**Online Supplemental Materials**

**Pilot Study 1**

A total of 51 Prolific participants (no exclusions: 59% female; *Mage* = 39.0, *SDage* = 13.9) completed the study. Participants were asked whether they had ever attended a social activity that they did not want to attend because of a concern about the negative consequences that would arise in the eyes of the person who invited them if they declined (e.g., upsetting them, angering them, etc.). We found that 77% indicated they had.

**Pilot Study 2**

A total of 52 Prolific participants (no exclusions: 44% female; *Mage* = 38.2, *SDage* = 13.4) completed the study. Participants were asked (in random order) whether they had ever: i) invited someone to a social activity but were turned down because the other person indicated that they just wanted to stay home, and ii) been invited by someone to a social activity but turned them down and indicated that they just wanted to stay home. We found that, for the former, 69% of participants answered in the affirmative, and for the latter, 75% did.

**Study 1 Factor Analysis**

We conducted a factor analysis on the six measures. We used the Principal Components method for factor extraction (minimum eigenvalue set to 1) along with a Varimax rotation. This analysis revealed that four of the measures—Anger, Lack Of Care About Inviter, Disappointment, and Relationship Harm—loaded onto one factor involving Immediate Negative Ramifications (explaining 58% of the variance), while two—Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations and Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations—loaded onto another factor involving Delayed Negative Ramifications (explaining 22% of the variance). The scree plot for the factor analysis is displayed in Figure OSM1. In addition, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .77, the Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity was significant (*p* < .001), and the loadings for Immediate Negative Ramifications and Delayed Negative Ramifications, respectively, were as follows: Anger (.86, .14), Lack Of Care About Inviter (.85, .21), Disappointment (.80, .08), Relationship Harm (.86, .27), Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations (.18, .93), Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations (.18, .93). Finally, we conducted a parallel analysis to compare the eigenvalues that emerged from our dataset to the eigenvalues from 1,000 randomly generated correlation matrices (see Table OSM1). As Table OSM1 shows, the eigenvalues for the first two factors that emerged from our dataset were larger than both the average eigenvalues and the 95th percentile eigenvalues for the first two factors from the simulated dataset, whereas they were smaller for the remaining factors.

**Number of Invitees Analyses**

As mentioned in the paper, in Studies 1, 3, and 4, we collapsed across the Number Of Invitees manipulation due to this aspect playing a limited role. In each study, we conducted an ANOVA on both Immediate Negative Ramifications and Delayed Negative Ramifications, with Role, Number of Invitees, and their interaction entered as dependent variables. The interaction was never significant. Across the studies, the *p*s for the interaction term on Immediate and Delayed Negative Ramifications, respectively, were as follows: Study 1: *p* = .571, *p* =.406; Study 3: *p* = .576, *p* =.559; Study 4: *p* = .132, *p* = .733. The same was true for Study 4’s Focus On Behavior vs. Thoughts difference score. The interaction was not significant: *p* = .578.

**Study 2 Relationship Length and Status**

 As mentioned in the paper, in Study 2, we collected data on relationship status (24% dating, 6% engaged, 69% married, 1% other) and relationship length (4% less than six months, 1% six to twelve months, 21% one to five years, 74% more than five years). As is evident, both questions were dominated by one answer (married, more than five years), with only one other answer choice being selected relatively often for each question (dating, one to five years). Table OSM1 displays the results split across these answer choices. Importantly, even though the difference was not significant in some cases (due to the small sample size when splitting the data), the results were always in the predicted direction.

**Figure OSM1**

*Scree Plot for Study 1 Factor Analysis*

****

**Table OSM1**

*Study 1 Parallel Analysis*

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|  | Eigenvalue From Actual Dataset | Mean Eigenvalue From Randomly Generated Correlation Matrices | 95th Percentile Eigenvalue From Randomly Generated Correlation Matrices |
| Factor 1 (Immediate Negative Ramifications) | 3.47 | 1.17 | 1.24 |
| Factor 2(Delayed Negative Ramifications) | 1.33 | 1.09 | 1.14 |
| Factor 3 | .47 | 1.03 | 1.06 |
| Factor 4 | .33 | .97 | 1.00 |
| Factor 5 | .22 | .91 | .95 |
| Factor 6 | .18 | .84 | .89 |

