

**Supplemental Online Materials for:**

**Hiding Success**

**Additional measures and results from reported studies:**

- SOM 1. Same versus mixed gender dyads (Study 1)
- SOM 2. Moderation by relationship closeness (Study 1)
- SOM 3. Complete OLS regression results (Study 2)
- SOM 4. Subscales of paternalistic motives measure (Studies 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7)
- SOM 5. Trust game results (Study 4)
- SOM 6. Time 1 vs. time 2 results (Study 6)
- SOM 7. Discomfort with sharing success (Study 7)
- SOM 8. Results by gender (Studies 1-7)

**Additional studies not reported in the main manuscript:**

- SOM 9. Study S1. Social comparison (communicator perspective)
- SOM 10. Study S2. Social comparison (target perspective)
- SOM 11. Study S3. Communicator mispredictions about hiding success
- SOM 12. Study S4. Hiding success vs. failure replication
- SOM 13. Study S5. Closeness and social comparison
- SOM 14. Study S6. Paternalistic motives pilot
- SOM 15. Study S7. Hiding success naturalistic lab study pre-test

**SOM 1. Same versus mixed gender dyads (Study 1)**

We conducted additional analyses in Study 1, in which we examine how the gender combination of the communicator and target affected our results. In Study 1, there were 65 mixed-sex dyads (32 dyads with a male communicator/female target and 33 dyads with a female communicator/male target) and 86 same-sex dyads (40 dyads of both males and 46 dyads of both females). In this study, the gender combination of the dyad significantly moderated the effect of hiding success on feelings of insult,  $F(1, 147) = 5.75, p = .018$ . In mixed-gender dyads, targets felt significantly more insulted when the communicator hid their success than when they shared their success,  $F(1, 63) = 11.69, p < .001$ . This effect was attenuated in same-gender dyads, where targets only felt marginally more insulted when the communicator hid their success than when they shared their success,  $F(1, 84) = 3.35, p = .071$ . Otherwise, there were no significant differences in the reactions to sharing and hiding success based on the gender combination of the dyads (each  $p > .100$ ). These findings suggest that the relational costs of hiding success may be greater in mixed-gender dyads than in same-gender dyads, however, we are hesitant to over-interpret this post-hoc result.

**SOM 2. Moderation by relationship closeness (Study 1)**

In Study 1, we explored whether the consequences of hiding success were moderated by the target's closeness to the communicator. In order to explore the moderating role of relationship closeness in a naturalistic setting, we ran additional analyses to test the impact of targets' initial closeness (before the manipulation) with the communicator on reactions to sharing and hiding success. We found targets' closeness to their partner significantly moderated their feelings of happiness ( $b = -0.86, p = .001$ ). When communicators shared their success, targets felt similarly happy for the communicator regardless of their relationship closeness ( $b = 0.15, p = .175$ ). However, when communicators hid their success, targets felt happier for the communicator when they were in a close relationship than in a distant relationship ( $b = 1.01, p < .001$ ). These results should be interpreted with caution because participants may have been interpreting the questions differently across the two conditions. Specifically, targets in the Share condition may have reported their happiness for the communicator's success, and targets in the Hide condition (who never learned about the communicator's success) may have been instead thinking generally about their feelings towards the communicator, which were positively correlated with closeness ( $r = .238, p = .003$ ).

Additionally, targets' closeness to their partner marginally moderated their feelings of insult ( $b = -0.22, p = .077$ ) and closeness ( $b = -0.42, p = .099$ ). When communicators shared their success, targets felt similarly insulted by the communicator regardless of their relationship closeness ( $b = 0.01, p = .754$ ). However, when communicators hid their success, targets felt marginally more insulted by the communicator when they were in a close relationship than in a distant relationship ( $b =$

0.23,  $p < .001$ ). While these marginal results should be interpreted with caution, they are consistent with Supplemental Study S5, where we find the strength of the relationship moderates the relational consequences of hiding success. However, while target's felt closer to communicator in close relationships than in distant relationships both when the communicator hid success ( $b = 1.24, p < .001$ ) and shared success ( $b = 0.82, p < .001$ ), hiding success reduced feelings of closeness less in close relationships than in distant relationships. These marginal closeness results should also be interpreted with caution, particularly because the findings conflict with Studies 7 and S5, where we manipulate the strength of the relationship and instead find hiding success reduces feelings of closeness more in close relationships than in distant relationships, presumably because sharing is more normative in close relationships (Chelune, Vosk, Waring, Sultan, & Ogden, 1984; Petronio & Bantz, 1991; Schweitzer & Croson, 1999).

