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**Table S1:** Results for individual items included in composite ratings for Studies 2-4.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Study** | **Item** | **Comparison *M* (*SD*)** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***d*** |
|  |  | **Expresser Prediction** | **Recipient Experience** |  |  |  |
|  | **Warmth** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Sincere | 6.96 (2.32) | 8.52 (2.00) | -3.69 | < .001 | -0.52 |
| 2 | Warm | 7.28 (2.12) | 8.26 (2.19) | -2.07 | .044 | -0.29 |
|  | **Competence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Articulate | 5.97 (2.08) | 7.92 (1.66) | -4.71 | <.001 | -0.67 |
| 2 | Words just right | 6.42 (2.12) | 8.02 (2.08) | -3.83 | <.001 | -0.54 |
|  | **Positive Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2 | Feel | 7.30 (1.59) | 8.32 (1.77) | -2.50 | .016 | -0.35 |
| 2 | Supported | 6.40 (2.17) | 7.60 (2.26) | -2.18 | .034 | -0.31 |
|  |  | **Expresser Rating** | **Recipient Rating** |  |  |  |
|  | **Seriousness** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Serious | 8.46 (2.33) | 7.48 (2.54) | 2.08 | .043 | 0.29 |
| 3 | Upset | 7.88 (2.34) | 6.68 (2.87) | 3.00 | .004 | 0.42 |
| 3 | Need | 7.90 (2.36) | 5.70 (3.00) | 4.10 | <.001 | 0.58 |
| 3 | Appreciate support | 8.56 (1.93) | 7.52 (2.81) | 2.13 | .039 | 0.30 |
|  |  | **Expresser Prediction** | **Recipient Experience** |  |  |  |
|  | **Negative Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Awkward | 5.76 (2.57) | 4.04 (2.95) | 3.29 | .002 | 0.47 |
| 3 | Uncomfortable | 5.74 (2.63) | 4.12 (2.87) | 2.95 | .005 | 0.42 |
| 3 | Difficult | 5.56 (2.62) | 3.58 (2.95) | 3.84 | < .001 | 0.54 |
| 3 | Draining | 4.08 (2.39) | 2.88 (2.13) | 2.72 | .009 | 0.39 |
|  | **Warmth** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Sincere | 7.18 (2.22) | 9.3 (2.26) | -4.59 | < .001 | -0.65 |
| 3 | Warm | 6.76 (2.2) | 9.06 (2.23) | -5.66 | < .001 | -0.80 |
|  | **Competence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Articulate | 6.9 (2.32) | 8.64 (2.43) | -3.75 | < .001 | -0.53 |
| 3 | Clearly | 6.58 (2.27) | 8.98 (1.95) | -5.47 | < .001 | -0.77 |
|  | **Positive Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Positive or neg | 7.6 (1.31) | 8.8 (2.1) | -3.82 | < .001 | -0.54 |
| 3 | How supported | 6.46 (2.11) | 8.14 (2.78) | -3.68 | < .001 | -0.52 |
| **Study** | **Item** | **Comparison *M* (*SD*)** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***d*** |
|  |  | **Expresser Prediction** | **Expresser Postdiction** |  |  |  |
|  | **Negative Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Awkward | 5.76 (2.57) | 3.3 (2.46) | 7.10 | < .001 | 1.00 |
| 3 | Uncomfortable | 5.74 (2.63) | 3.5 (2.7) | 4.92 | < .001 | 0.70 |
| 3 | Difficult | 5.56 (2.62) | 3.72 (3.01) | 4.37 | < .001 | 0.62 |
| 3 | Draining | 4.08 (2.39) | 2.38 (2.01) | 5.19 | < .001 | 0.73 |
|  | **Warmth** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Sincere | 7.18 (2.22) | 8.3 (2.22) | -4.16 | < .001 | -0.59 |
| 3 | Warm | 6.76 (2.2) | 8.16 (1.92) | -5.90 | < .001 | -0.83 |
|  | **Competence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Articulate | 6.9 (2.32) | 7.54 (2.3) | -1.82 | .074 | -0.26 |
| 3 | Clearly | 6.58 (2.27) | 7.76 (2.2) | -3.89 | < .001 | -0.55 |
|  | **Positive Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Positive or neg | 7.6 (1.31) | 8.06 (1.97) | -2.07 | .043 | -0.29 |
| 3 | How supported | 6.46 (2.11) | 7.08 (2.72) | -2.07 | .044 | -0.29 |
|  |  | **Expresser Postdiction** | **Recipient Experience** |  |  |  |
|  | **Negative Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Awkward | 3.3 (2.46) | 4.04 (2.95) | -1.42 | .163 | -0.20 |
| 3 | Uncomfortable | 3.5 (2.7) | 4.12 (2.87) | -1.28 | .208 | -0.18 |
| 3 | Difficult | 3.72 (3.01) | 3.58 (2.95) | 0.29 | .776 | 0.04 |
| 3 | Draining | 2.38 (2.01) | 2.88 (2.13) | -1.17 | .246 | -0.17 |
|  | **Warmth** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Sincere | 8.3 (2.22) | 9.3 (2.26) | -2.60 | .012 | -0.37 |
| 3 | Warm | 8.16 (1.92) | 9.06 (2.23) | -2.87 | .006 | -0.41 |
|  | **Competence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Articulate | 7.54 (2.3) | 8.64 (2.43) | -2.68 | .010 | -0.38 |
| 3 | Clearly | 7.76 (2.2) | 8.98 (1.95) | -3.06 | .004 | -0.43 |
|  | **Positive Effects** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3 | Positive or neg | 8.06 (1.97) | 8.8 (2.1) | -2.62 | .012 | -0.37 |
| 3 | How supported | 7.08 (2.72) | 8.14 (2.78) | -2.47 | .017 | -0.35 |
|  |  | **Expresser** | **Recipient** |  |  |  |
|  | **Warmth** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Genuine | 7.78 (2.84) | 8.78 (2.24) | -3.40 | <.001 | -0.39 |
| 4 | Caring | 7.74 (2.50) | 8.74 (1.89) | -3.92 | <.001 | -0.45 |
| 4 | Grateful | 7.19 (2.80) | 9.33 (1.87) | -7.78 | <.001 | -0.90 |
|  | **Competence** |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4 | Useful | 8.09 (2.51) | 7.77 (2.67) | 1.05 | .297 | 0.12 |
| 4 | Capable | 6.48 (3.12) | 6.16 (3.04) | 0.91 | .363 | 0.11 |
| 4 | How exactly | 8.46 (2.23) | 7.74 (2.43) | 2.70 | .007 | 0.31 |

