J Pers* 66: 65–83.
419 8. Paulhus DL, Williams KM (2002): The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism, and
420 psychopathy. *J Res Pers* 36: 556–563.
421 9. Back MD, Küfner ACP, Dufner M, Gerlach TM, Rauthmann JF, Denissen JJA (2013): Narcissistic
422 admiration and rivalry: Disentangling the bright and dark sides of narcissism. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 105:
423 1013–1037.
424 10. Hart W, Adams J, Burton KA, Tortoriello GK (2017): Narcissism and self-presentation: Profiling
425 grandiose and vulnerable Narcissists' self-presentation tactic use. *Pers Individ Dif* 104: 48–57.

11. Campbell WK, Brunell AB, Finkel EJ (2006): Narcissism, Interpersonal Self-Regulation, and Romantic Relationships: An Agency Model Approach. In: Vohs KD, Finkel EJ, editors. *Self and Relationships: Connecting Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Processes*. New York, NY: Guilford Press, pp 57–83.

12. Paulhus DL (1998): Interpersonal and intrapsychic adaptiveness of trait self-enhancement: A mixed blessing? *J Pers Soc Psychol* 74: 1197–1208.

13. Stucke TS, Sporer SL (2002): When a grandiose self-image is threatened: Narcissism and self-concept clarity as predictors of negative emotions and aggression following ego-threat. *J Pers* 70: 509–532.

14. Ferriday C, Vartanian O, Mandel DR (2011): Public but not private ego threat triggers aggression in narcissists. *Eur J Soc Psychol* 41: 564–568.

15. Dickinson KA, Pincus AL (2003): Interpersonal Analysis of Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism. *J Pers Disord* 17: 188–207.

16. Fatfouta R, Gerlach TM, Schröder-Abé M, Merkl A (2015): Narcissism and lack of interpersonal forgiveness: The mediating role of state anger, state rumination, and state empathy. *Pers Individ Dif* 75: 36–40.

17. Wurst SN, Gerlach TM, Dufner M, Rauthmann JF, Grosz MP, Küfner ACP, *et al.* (2017): Narcissism and romantic relationships: The differential impact of narcissistic admiration and rivalry. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 112: 280–306.

18. Sauls D, Zeigler-Hill V, Vrabel JK, Lehtman MJ (2019): How do narcissists get what they want from their romantic partners? The connections that narcissistic admiration and narcissistic rivalry have with influence strategies. *Pers Individ Dif* 147: 33–42.

19. Miller JD, Hoffman BJ, Gaughan ET, Gentile B, Maples J, Keith Campbell W (2011): Grandiose and Vulnerable Narcissism: A Nomological Network Analysis. *J Pers* 79: 1013–1042.

20. Crowe ML, Edershile EA, Wright AGC, Campbell WK, Lynam DR, Miller JD (2018): Development and validation of the Narcissistic Vulnerability Scale: An adjective rating scale. *Psychol Assess* 30: 978–983.

451 21. Pincus AL, Ansell EB, Pimentel CA, Cain NM, Wright AGC, Levy KN (2009): Initial Construction and
452 Validation of the Pathological Narcissism Inventory. *Psychol Assess* 21: 365–379.
453 22. Vater A, Schröder-Abé M, Ritter K, Renneberg B, Schulze L, Bosson JK, Roepke S (2013): The
454 Narcissistic Personality Inventory: A Useful Tool for Assessing Pathological Narcissism? Evidence
455 From Patients With Narcissistic Personality Disorder. *J Pers Assess* 95: 301–308.
456 23. Aslinger EN, Manuck SB, Pilkonis PA, Simms LJ, Wright AGC (2018): Narcissist or narcissistic?
457 Evaluation of the latent structure of narcissistic personality disorder. *J Abnorm Psychol* 127: 496–
458 502.
459 24. Ritter K, Dziobek I, Preißler S, Rüter A, Vater A, Fydrich T, *et al.* (2011): Lack of empathy in patients
460 with narcissistic personality disorder. *Psychiatry Res* 187: 241–247.
461 25. Schulze L, Dziobek I, Vater A, Heekeren HR, Bajbouj M, Renneberg B, *et al.* (2013): Gray matter
462 abnormalities in patients with narcissistic personality disorder. *J Psychiatr Res* 47: 1363–1369.
463 26. Miller JD, Campbell WK, Pilkonis PA (2007): Narcissistic personality disorder: relations with distress
464 and functional impairment. *Compr Psychiatry* 48: 170–177.
465 27. Campbell WK, Bush CP, Brunell AB, Shelton J (2005): Understanding the social costs of narcissism:
466 The case of the tragedy of the commons. *Personal Soc Psychol Bull* 31: 1358–1368.
467 28. Böckler A, Sharifi M, Kanske P, Dziobek I, Singer T (2017): Social decision making in narcissism:
468 Reduced generosity and increased retaliation are driven by alterations in perspective-taking and
469 anger. *Pers Individ Dif* 104: 1–7.
470 29. Bushman BJ, Baumeister RF (1998): Threatened Egotism, Narcissism, Self-Esteem, and Direct and
471 Displaced Aggression: Does Self-Love or Self-Hate Lead to Violence. *J Pers Soc Psychol* 75: 219–229.
472 30. Tusche A, Böckler A, Kanske P, Trautwein F-M, Singer T (2016): Decoding the Charitable Brain:
473 Empathy, Perspective Taking, and Attention Shifts Differentially Predict Altruistic Giving. *J Neurosci*
474 36: 4719–4732.
475 31. Paciello M, Fida R, Cerniglia L, Tramontano C, Cole E (2013): High cost helping scenario: The role of