**Table OSM2**

*Study 2 Results Split By Relationship Status and Length*

|  |
| --- |
| Relationship Status |
|  | Dating (*n* = 19)Immediate Negative Ramifications | Married (*n* = 55)Immediate Negative Ramifications |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 3.67*SD* = 1.71 | *M* = 3.48*SD* = 1.53 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 2.83*SD* = 2.13 | *M* = 2.83*SD* = 1.43 |
|  | *t* = 1.60 *p* = .127*d* = .37CI95% = [-.26, .1.93] | *t* = 3.54*p* < .001*d* = .48CI95% = [.29, 1.03] |
| Relationship Length |
|  | One To Five Years (*n* = 17)Immediate Negative Ramifications | More Than Five Years (*n* = 59)Immediate Negative Ramifications |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 3.82*SD* = 1.63 | *M* = 3.45*SD* = 1.54 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 3.32*SD* = 2.10 | *M* = 2.74*SD* = 1.40 |
|  | *t* = .87*p* = .397*d* = .21CI95% = [-.72, 1.72] | *t* = 3.93*p* < .001*d* = .51CI95% = [.35, 1.07] |

*Note*. These results come after applying our pre-determined exclusion protocol.

**Table OSM3**

*Study 1 Results*

|  |
| --- |
| *Number Of Invitees – One* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.36*SD* = 1.43 | *M* = 3.04*SD* = 1.61 | *M* = 3.76 *SD* = 1.47 | *M* = 2.73*SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 3.56*SD* = 1.35 | *M* = 3.31 *SD* = 1.24 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.80*SD* = 1.31 | *M* = 2.71*SD* = 1.65 | *M* = 3.42*SD* = 1.58 | *M* = 2.07*SD* = 1.46 | *M* = 3.33*SD* = 1.67 | *M* = 2.95 *SD* = 1.55 |
|  | *F* = 7.86 *p* = .006ηp2 = .041CI95% = [.17, .96] | *F* = 1.86 *p* = .175ηp2 = .010CI95% = [-.15, .80] | *F* = 2.30 *p* = .131ηp2 = .012CI95% = [-.10, .78] | *F* = 8.88 *p* = .003ηp2 = .046CI95% = [.22, 1.09] | *F* = 1.06 *p* = .304ηp2 = .006CI95% = [-.21, .67] | *F* = 2.97 *p* = .086ηp2 = .016CI95% = [-.05, .76] |
| *Number Of Invitees – Multiple* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.36*SD* = 1.45 | *M* = 2.98*SD* = 1.56 | *M* = 3.50 *SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 2.58*SD* = 1.40 | *M* = 3.29*SD* = 1.53 | *M* = 3.26 *SD* = 1.41 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.81*SD* = 1.30 | *M* = 2.69*SD* = 1.63 | *M* = 3.39 *SD* = 1.65 | *M* = 2.26*SD* = 1.54 | *M* = 2.86*SD* = 1.43 | *M* = 2.64 *SD* = 1.35 |
|  | *F* = 7.87 *p* = .006ηp2 = .039CI95% = [.16, .94] | *F* = 1.60 *p* = .208ηp2 = .008CI95% = [-.16, .74] | *F* = .25 *p* = .621ηp2 = .001CI95% = [-.34, .57] | *F* = 2.37 *p* = .125ηp2 = .012CI95% = [-.09, .74] | *F* = 4.22 *p* = .041ηp2 = .021CI95% = [.02, .85] | *F* = 9.77 *p* = .002ηp2 = .048CI95% = [.23, 1.01] |

**Table OSM4**

*Study 2 Results*

|  |
| --- |
| Following The Pre-Registered Exclusion Protocol |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.75*SD* = 1.67 | *M* = 3.43*SD* = 1.95 | *M* = 4.46 *SD* = 1.76 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 2.31*SD* = 1.76 | *M* = 2.76*SD* = 1.95 | *M* = 3.68*SD* = 1.98 |
|  | *t* = 2.04 *p* = .044*d* = .23CI95% = [.01, .88] | *t* = 3.09*p* = .003*d* = .35CI95% = [.24, 1.11] | *t* = 3.63*p* < .001*d* = .41CI95% = [.35, 1.21] |
| Adding Two Additional Exclusion Criteria |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.65*SD* = 1.58 | *M* = 3.38*SD* = 1.95 | *M* = 4.44 *SD* = 1.73 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 2.29*SD* = 1.76 | *M* = 2.83*SD* = 2.03 | *M* = 3.66*SD* = 1.94 |
|  | *t* = 1.52 *p* = .134*d* = .18CI95% = [-.12, .84] | *t* = 2.32*p* = .024*d* = .28CI95% = [.08, 1.03] | *t* = 3.23*p* = .002*d* = .39CI95% = [.30, 1.27] |