**SOM 3. Complete OLS regression results (Study 2)**

In Study 2, we ran OLS regressions on all of the dependent measures, using Decision to Share, Previous Knowledge, and the Decision to Share x Previous Knowledge interaction as independent variables (Model 1). For completeness, we replicated this analysis adding Scenario as an independent variable (Model 2) and the Scenario x Decision to Share and Scenario x Previous Knowledge interactions (Model 3). Adding these terms does not qualitatively change our results.

**Table S1.** OLS Regression Results (Study 2,  $N = 403$ )

|                           |   | Model 1           | Model 2           | Model 3           |
|---------------------------|---|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| <b>Manipulation Check</b> | Intercept   | 2.13***<br>(0.10) | 2.21***<br>(0.10) | 2.17***<br>(0.12) |
|                           | Previous knowledge                                | 0.04<br>(0.12)    | 0.04<br>(0.12)    | 0.09<br>(0.17)    |
|                           | Decision to Share                                 | 0.11<br>(0.14)    | 0.11<br>(0.14)    | 0.04<br>(0.18)    |
|                           | Scenario  |                   | -0.16*<br>(0.07)  | -0.08<br>(0.18)   |
|                           | Previous knowledge x Decision to Share            | 1.60***<br>(0.18) | 1.60***<br>(0.18) | 1.81***<br>(0.23) |
|                           | Previous knowledge x Scenario                     |                   |                   | -0.10<br>(0.27)   |
|                           | Decision to Share x Scenario                      |                   |                   | 0.15<br>(0.27)    |
|                           | Previous knowledge x Decision to Share x Scenario |                   |                   | -0.40<br>(0.35)   |
|                           | R-squared   | 0.25              | 0.26              | 0.26              |
| <b>Insult</b>             | Intercept   | 1.63***<br>(0.08) | 1.60***<br>(0.09) | 1.52***<br>(0.10) |
|                           | Previous knowledge                                | 0.09<br>(0.10)    | 0.09<br>(0.10)    | 0.14<br>(0.15)    |
|                           | Decision to Share                                 | 1.15***<br>(0.14) | 1.15***<br>(0.14) | 1.32***<br>(0.19) |
|                           | Scenario  |                   | 0.05<br>(0.06)    | 0.21<br>(0.15)    |
|                           | Previous knowledge                                | -0.93***          | -0.93***          | -1.06***          |
|                           |   |                   |                   |                   |

|                  |                      |          |          |          |
|------------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|
|                  | x Decision to Share  | (0.19)   | (0.19)   | (0.26)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   |          |          | -0.10    |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.25)   |
|                  | Decision to Share    |          |          | -0.34    |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.26)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge x |          |          | 0.27     |
|                  | Decision to Share x  |          |          |          |
|                  | Scenario             |          |          | (0.37)   |
|                  | R-squared            | 0.11     | 0.11     | 0.11     |
| <b>Closeness</b> | Intercept            | 4.94***  | 5.17***  | 5.22***  |
|                  |                      | (0.11)   | (0.12)   | (0.14)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   | -0.10    | -0.11    | -0.04    |
|                  |                      | (0.15)   | (0.14)   | (0.20)   |
|                  | Decision to Share    | -1.40*** | -1.40*** | -1.57*** |
|                  |                      | (0.16)   | (0.16)   | (0.22)   |
|                  | Scenario             |          | -0.47*** | -0.56**  |
|                  |                      |          | (0.08)   | (0.19)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   | 1.04***  | 1.06***  | 1.05***  |
|                  | x Decision to Share  | (0.22)   | (0.22)   | (0.31)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   |          |          | -0.13    |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.30)   |
|                  | Decision to Share    |          |          | 0.32     |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.29)   |
| <b>Happy</b>     | Previous knowledge x |          |          | 0.01     |
|                  | Decision to Share x  |          |          |          |
|                  | Scenario             |          |          | (0.42)   |
|                  | R-squared            | 0.12     | 0.14     | 0.14     |
|                  | Intercept            | 5.91***  | 6.10***  | 6.06***  |
|                  |                      | (0.10)   | (0.10)   | (0.11)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   | -0.04    | -0.05    | -0.12    |
|                  |                      | (0.12)   | (0.16)   | (0.17)   |
|                  | Decision to Share    | -1.00*** | -1.00*** | -0.87*** |
|                  |                      | (0.15)   | (0.15)   | (0.19)   |
|                  | Scenario             |          | -0.38*** | -0.30    |
|                  |                      |          | (0.08)   | (0.17)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   | -0.78*** | -0.77*** | -0.71**  |
|                  | x Decision to Share  | (0.20)   | (0.20)   | (0.27)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge   |          |          | 0.15     |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.27)   |
|                  | Decision to Share    |          |          | -0.26    |
|                  | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.28)   |
|                  | Previous knowledge x |          |          | -0.12    |
|                  | Decision to Share x  |          |          | (0.42)   |