476 empathy, prosocial reasoning and moral disengagement on helping behavior. *Pers Individ Dif* 55: 3–
477 7.
478 32. Gallo S, Paracampo R, Müller-Pinzler L, Severo MC, Blömer L, Fernandes-Henriques C, *et al.* (2018):
479 The causal role of the somatosensory cortex in prosocial behaviour. *Elife* 7: 1–31.
480 33. Carlo G, Mestre MV, Samper P, Tur A, Armenta BE (2010): Feelings or cognitions? Moral cognitions
481 and emotions as longitudinal predictors of prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *Pers Individ Dif* 48:
482 872–877.
483 34. Evans AM, Dillon KD, Rand DG (2015): Fast But Not Intuitive, Slow But Not Reflective: Decision
484 Conflict Drives Reaction Times in Social Dilemmas. *J Exp Psychol Gen* 144: 951–966.
485 35. Cornelissen G, Dewitte S, Warlop L (2011): Are Social Value Orientations Expressed Automatically?
486 Decision Making in the Dictator Game. *Personal Soc Psychol Bull* 37: 1080–1090.
487 36. Yamagishi T, Matsumoto Y, Kiyonari T, Takagishi H, Li Y, Kanai R, Sakagami M (2017): Response time
488 in economic games reflects different types of decision conflict for prosocial and proself individuals.
489 *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 114: 6394–6399.
490 37. Hutcherson CA, Bushong B, Rangel A (2015): A Neurocomputational Model of Altruistic Choice and Its
491 Implications. *Neuron* 87: 451–462.
492 38. Nachev P, Kennard C, Husain M (2008): Functional role of the supplementary and pre-supplementary
493 motor areas. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 9: 856–869.
494 39. Botvinick MM, Cohen JD, Carter CS (2004): Conflict monitoring and anterior cingulate cortex: An
495 update. *Trends Cogn Sci* 8: 539–46.
496 40. Bonini F, Burle B, Liegeois-Chauvel C, Regis J, Chauvel P, Vidal F (2014): Action Monitoring and Medial
497 Frontal Cortex: Leading Role of Supplementary Motor Area. *Science (80-)* 343: 888–891.
498 41. Cutler J, Campbell-Meiklejohn D (2019): A comparative fMRI meta-analysis of altruistic and strategic
499 decisions to give. *Neuroimage* 184: 227–241.
500 42. Feng C, Luo YJ, Krueger F (2015): Neural signatures of fairness-related normative decision making in

