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Supplemental Method

*Questionnaires*

 Affect. Participants completed the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988) 3 times (at baseline, post-manipulation but pre-TSST, and post-TSST). We computed positive and negative affect composites, then constructed reactivity scores for both pre- and post-TSST by subtracting baseline scores from those obtained at each time, respectively.

Risk perception. A risk perception questionnaire was given post-TSST that asked participants to rate the likelihood of positive and negative events occurring within 1-week, 1-year, and 10-year timeframes by marking the probability on a continuous percentage scale anchored at 0% and 100% (e.g., de Bruin, Parker, & Fischhoff, 2007; Woloshin, Schwartz, Byram, Fischhoff, & Welch, 2000). The probability of positive (Cronbach’s *α* = .708) and negative (Cronbach’s *α* = .756) events were averaged across time, and a risk perception composite was constructed by averaging the probability of negative events and the probability of positive events subtracted from 100%. Thus, higher scores indicated greater risk perception.

*Behavioral Displays*

 After all three raters coded participants’ videotaped speeches, interrater reliability was calculated for each individual item in the coding scheme. Intraclass correlation coefficients (ICCs) for each item are reported in Table 1s. Interrater reliability was high for all items except “defensive,” which was excluded from further analyses.

 Talking Time**.** Since the video recordings of some speeches were not exactly 5 minutes and fixing problems with equipment took time out of some speeches, the percentage of the available talking time that the participant filled with speech was used as a measure of talking time. To calculate this, the amount of time spent pausing (a pause was defined as 5 seconds or longer without any meaningful words spoken) was subtracted from the amount of time available for the speech.

 The full coding manual is available upon request. If you are interested in replicating this project or utilizing the coding scheme presented here, please contact Jeremy Jamieson at jeremy.jamieson@rochester.edu.

*Physiological Measurement*

 Saliva samples were collected using passive drool procedures. Specifically, participants will be told to transfer saliva into a test tube up to a black line [marked at 1 ml] using a sanitary straw (or no straw if they preferred). This method is preferred (time permitting) to the common cotton swab method (i.e. having participants place a cotton pledget in their mouth to absorb saliva) because cotton pledgets can interfere with immunoassay (Shirtcliff, Granger, Schwartz, & Curran, 2001).

Supplemental Results

*Questionnaires*

 Affect. At all three time points when affect was measured, there were significant main effects of social anxiety on negative and positive affect. Socially anxious people reported more negative affect than non-anxious controls at baseline, *F*(1,79) = 41.89, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.46, post-manipulation, pre-TSST, *F*(1,78) = 57.08, *p* < .001, *d* = 1.55, and post-TSST, *F*(1,77) = 19.99, *p* < .001, *d* = .99. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 2s. A main effect was also found for reappraisal instructions on negative affect post-manipulation, pre-TSST, *F*(1,78) = 12.10, *p* = .001, *d* = .56, such that reappraisal lowered negative affect. Post-TSST, we found a marginal interaction between reappraisal and social anxiety on negative affect, *F*(1,77) = 2.83, *p* = .097, *d* = .38, such that receiving reappraisal instructions decreased negative affect after the speech for socially anxious participants, but increased negative affect for non-anxious controls.

 In addition to consistently reporting higher negative affect, socially anxious participants reported lower positive affect than non-anxious controls at baseline, *F*(1,79) = 16.11, *p* < .001, *d* = .91, post-manipulation, pre-TSST, *F*(1,80) = 5.42, *p* = .023, *d* = .51, and post-TSST, *F*(1,77) = 5.80, *p* = .019, *d* = .55. Means and standard deviations are reported in Table 3s. There were no main effects of reappraisal, nor any interactions between reappraisal and social anxiety, on positive affect.

 We also examined the changes in positive and negative affect from baseline to post-manipulation, pre-TSST and post-TSST. Reappraisal participants reported a decrease in negative affect (*M* = -.18, *SD* = .61) from baseline to post-manipulation, pre-TSST, whereas the no instruction group reported an increase in negative affect for this same time interval (*M* = .16, *SD* = .46), *F*(1,79) = 7.66 , *p =*.007, *d* = .63. There was no main effect for social anxiety at this interval, nor was there an interaction, *p*s > .54.

 There was, however a main effect for social anxiety on the change in negative affect reported from baseline to post-TSST, *F*(1,79) = 4.23, *p* = .043, *d* = .48, but no main effect for reappraisal and no interaction, *p*s > .26. Socially anxious participants reported a decrease in negative affect after the speech (*M* = -.16, *SD* = .94), whereas non-anxious controls reported an increase (*M* = .19, *SD* = .42).