| Scenario    |                      |          |          |          |
|-------------|----------------------|----------|----------|----------|
| R-squared   |                      | 0.21     | 0.22     | 0.22     |
| <b>Envy</b> | Intercept            | 4.04***  | 3.98***  | 3.82***  |
|             |                      | (0.14)   | (0.15)   | (0.19)   |
|             | Previous knowledge   | 0.11     | 0.11     | 0.33     |
|             |                      | (0.19)   | (0.19)   | (0.27)   |
|             | Decision to Share    | 0.03     | 0.04     | 0.27     |
|             |                      | (0.20)   | (0.20)   | (0.27)   |
|             | Scenario             |          | 0.14     | 0.45     |
|             |                      |          | (0.10)   | (0.24)   |
|             | Previous knowledge   | -2.07*** | -2.08*** | -2.40*** |
|             | x Decision to Share  | (0.26)   | (0.26)   | (0.37)   |
|             | Previous knowledge   |          |          | -0.45    |
|             | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.38)   |
|             | Decision to Share    |          |          | -0.48    |
|             | x Scenario           |          |          | (0.37)   |
|             | Previous knowledge x |          |          | 0.65     |
|             | Decision to Share x  |          |          |          |
|             | Scenario             |          |          | (0.50)   |
| R-squared   |                      | 0.18     | 0.18     | 0.18     |

*Note.* \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . Standard error in parenthesis. Model 1 includes Previous knowledge, Decision to Share, Previous knowledge x Decision to Share. Model 2 includes also includes Scenario, while Model 3 also includes the Previous knowledge x Scenario, Decision to Share x Scenario, and Previous knowledge x Decision to Share x Scenario interactions.

**SOM 4. Subscales of paternalistic motives measure (Studies 3, 4, 5, 6, and 7)**

In additional analyses, we explored how hiding success (and failure) differentially influenced the two sub-components of the paternalistic motives mechanism: the communicator's assumption that the target is threatened (six items: To what extent would you believe [the communicator] thought: (1) "You would be upset?" (2) "You could not handle the truth?" (3) "You would be envious?" (4) "You would be happy for them?" (Reverse-scored) (5) "You could not handle learning about their success?" (6) "You would feel threatened?") and the communicator's attempt to regulate the target's threat (three items: "To what extent would you believe [the communicator] was: (7) "Attempting to regulate your emotions?" (8) "Attempting to manipulate your feelings?" (9) "Being condescending?").

Results of these analyses are below. Overall, we find that hiding success increases the target's perception that the communicator both assumed the target would be threatened and attempted to regulate the target's threat.

**Table S2.** Descriptive statistics

|                |                       | Assume Threat |           |          |           | Regulate Threat |           |          |           |
|----------------|-----------------------|---------------|-----------|----------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|----------|-----------|
|                |                       | Share         |           | Hide     |           | Share           |           | Hide     |           |
|                |                       | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>        | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| <b>Study 3</b> | Total                 | 4.34          | 1.19      | 2.83     | 1.19      | 3.00            | 1.27      | 2.12     | 1.22      |
| <b>Study 4</b> | Success               | 2.31          | 0.64      | 3.79     | 1.31      | 1.37            | 0.84      | 2.74     | 1.68      |
|                | Failure               | 2.25          | 0.77      | 2.27     | 0.52      | 1.37            | 0.97      | 1.81     | 1.15      |
| <b>Study 5</b> | Public                | 3.09          | 1.34      | 4.14     | 1.23      | 1.88            | 0.96      | 2.99     | 1.21      |
|                | Private               | 2.93          | 1.06      | 4.40     | 1.29      | 1.95            | 1.18      | 3.42     | 1.45      |
| <b>Study 6</b> | Direct                | 2.75          | 1.08      | 4.79     | 1.22      | 3.39            | 1.35      | 2.04     | 1.12      |
|                | Indirect              | 2.90          | 1.16      | 4.47     | 1.31      | 2.93            | 1.25      | 2.41     | 1.21      |
| <b>Study 7</b> | Close relationships   | 1.89          | 0.85      | 3.06     | 1.90      | 1.36            | 0.53      | 2.32     | 1.45      |
|                | Distant relationships | 2.37          | 1.13      | 3.83     | 1.61      | 1.98            | 1.26      | 2.31     | 1.37      |