**Study 1 pre-registered analyses**

In our pre-registered analyses, we examined the extent to which participants’ expectations about the recipients’ responses were related to their reported likelihood of expressing support by first calculating the correlation between our measures across the five imagined targets for each individual participant. We then used those correlations as an index variable and tested whether the resulting distributions differed significantly from an average correlation of zero using one-sample *t*-tests. Replicating the results presented in the main text, the average correlations between our measures were all significantly larger than zero, such that participants reported being more likely to express support to the targets that they expected would respond more positively (Table S2).

Table S2. Correlation coefficients between measures and their significance.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Need | Awkward | Mood | Supported | Certainty |
| Likelihood | .22\*\*\* | -.51\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | .48\*\*\* | .39\*\*\* |
| Need | -- | -.13\*\*\* | .12\*\*\* | .22\*\*\* | .18\*\*\* |
| Awkward |  | -- | -.35\*\*\* | -47\*\*\* | -.34\*\*\* |
| Mood |  |  | -- | .49\*\*\* | .40\*\*\* |
| Supported |  |  |  | -- | .42\*\*\* |
| Certainty |  |  |  |  | -- |

*Note:* Correlation coefficients reflect the average correlation between measures for all participants’ ratings of the five targets. *P*-values are based on a *one-sample t*-test. \**p* <.05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001

# Supplementary Study S1

In a replication of Study 1 in the main text, we again test if expectations of a recipient’s response guide people’s interest in expressing support to that person.