501 the ultimatum game: A coordinate-based meta-analysis. *Hum Brain Mapp* 36: 591–602.
502 43. Zaki J, Hennigan K, Weber J, Ochsner KN (2010): Social cognitive conflict resolution: Contributions of
503 domain-general and domain-specific neural systems. *J Neurosci* 30: 8481–8488.
504 44. Bartra O, McGuire JT, Kable JW (2013): The valuation system: A coordinate-based meta-analysis of
505 BOLD fMRI experiments examining neural correlates of subjective value. *Neuroimage* 76: 412–427.
506 45. Stolz DS, Müller-Pinzler L, Krach S, Paulus FM (2020): Internal control beliefs shape positive affect and
507 associated neural dynamics during outcome valuation. *Nat Commun* 11: 1230.
508 46. Will G-J, Rutledge RB, Moutoussis M, Dolan RJ (2017): Neural and computational processes
509 underlying dynamic changes in self-esteem. *Elife* 6: 1–21.
510 47. Eisenberger NI, Inagaki TK, Muscatell K a., Byrne Haltom KE, Leary MR (2011): The Neural Sociometer:
511 Brain Mechanisms Underlying State Self-esteem. *J Cogn Neurosci* 23: 3448–3455.
512 48. Tricomi E, Rangel A, Camerer CF, O'Doherty JP (2010): Neural evidence for inequality-averse social
513 preferences. *Nature* 463: 1089–1091.
514 49. Aoki R, Matsumoto M, Yomogida Y, Izuma K, Murayama K, Sugiura A, *et al.* (2014): Social equality in
515 the number of choice options is represented in the ventromedial prefrontal cortex. *J Neurosci* 34:
516 6413–6421.
517 50. Strombach T, Weber B, Hangebrauk Z, Kenning P, Karipidis II, Tobler PN, Kalenscher T (2014): Social
518 discounting involves modulation of neural value signals by temporoparietal junction. *Proc Natl Acad*
519 *Sci* 112: 1619–1624.
520 51. Park SQ, Kahnt T, Dogan A, Strang S, Fehr E, Tobler PN (2017): A neural link between generosity and
521 happiness. *Nat Commun* 8: 15964.
522 52. Schurz M, Tholen MG, Perner J, Mars RB, Sallet J (2017): Specifying the brain anatomy underlying
523 temporo-parietal junction activations for theory of mind: A review using probabilistic atlases from
524 different imaging modalities. *Hum Brain Mapp* 38: 4788–4805.
525 53. Decety J, Lamm C (2007): The role of the right temporoparietal junction in social interaction: How

526 low-level computational processes contribute to meta-cognition. *Neuroscientist* 13: 580–593.
527 54. Saxe R, Kanwisher N (2003): People thinking about thinking people: The role of the temporo-parietal
528 junction in “theory of mind.” *Neuroimage* 19: 1835–1842.
529 55. Young L, Camprodon JA, Hauser M, Pascual-Leone A, Saxe R (2010): Disruption of the right
530 temporoparietal junction with transcranial magnetic stimulation reduces the role of beliefs in moral
531 judgments. *Proc Natl Acad Sci* 107: 6753–6758.
532 56. A.D. Craig (2002): How do you feel? Interoception: the sense of the physiological condition of the
533 body. *Nat Rev Neurosci* 3: 655–666.
534 57. Kanske P, Böckler A, Trautwein FM, Singer T (2015): Dissecting the social brain: Introducing the
535 EmpaToM to reveal distinct neural networks and brain-behavior relations for empathy and Theory
536 of Mind. *Neuroimage* 122: 6–19.
537 58. Hein G, Morishima Y, Leiberg S, Sul S, Fehr E (2016): The brain’s functional network architecture
538 reveals human motives. *Science (80-)* 351: 84–90.
539 59. First M, Spitzer R, Gibbon M, Williams JBW (1996): *Structured Clinical Interview for DSM-IV Axis I*
540 *Disorders (SCID-I)*. New York: New York State Psychiatric Institute, Biometrics Research Department.
541 60. First MB, Gibbon M, Spitzer RL, Williams JBW, Benjamin L (1997): *Structured Clinical Interview for*
542 *DSM–IV Personality Disorders (SCID–II).* Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.
543 61. Wittchen HU, Zaudig M, Fydrich T (1997): *SKID-I - Strukturiertes Klinisches Interview Für DSM–IV–TR -*
544 *Achse I [Structured Clinical Interview for DSM–IV–TR - Axis I]*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
545 62. Fydrich T, Renneberg B, Schmitz B, Wittchen H-U (1997): *SKID-II - Strukturiertes Klinisches Interview*
546 *Für DSM–IV Achse II: Persönlichkeitsstörungen [SCID II, Structured Clinical Interview for DSM–IV Axis*
547 *II: Personality Disorders].* Göttingen: Hogrefe.
548 63. Ritter K, Vater A, Rüsch N, Schröder-Abé M, Schütz A, Fydrich T, *et al.* (2014): Shame in patients with
549 narcissistic personality disorder. *Psychiatry Res* 215: 429–437.
550 64. JASP Team (2019): JASP (Version 0.11.1).