**Table S3.** Share vs. hide t-tests

|                |                       | <b>Assume Threat</b>       | <b>Regulate Threat</b>    |
|----------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------|
|                |                       | Share vs. Hide             | Share vs. Hide            |
| <b>Study 3</b> | Total                 | $t(111) = 6.79, p < .001$  | $t(112) = 3.75, p < .001$ |
| <b>Study 4</b> | Success               | $t(141) = 8.48, p < .001$  | $t(141) = 6.14, p < .001$ |
|                | Failure               | $t(143) = 0.13, p = .894$  | $t(143) = 2.52, p = .013$ |
| <b>Study 5</b> | Public                | $t(84) = 3.78, p < .001$   | $t(84) = 4.69, p < .001$  |
|                | Private               | $t(129) = 7.14, p < .001$  | $t(129) = 6.40, p < .001$ |
| <b>Study 6</b> | Direct                | $t(157) = 11.14, p < .001$ | $t(157) = 6.89, p < .001$ |
|                | Indirect              | $t(153) = 7.86, p < .001$  | $t(153) = 2.63, p = .009$ |
| <b>Study 7</b> | Close relationships   | $t(48) = 4.85, p < .001$   | $t(48) = 4.89, p < .001$  |
|                | Distant relationships | $t(53) = 6.71, p < .001$   | $t(53) = 1.81, p = .076$  |

**SOM 5. Trust game results (Study 4)**

In Study 4, participants were paired with an anonymous (fictitious) stranger in the lab and received information indicating that the stranger either shared or hid their impressive (success condition) or unimpressive (failure condition) GPA from the participant. The information participants received was actually from a standard set of pre-populated responses based on the responses of participants in a small pilot study we ran prior to the main study.

In addition to the measures reported in the main manuscript, participants played a trust game with the stranger. In our version of the trust game, the participant was Player 1 and the stranger was Player 2. Player 1 was endowed with \$2 and could either keep the money or pass it to Player 2, in which case the \$2 would turn into \$5. Player 2 made a decision to either keep the \$5 or return half of the money to Player 1 and keep half of the money for themselves (\$2.50 each). Before playing, participants learned the rules of the trust game and were required to pass a comprehension check. Participants received their earnings from the trust game at the end of the lab session.

We conducted a logistic regression on the passing decision (1 = pass, 0 = keep), which included Decision to Share (1 = share, 0 = hide), Outcome (1 = success, 0 = failure), and the Decision to Share x Outcome interaction as independent variables. See tables below for OLS regression results and descriptive statistics. These results suggest that hiding both success and failure directionally, but not significantly, decreased trust.

**Table S4.** Percent passing in trust game

| <b>Outcome</b> | <b>Decision to Share</b> |             | <b>Total</b> |
|----------------|--------------------------|-------------|--------------|
|                | <b>Share</b>             | <b>Hide</b> |              |
| Success        | 67%                      | 65%         | 66%          |
| Failure        | 69%                      | 57%         | 63%          |
| Total          | 68%                      | 61%         | 64%          |

**Table S5.** Trust game regression results

| <b>Variable</b>             | <b><i>B</i></b> | <b><i>SE</i></b> | <b><i>p</i></b> |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Constant                    | 0.27            | 0.24             | .246            |
| Outcome                     | 0.34            | 0.34             | .313            |
| Decision to Share           | 0.53            | 0.35             | .128            |
| Decision to Share x Outcome | -0.45           | 0.50             | .365            |

**SOM 6. Time 1 vs. time 2 results (Study 6)**

To explore how the consequences of hiding and sharing success change over time, we report the results of a mixed within-between subjects ANOVA on all of our dependent variables in Study 6, using Time as the within-subjects factor and Decision to Share and Directness as between-subject factors. In the main manuscript, we discuss the effects of Time (main effect and the Time x Directness, Time x Share, and Time x Directness x Share interaction) to clarify how judgments of hiding success in response to direct versus indirect questions change over time. Here we report the complete results for the within-between subjects ANOVA on all of our dependent variables. In addition to the insights discussed in the main manuscript, these analyses reveal a consistent significant main effect of Decision to Share across all relational, emotional, and impression management consequences, but no significant main effect of Directness.