## Methods

*Participants*. We recruited participants from Amazon’s Mechanical Turk platform. Per our preregistration, we excluded participants who completed the survey in under 120 seconds or failed to follow instructions, yielding a final sample of 100 participants (age: *M* = 33.42, *SD* = 10.25; 47% female).

*Procedure.*The procedure was identical to Study 1 in the main text, though we included fewer dependent measures. We again asked participants to think about 5 specific people they might be able to express support to who were going through a complicated time, facing a tough situation, or enduring a difficult moment in their lives: a family member, friend, someone they know from work, a member of their community, and an acquaintance. We randomized the order of recipients across participants. For each recipient, participants listed their initials, indicated the precise nature of their relationship (e.g., parent, sibling, teacher), and described why this person needs support.

Participants then imagined what it would be like to send a supportive message to each person and what they would say. For each message, participants reported the extent to which each recipient needed support, how awkward the recipient would feel after reading the message and how positively or negatively the message would make the recipient feel (compared to how they normally feel). Finally, participants reported how likely they are to actually send a message to each target. Participants reported their response to each item on 11-point scales from (0) *not at all* to (10) e*xtremely*, with the exception of the mood measure which was rated from (-5) *much more negative than normal* to (5) *much more positive than normal*, with the midpoint labeled as (0) *no different from normal*. Finally, participants reported their age and gender.

## Results

To examine the extent to which participants’ expectations about the recipients’ responses were related to their likelihood of expressing support, we again used repeated measures correlations (Bakdash & Marusich, 2017). Replicating the findings of Study 1 in the main text, significant correlations indicated that participants reported being more likely to express support to the targets that they expected would respond more positively (Table S3).

Table S3. Repeated measures correlation coefficients between measures in Study S1.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Need | Awkward | Mood |
| Likelihood | .28\*\*\*[.18, .37] | -.61\*\*\*[-.67, -.54] | .54\*\*\*[.47, .61] |
| Need | -- | -.06[-.16, .04] | .11\*[.01, .21] |
| Awkward |  | -- | -.58\*\*\*[-.64, -.51] |
| Mood |  |  | -- |

*Note.* Correlation coefficients are the overall within-participant association between measures. The 95% confidence intervals shown in brackets are estimated using the Fisher transformation. \**p* <.05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001

As in Study 1, our pre-registered analyses for this replication used what we later learned to be a suboptimal method for calculating these correlations that relied on averaging correlations across participants. Specifically, we calculated the correlation between our measures across the five imagined targets for each individual participant and then used those correlations as an index variable. We tested whether the resulting distributions differed significantly from an average correlation of zero using one-sample *t*-tests. Calculating the correlations between our measures in this way replicated the results of the analysis method above. Likelihood was significantly correlated with need, *r* = .27, *one-sample* *t*(84) = 4.89, *p* < .001, awkward, *r* = -.57, *one-sample* *t*(87) = -11.23, *p* < .001, and mood, *r* = .53, *one-sample* *t*(87) = 10.64, *p* < .001. Additionally, mood was significantly correlated with both need, *r* = .16, *one-sample* *t*(89) = 2.70, *p* = .004, and awkward, *r* = -.55, *one-sample* *t*(92) = -12.09, *p* <.001. Need was not significantly correlated with awkward, *r* = -.04, *one-sample* *t*(91) = -0.75, *p* = .228.

Given the collinearity between our measures, we also conducted an exploratory linear mixed model with likelihood of expressing support as the outcome variable, participant- and target-specific intercepts as random effects, and need, awkwardness, and mood as predictors. Critically, expectations of the recipients’ reactions again predicted participants’ reported likelihood of expressing support: how awkward the recipients would feel, *b* = -0.32, *SE* = .04, *t*(466.0) = -8.30, *p* < .001, and how positive or negative the recipients would feel, *b* = 0.43, *SE* = .06, *t*(473.8) = 6.98, *p* < .001. Unlike in Study 1 in the main text, judgments of the recipient’s need also predicted likelihood of expressing support, *b* = 0.35, *SE* = .05, *t*(447.1) = 7.08, *p* < .001. Together, these results provide further evidence for our first hypothesis that expectations of how positively recipients will respond guide people’s decisions to express support or not.