65. The jamovi project (2020): jamovi [no. 1.2]. Retrieved from https://www.jamovi.org

66. R Core Team (2013): R: A language and environment for statistical computing. Vienna, Austria, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.

67. Ashburner J, Barnes G, Chen C, Daunizeau J, Moran R, Henson R, *et al.* (, February): SPM12 Manual. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1365-294X.2006.02813.x

68. Yarkoni T, Poldrack RA, Nichols TE, Van Essen DC, Wager TD (2011): Large-scale automated synthesis of human functional neuroimaging data. *Nat Methods* 8: 665–670.

69. Hepper EG, Hart CM, Sedikides C (2014): Moving Narcissus: Can Narcissists Be Empathic? *Personal Soc Psychol Bull* 40: 1079–1091.

70. Eckel CC, Grossman PJ (1996): Altruism in anonymous dictator games. *Games Econ Behav* 16: 181–191.

71. Meffert H, Gazzola V, Den Boer JA, Bartels AAJ, Keysers C (2013): Reduced spontaneous but relatively normal deliberate vicarious representations in psychopathy. *Brain* 136: 2550–2562.

72. Weisz E, Zaki J (2017): Empathy-Building Interventions: A Review of Existing Work and Suggestions for Future Directions. In: Seppala EM, Simon-Thomas E, Brown SL, Worline MC, Cameron CD, Doty JR, editors. *The Oxford Handbook of Compassion Science.* New York: Oxford University Press, pp 205–218.

73. Leary MR (2005): Sociometer theory and the pursuit of relational value: Getting to the root of self-esteem. *Eur Rev Soc Psychol* 16: 75–111.

74. Morelli SA, Lee IA, Arnn ME, Zaki J (2015): Emotional and instrumental support provision interact to predict well-being. *Emotion* 15: 484–493.

75. Seghier ML (2013): The angular gyrus: Multiple functions and multiple subdivisions. *Neuroscientist* 19: 43–61.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Structure of the experimental task. **Top.** Structure of a single trial. Following a jittered fixation (500-6500 ms), a trial was initialized for 500 ms and followed by a 3000 ms display of the two possible splits of the endowment of 1000 points (equivalent to 10€). Participants chose between options with a button press. Responses slower than 3000 ms were discarded. Player A is the participant and Player B the recipient. **Bottom.** Overview of all experimental conditions, with mean number of points assigned to each player and the preset maximum deviation from the mean assignment (max +/-). The split assigning most money to the participant was defined to be the selfish options, whereas the prosocial option was the one splitting the endowment in a relatively more beneficial way for the recipient. Note that due to this definition, the prosocial option did not necessarily assign more money to the recipient than to the participant. There were 12 different, pseudorandomized trial sequences that were designed to optimize BOLD efficiency. Thus, the number of trials in each sequence varied between 223 and 229 (see text for details).

Figure 2. Behavioral data. **a.** Percentages of prosocial choices for the CTL group and NPD group overall (left), for trials with low and medium (LC&MC) vs high motivational conflict (HC; middle), and separately for trials without (noPUN: MC, HC), and with punishment (PUN: MCP, HCP). **b.** Median reaction times in seconds for BL and Choice trials (left), for LC&MC trials and HC trials (middle), and separately for PUN and noPUN trials. Where shown, small crossed bars represent interaction between group (CTL, NPD) and factor on x-axis. Central bars of boxplots show median, lower and upper box borders show 25th and 75th percentile and whiskers end at last data point within 1.5 times the interquartile range from lower or upper box border.

600 **Figure 3.** Reaction times separated by decision. Small crossed bar represents interaction between group
601 (CTL, NPD) and decision made (selfish, prosocial). Small crossed bars represents interaction between group
602 (CTL, NPD) and choice (selfish, prosocial). Central bars of boxplots show median, lower and upper box
603 borders show 25th and 75th percentile and whiskers end at last data point within 1.5 times the interquartile
604 range from lower or upper box border.