**Table OSM5**

*Study 3 Results*

|  |
| --- |
| *Number Of Invitees – One* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.38*SD* = 1.36 | *M* = 2.90*SD* = 1.62 | *M* = 3.87*SD* = 1.43 | *M* = 2.35*SD* = 1.36 | *M* = 3.35*SD* = 1.43 | *M* = 3.25 *SD* = 1.37 |
| *Observer* | *M* = 2.28*SD* = 1.44 | *M* = 2.92*SD* = 1.46 | *M* = 3.70*SD* = 1.42 | *M* = 2.52*SD* = 1.33 | *M* = 3.42*SD* = 1.28 | *M* = 3.18 *SD* = 1.19 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.76*SD* = 1.29 | *M* = 2.36*SD* = 1.51 | *M* = 3.50*SD* = 1.67 | *M* = 1.95*SD* = 1.32 | *M* = 2.97*SD* = 1.66 | *M* = 2.49*SD* = 1.28 |
| *Invitee* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 9.81 *p* = .002ηp2 = .033CI95% = [.23, 1.00] | *F* = 6.17*p* = .014ηp2 = .021CI95% = [.11, .98] | *F* = 3.00 *p* = .085ηp2 = .010CI95% = [-.05, .80] | *F* = 4.26 *p* = .040ηp2 = .015CI95% = [.02, .78] | *F* = 3.20 *p* = .075ηp2 = .011CI95% = [.04, .79] | *F* = 17.14*p* < .001ηp2 = .057CI95% = [.40, 1.13] |
| *Observer* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 7.01 *p* = .009ηp2 = .024CI95% = [.13, .91] | *F* = 6.42*p* = .012ηp2 = .022CI95% = [.13, 1.00] | *F* = .84 *p* = .361ηp2 = .003CI95% = [-.23, .63] | *F* = 8.61 *p* = .004ηp2 = .029CI95% = [.19, .95] | *F* = 4.36 *p* = .038ηp2 = .015CI95% = [.03, .86] | *F* = 14.06*p* < .001ηp2 = .047CI95% = [.33, 1.06] |
| *Number Of Invitees – Multiple* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.35*SD* = 1.29 | *M* = 3.03*SD* = 1.59 | *M* = 3.78*SD* = 1.35 | *M* = 2.60*SD* = 1.36 | *M* = 3.47*SD* = 1.35 | *M* = 3.26 *SD* = 1.20 |
| *Observer* | *M* = 2.40*SD* = 1.49 | *M* = 2.97*SD* = 1.67 | *M* = 3.84*SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 2.58*SD* = 1.48 | *M* = 3.27*SD* = 1.39 | *M* = 3.19*SD* = 1.25 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.57*SD* = 1.11 | *M* = 2.25*SD* = 1.60 | *M* = 3.33*SD* = 1.61 | *M* = 1.81*SD* = 1.27 | *M* = 2.52*SD* = 1.42 | *M* = 2.51 *SD* = 1.35 |
| *Invitee* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 16.09 *p <* .001ηp2 = .057CI95% = [.40, 1.16] | *F* = 10.67 *p* = .001ηp2 = .038CI95% = [.31, 1.26] | *F* = 4.13 *p* = .043ηp2 = .015CI95% = [.01, .89] | *F* = 15.07 *p* < .001ηp2 = .053CI95% = [.39, 1.19] | *F* = 21.38 *p* < .001ηp2 = .074CI95% = [.55, 1.36] | *F* = 16.00 *p* < .001ηp2 = .056CI95% = [.38, 1.12] |
| *Observer* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 18.06*p* < .001ηp2 = .063 CI95% = [.45, 1.22] | *F* = 8.76 *p* = .003ηp2 = .032CI95% = [.24, 1.20] | *F* = 5.13 *p* = .024ηp2 = .019 CI95% = [.07, .96] | *F* = 14.08 *p* < .001ηp2 = .050 CI95% = [.37, 1.17] | *F* = 12.92*p* < .001ηp2 = .046 CI95% = [.34, 1.16] | *F* = 12.58 *p* < .001ηp2 = .045CI95% = [.30, 1.05] |