 Between baseline and post-manipulation, pre-TSST, participants who received the reappraisal instructions reported a marginal increase in positive affect (*M* = .35, *SD* = 1.38), whereas no instruction controls reported a decrease (*M* = -.16, *SD* = .87), *F*(1,79) = 3.78, *p* = .056, *d* = .44. There was no main effect for social anxiety at this interval, nor was there an interaction, *p*s > .42.

 From baseline to post-TSST, both reappraisal and no-reappraisal groups reported a decrease in positive affect, but this decrease was significantly smaller for the reappraisal group (*M* = -.19, *SD* = .67) than the no-reappraisal group (*M* = -.56, *SD* = .59), *F*(1,79) = 6.60, *p* = .012, *d* = .59. There was no main effect for social anxiety at this interval, nor was there an interaction, *p*s > .52.

 Risk Perception. Analysis of the risk perception composite produced a main effect for social anxiety, *F*(1,81) = 17.81, *p* < .001, *d* = .95, with socially anxious individuals perceiving more risk (*M* = 51.46, *SD* = 10.24) than their non-anxious counterparts (*M* = 42.61, *SD* = 8.23). There was no main effect for instruction condition or interaction, *p*s > .41.

*Behavioral Measures*

 Talking Time & Speech Fluidity. Socially anxious participants spent less time talking (*M* = 81.05, *SD* = 22.67) than did non-anxious controls (*M* = 93.05, *SD* = 9.95), *F*(1,80) = 9.71, *p* = .003, *d* = .69. Socially anxious participants also had less fluid speeches (*M* = 3.01, *SD* = .97) than did non-anxious controls (*M* = 3.58, *SD* = .55), *F*(1,80) = 10.69, *p* = .002, *d* = .72. No other effects reached significance, *p*s > .20.

*Post-hoc Correlations*

To further explore the relationship between affective displays and speech performance, we tested the associations (across the entire sample) between displays of shame and anxiety, nonverbal signaling, and speech performance. Performance was negatively correlated with displays of anxiety, *r* = -.86, *p* < .001, and shame, *r* = -.88, *p* < .001, and positively correlated with approach-oriented nonverbal signaling, *r* = .59, *p* < .001. Talking time, *r*(82) = .805, *p* < .001, and speech fluidity, *r*(82) = .714, *p* < .001, were also positively correlated with performance.

Open-source data access

The full dataset is available in SPSS or Excel format upon request. If you are interested in replicating this project or re-analyzing the data reported here, please contact Jeremy Jamieson at jeremy.jamieson@rochester.edu.

Table 1s. Intra-class correlation coefficients for items included in the behavioral coding.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Coding Scheme Item** | **ICC** |
| Tense/loose | .724 |
| Closed/open | .825 |
| Leaning back/forward | .895 |
| Fidgeting | .867 |
| Gestures | .943 |
| Eye contact | .827 |
| Smiling | .880 |
| Personal disclosure | .719 |
| Self-handicapping | .949 |
| Thought out | .924 |
| Awkward | .881 |
| Confident | .879 |
| Nervous | .872 |
| Comfortable | .885 |
| Performance – Minute 1 | .870 |
| Performance – Minute 2 | .897 |
| Performance – Minute 3 | .913 |
| Performance – Minute 4 | .889 |
| Performance – Minute 5 | .917 |
| Performance – Overall | .912 |
| Fluidity | .736 |
| Embarrassed | .852 |
| Angry | .806 |
| Ashamed | .858 |
| Hostile | .789 |
| Impatient | .845 |
| Agitated | .781 |
| Disengaged | .754 |
| Sad | .710 |
| Defensive | .454 |
| Afraid | .831 |
| Anxious | .837 |

Table 2s. Means and standard deviations for negative affect by social anxiety and instruction condition

|  |
| --- |
| Negative Affect |
| Condition | Baseline | Post-manipulation, pre-TSST | Post-TSST |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| **Socially anxious** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Reappraisal  | 2.20 | .83 | 1.97 | .65 | 1.99 | .71 |
|  No instruction | 2.38 | .73 | 2.56 | .52 | 2.36 | .67 |
| **Non-anxious**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Reappraisal  | 1.39 | .41 | 1.23 | .48 | 1.60 | .56 |
|  No instruction | 1.39 | .34 | 1.48 | .44 | 1.50 | .51 |

Table 3s. Means and standard deviations for positive affect by social anxiety and instruction condition

|  |
| --- |
| Positive Affect |
| Condition | Baseline | Post-manipulation, pre-TSST | Post-TSST |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
| **Socially anxious**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Reappraisal  | 2.07 | .63 | 2.22 | .74 | 2.00 | .83 |
|  No instruction | 2.42 | .68 | 1.97 | .71 | 1.92 | .73 |
| **Non-anxious**  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Reappraisal  | 2.84 | .74 | 2.60 | .98 | 2.54 | .73 |
|  No instruction  | 2.85 | .62 | 2.46 | .90 | 2.22 | .72 |