**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*

**A graph with a line and a number

Description automatically generated**

**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* = .37  CI95% =  [-.26, .1.93] | *t* = 3.54 *p* < .001 *d* = .48  CI95% =  [.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* = .21  CI95% =  [-.72, 1.72] | *t* = 3.93 *p* < .001 *d* = .51  CI95% =  [.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* = .006  ηp2 = .041  CI95% =  [.17, .96] | *F* = 1.86  *p* = .175  ηp2 = .010  CI95% =  [-.15, .80] | *F* = 2.30  *p* = .131  ηp2 = .012  CI95% =  [-.10, .78] | *F* = 8.88  *p* = .003  ηp2 = .046  CI95% =  [.22, 1.09] | *F* = 1.06  *p* = .304  ηp2 = .006  CI95% =  [-.21, .67] | *F* = 2.97  *p* = .086  ηp2 = .016  CI95% =  [-.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* = .006  ηp2 = .039  CI95% =  [.16, .94] | *F* = 1.60  *p* = .208  ηp2 = .008  CI95% =  [-.16, .74] | *F* = .25  *p* = .621  ηp2 = .001  CI95% =  [-.34, .57] | *F* = 2.37  *p* = .125  ηp2 = .012  CI95% =  [-.09, .74] | *F* = 4.22  *p* = .041  ηp2 = .021  CI95% =  [.02, .85] | *F* = 9.77  *p* = .002  ηp2 = .048  CI95% =  [.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* = .23  CI95% =  [.01, .88] | *t* = 3.09 *p* = .003 *d* = .35  CI95% =  [.24, 1.11] | *t* = 3.63 *p* < .001 *d* = .41  CI95% =  [.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* = .18  CI95% =  [-.12, .84] | *t* = 2.32 *p* = .024 *d* = .28  CI95% =  [.08, 1.03] | *t* = 3.23 *p* = .002 *d* = .39  CI95% =  [.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* = .002  ηp2 = .033  CI95% =  [.23, 1.00] | *F* = 6.17 *p* = .014  ηp2 = .021  CI95% =  [.11, .98] | *F* = 3.00  *p* = .085  ηp2 = .010  CI95% =  [-.05, .80] | *F* = 4.26  *p* = .040  ηp2 = .015  CI95% =  [.02, .78] | *F* = 3.20  *p* = .075  ηp2 = .011  CI95% =  [.04, .79] | *F* = 17.14 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .057  CI95% =  [.40, 1.13] |
| *Observer* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 7.01  *p* = .009  ηp2 = .024  CI95% =  [.13, .91] | *F* = 6.42 *p* = .012  ηp2 = .022  CI95% =  [.13, 1.00] | *F* = .84  *p* = .361  ηp2 = .003  CI95% =  [-.23, .63] | *F* = 8.61  *p* = .004  ηp2 = .029  CI95% =  [.19, .95] | *F* = 4.36  *p* = .038  ηp2 = .015  CI95% =  [.03, .86] | *F* = 14.06 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .047  CI95% =  [.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 <* .001  ηp2 = .057  CI95% =  [.40, 1.16] | *F* = 10.67  *p* = .001  ηp2 = .038  CI95% =  [.31, 1.26] | *F* = 4.13  *p* = .043  ηp2 = .015  CI95% =  [.01, .89] | *F* = 15.07  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .053  CI95% =  [.39, 1.19] | *F* = 21.38  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .074  CI95% =  [.55, 1.36] | *F* = 16.00  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .056  CI95% =  [.38, 1.12] |
| *Observer* vs. *Inviter* | *F* = 18.06 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .063 CI95% =  [.45, 1.22] | *F* = 8.76  *p* = .003  ηp2 = .032  CI95% =  [.24, 1.20] | *F* = 5.13  *p* = .024  ηp2 = .019 CI95% =  [.07, .96] | *F* = 14.08  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .050 CI95% =  [.37, 1.17] | *F* = 12.92 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .046  CI95% =  [.34, 1.16] | *F* = 12.58  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .045  CI95% =  [.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* < .001  ηp2 = .067  CI95% =  [.37, .94] | *F* = 22.02 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .071  CI95% =  [.50, 1.22] | *F* = 6.84  *p* = .009  ηp2 = .023  CI95% =  [.12, .83] | *F* = 22.18  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .072  CI95% =  [.43, 1.05] | *F* = 13.01 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .043  CI95% =  [.29, .97] | *F* = 20.31 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .066  CI95% =  [.39, .99] | *F* = 12.54 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .042  CI95% =  [.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* < .001  ηp2 = .042  CI95% =  [.25, .86] | *F* = 7.85 *p* = .005  ηp2 = .027  CI95% =  [.16, .91] | *F* = .53  *p* = .468  ηp2 = .002  CI95% =  [.25, .54] | *F* = 3.63  *p* = .058  ηp2 = .012  CI95% =  [-.01, .60] | *F* = 9.22 *p* = .003  ηp2 = .031  CI95% =  [.19, .89] | *F* = 15.28  *p* < .001  ηp2 = .051  CI95% =  [.31, .94] | *F* = 5.98  *p* = .015  ηp2 = .020  CI95% =  [.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* = .006  ηp2 = .019  CI95% =  [.12, .69] | *F* = 7.64 *p* = .006  ηp2 = .019  CI95% =  [.13, .76] | *F* = 1.04 *p* = .308  ηp2 = .003  CI95% =  [-.15, .49] | *F* = 10.85  *p* = .001  ηp2 = .027  CI95% =  [.19, .77] | *F* = 10.24 *p* = .001  ηp2 = .025  CI95% =  [.19, .79] | *F* = 15.06 *p* < .001  ηp2 = .037  CI95% =  [.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* = .373  ηp2 = .002  CI95% =  [-.42, .16] | *F* = .87 *p* = .352  ηp2 = .002  CI95% =  [-.16, .44] | *F* = 1.85 *p* = .174  ηp2 = .005  CI95% =  [-.10, .54] | *F* = .79 *p* = .374  ηp2 = .002  CI95% =  [-.42, .16] | *F* = 2.05 *p* = .153  ηp2 = .005  CI95% =  [-.52, .08] | *F* = 2.32  *p* = .129  ηp2 = .006  CI95% =  [-.51, .07] |