605

606 **Figure 4.** Neural activity during the experimental task. **a.** Neural activity in regions associated with the term
607 *conflict* (green outline) including dorsomedial prefrontal cortex (dmPFC) and supplementary motor area
608 (SMA) was higher for the contrast Choice>BL (p<.05, whole-brain FWE-corrected; displayed at p<.0001,
609 uncorrected). This effect was larger in the CTL group than in the NPD group, visualized in the bar plots.
610 Neural activation data in bar plots are based on mean parameter estimate across all voxels in dmPFC and
611 SMA, respectively, in which the interaction of Choice>BL * CTL>NPD was significant at p<.05, small-volume
612 FWE-corrected inside the *conflict* mask). **b.** Neural activity in right angular gyrus (AG) and right inferior
613 temporal gyrus (ITG) was higher for PUN than for noPUN trials, but did not differ between groups. Bar
614 plots show mean parameter estimates across all voxels in right AG and right ITG in which the contrast
615 PUN>noPUN was significant at p<.05, whole-brain FWE-corrected (displayed at p<.005, uncorrected). Inset
616 in bottom right corner depicts activation in right AG, rotated around the y axis by 45 degrees. Errorbars
617 are +/- 1 standard error of the mean.

Tables

Table 1. Behavioral data by group and experimental condition

Choice behavior	CTL			NPD							
Condition	median % prosocial	[25th, 75th percentile]		median % prosocial	[25th,75th percentile]		W	one-sided *p*-value[1]	Rank-Biserial Correlation	90% *CI* for Rank-Biserial Correlation	
										Lower	Upper
Overall	45.20	35.30	70.03	9.80	1.38	25.51	260.5	.003	0.52	0.26	0.72
LC	53.49	17.58	79.18	4.65	0	28.33	246	.046	0.44	0.15	0.66
MC	53.33	29.35	88.04	2.30	0	19.99	273.5	.005	0.60	0.36	0.77
HC	15.22	4.35	30.00	0.00	0	22.23	229	.046	0.34	0.04	0.59
MCP	95.65	45.65	100.00	18.22	0	85.87	242	.046	0.42	0.13	0.64
HCP	79.17	37.47	97.83	7.03	0	79.19	245	.046	0.43	0.15	0.65

Reaction times	CTL		NPD							
Condition	*Mean* (ms)	*SD*	*Mean* (ms)	*SD*	*t*	*df*	two-sided *p*-value[1]	*d*	95% *CI* for *d*	
									Lower	Upper
Overall	1138.63	231.72	951.50	218.88	2.52	35	.016	0.83	0.15	1.50
BL	889.08	166.62	887.89	187.96	0.02	35	.984	0.01	-0.64	0.65
LC	1180.98	262.65	1060.97	283.77	1.34	35	.571	0.44	-0.22	1.09
MC	1164.63	301.72	950.72	275.30	2.25	35	.124	0.74	0.07	1.40
HC	1310.61	362.42	976.31	258.75	3.21	35	.017	1.06	0.36	1.74
MCP	1096.95	234.73	993.14	359.65	1.05	35	.606	0.34	-0.31	1.00
HCP	1393.84	414.36	1007.19	374.47	2.97	35	.027	0.98	0.29	1.66

Note. CTL=Control group. NPD=Group diagnosed with Narcissistic Personality Disorder. CI=confidence interval. LC=Low Conflict. MC=Medium Conflict. HC=High Conflict. MCP=Medium Conflict Punishment. HCP=High Conflict Punishment.
[1]*p*-values for individual conditions (i.e. not "Overall") are Holm-corrected.

620 **Figures**



baseline trials			mean	max +/-	mean	max +/-
baseline	**BL**	participant	500	0	500	0
		recipient	500		500	

non baseline trials trialtype			selfish option mean	max +/-	prosocial option mean	max +/-
low conflict	**LC**	participant	600	20	550	20
		recipient	400		450	
medium conflict	**MC**	participant	800	60	550	20
		recipient	200		450	
high conflict	**HC**	participant	800	60	200	60
		recipient	200		800	
medium conflict punishment	**MCP**	participant	1200	60	550	20
		recipient	-200		450	
high conflict punishment	**HCP**	participant	1200	60	200	60
		recipient	-200		800	

621

622 Figure 1


a choices
Choice trials
p=.003
% prosocial choices
CTL
NPD
group
p<.001
p=.002
p=.036
LC&MC
HC
trial type
p=.074
p<.001
noPUN
PUN
trial type
CTL
NPD
b reaction times
p=.002
p=.987
p=.009
median reaction time (seconds)
BL
Choice
trial type
p=.070
p=.137
p=.007
LC&MC
HC
trial type
p=.311
p=.023
p=.064
noPUN
PUN
trial type

Figure 2


reaction times
by decision
p=.006
p=.026
p=1.00
median reaction time (seconds)
2.0
1.5
1.0
0.5
CTL
NPD
selfish
prosocial
decision

Figure 3



627

628 Figure 4