**Table OSM6**

*Study 4 Results*

|  |
| --- |
| *Number Of Invitees – One* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations | Focus On Behavior vs. Thoughts Difference Score |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.16*SD* = 1.36 | *M* = 2.86*SD* = 1.72 | *M* = 3.84*SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 2.32*SD* = 1.48 | *M* = 2.82*SD* = 1.58 | *M* = 2.77*SD* = 1.39 | *M* = +.11*SD* = 1.57 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.50*SD* = 1.08 | *M* = 2.00*SD* = 1.37 | *M* = 3.36*SD* = 1.54 | *M* = 1.58*SD* = 1.17 | *M* = 2.19*SD* = 1.38 | *M* = 2.08*SD* = 1.19 | *M* = -.56*SD* = 1.65 |
|  | *F* = 20.66 *p* < .001ηp2 = .067CI95% = [.37, .94] | *F* = 22.02*p* < .001ηp2 = .071CI95% = [.50, 1.22] | *F* = 6.84 *p* = .009ηp2 = .023CI95% = [.12, .83] | *F* = 22.18 *p* < .001ηp2 = .072CI95% = [.43, 1.05] | *F* = 13.01*p* < .001ηp2 = .043CI95% = [.29, .97] | *F* = 20.31*p* < .001ηp2 = .066CI95% = [.39, .99] | *F* = 12.54*p* < .001ηp2 = .042CI95% = [.30, 1.05] |
| *Number Of Invitees – Multiple* |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations | Focus On Behavior vs. Thoughts Difference Score |
| *Invitee* | *M* = 2.20*SD* = 1.43 | *M* = 2.77*SD* = 1.70 | *M* = 3.90 *SD* = 1.59 | *M* = 2.10*SD* = 1.37 | *M* = 2.83*SD* = 1.54 | *M* = 2.82*SD* = 1.40 | *M* = .05*SD* = 1.70 |
| *Inviter* | *M* = 1.65*SD* = 1.21 | *M* = 2.34*SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 3.81*SD* = 1.80 | *M* = 1.81*SD* = 1.24 | *M* = 2.29*SD* = 1.47 | *M* = 2.19*SD* = 1.33 | *M* = -.47*SD* = 1.88 |
|  | *F* = 12.58 *p* < .001ηp2 = .042CI95% = [.25, .86] | *F* = 7.85*p* = .005ηp2 = .027CI95% = [.16, .91] | *F* = .53 *p* = .468ηp2 = .002CI95% = [.25, .54] | *F* = 3.63 *p* = .058ηp2 = .012CI95% = [-.01, .60] | *F* = 9.22*p* = .003ηp2 = .031CI95% = [.19, .89] | *F* = 15.28 *p* < .001ηp2 = .051CI95% = [.31, .94] | *F* = 5.98 *p* = .015ηp2 = .020CI95% = [.10, .93] |

**Table OSM7**

*Study 5 Results*

|  |
| --- |
| First Scenario |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee-Then-Inviter* | *M* = 2.21*SD* = 1.50 | *M* = 2.45*SD* = 1.72 | *M* = 4.05*SD* = 1.55 | *M* = 2.32*SD* = 1.56 | *M* = 2.80*SD* = 1.60 | *M* = 2.61*SD* = 1.52 |
| *Inviter-Then-Invitee* | *M* = 1.81*SD* = 1.40 | *M* = 2.01*SD* = 1.48 | *M* = 3.88*SD* = 1.69 | *M* = 1.84*SD* = 1.33 | *M* = 2.31*SD* = 1.45 | *M* = 2.07*SD* = 1.20 |
|  | *F* = 7.66*p* = .006ηp2 = .019CI95% = [.12, .69] | *F* = 7.64*p* = .006ηp2 = .019CI95% = [.13, .76] | *F* = 1.04*p* = .308ηp2 = .003CI95% = [-.15, .49] | *F* = 10.85 *p* = .001ηp2 = .027CI95% = [.19, .77] | *F* = 10.24*p* = .001ηp2 = .025CI95% = [.19, .79] | *F* = 15.06*p* < .001ηp2 = .037CI95% = [.26, .81] |
| Second Scenario |
|  | Anger | Lack Of Care About Inviter | Disappointment | Relationship Harm | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Offering Future Invitations | Likelihood Of Inviter Not Accepting Future Invitations |
| *Invitee-Then-Inviter* | *M* = 1.91*SD* = 1.47 | *M* = 2.17*SD* = 1.61 | *M* = 3.86 *SD* = 1.63 | *M* = 1.97*SD* = 1.46 | *M* = 2.23*SD* = 1.46 | *M* = 2.14*SD* = 1.39 |
| *Inviter-Then-Invitee* | *M* = 2.05*SD* = 1.46 | *M* = 2.03*SD* = 1.41 | *M* = 3.64*SD* = 1.62 | *M* = 2.10*SD* = 1.48 | *M* = 2.44*SD* = 1.56 | *M* = 2.36*SD* = 1.51 |
|  | *F* = .80*p* = .373ηp2 = .002CI95% = [-.42, .16] | *F* = .87*p* = .352ηp2 = .002CI95% = [-.16, .44] | *F* = 1.85*p* = .174ηp2 = .005CI95% = [-.10, .54] | *F* = .79*p* = .374ηp2 = .002CI95% = [-.42, .16] | *F* = 2.05*p* = .153ηp2 = .005CI95% = [-.52, .08] | *F* = 2.32 *p* = .129ηp2 = .006CI95% = [-.51, .07] |