**Table S6a.** Time 1 vs. Time 2 results

|                                       | <b>Insult</b> |          | <b>Closeness</b> |          | <b>Envy</b> |          |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------|------------------|----------|-------------|----------|
|                                       | <i>F</i>      | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>         | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>    | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Time</b>                           | 58.63         | <.001    | 39.14            | <.001    | 125.11      | <.001    |
| <b>Directness</b>                     | 2.15          | .144     | 3.12             | .078     | 0.34        | .558     |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>              | 19.84         | <.001    | 56.74            | <.001    | 106.81      | <.001    |
| <b>Time x Directness</b>              | 7.27          | .007     | 2.09             | .150     | 0.01        | .945     |
| <b>Time x Decision to Share</b>       | 31.91         | <.001    | 4.01             | .046     | 241.47      | <.001    |
| <b>Directness x Decision to Share</b> | 6.61          | .011     | 0.98             | .322     | 0.35        | .553     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>              | 8.34          | .004     | 4.22             | .041     | 0.96        | .328     |

**Table S6b.** Time 1 vs. Time 2 results

|                                       | <b>Warmth</b> |          | <b>Competence</b> |          | <b>Modesty</b> |          |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|----------|-------------------|----------|----------------|----------|
|                                       | <i>F</i>      | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>          | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>       | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Time</b>                           | 10.31         | .001     | 55.55             | <.001    | 1.49           | .224     |
| <b>Directness</b>                     | 1.83          | .177     | 0.28              | .596     | 3.06           | .081     |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>              | 73.51         | <.001    | 79.83             | <.001    | 23.06          | <.001    |
| <b>Time x Directness</b>              | 0.00          | .966     | 0.17              | .684     | 0.87           | .352     |
| <b>Time x Decision to Share</b>       | 2.95          | .087     | 58.32             | <.001    | 47.08          | <.001    |
| <b>Directness x Decision to Share</b> | 0.05          | .816     | 0.02              | .897     | 0.04           | .847     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>              | 0.47          | .492     | 2.03              | .156     | 0.07           | .794     |

**SOM 7. Discomfort with sharing success (Study 7)**

At the end of Study 7, participants rated their discomfort sharing their own college acceptance with their classmate (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely). Specifically, participants rated their discomfort using three items ( $\alpha = .88$ ): “If you got into [top choice college] and were talking to [initials], how uncomfortable would you feel sharing the news with them?” “If you got into [top choice college] and were talking to [initials], how hesitant would you be to share the news with them?” and “If you got into [top choice college] and were talking to [initials], how worried would you be about sharing the news with them?”

We conducted an independent samples t-test on the discomfort sharing, using Relationship as a between-subject factor. We did not find a significant difference in participants’ discomfort sharing based on the Relationship,  $t(94) = 1.56, p = .122$ . Participants felt similarly hesitant to share their own college acceptance with a distant classmate ( $M = 3.33, SD = 1.65$ ) as with a close classmate ( $M = 2.79, SD = 1.79$ ).

**SOM 8. Results by gender (Studies 1-7)**

We explored how gender affects the decision to hide success (pilot study) and reactions to hiding success (Studies 1-7) across our studies in the main manuscript. We report all main effects of Gender and Decision to Share x Gender interactions below.

Overall, we find no consistently significant Gender effects.

**Table S7.** Pilot Study Results by Gender

|                       | <b>Gender of Target</b> |                | <b>Comparison of Target Genders</b> |          |          |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|----------------|-------------------------------------|----------|----------|
|                       | <b>Female</b>           | <b>Male</b>    |                                     |          |          |
|                       | <i>Percent</i>          | <i>Percent</i> | <i>X<sup>2</sup></i>                | <i>N</i> | <i>p</i> |
| Report hiding success | 85.4%                   | 80.8%          | 0.38                                | 100      | .601     |

**Table S8.** Study 1 Results by Gender

|                       | <b>Gender of Target</b> |           |             |           | <b>Comparison of Target Genders</b> |           |          | <b>Decision to Share × Gender</b> |           |          |
|-----------------------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                       | <b>Female</b>           |           | <b>Male</b> |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
|                       | <i>M</i>                | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                            | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                          | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>         |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Hide                  | 1.62                    | 1.13      | 1.44        | 0.89      | 0.55                                | 147       | .460     | 0.50                              | 147       | .482     |
| Share                 | 1.07                    | 0.41      | 1.07        | 0.31      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Closeness</u>      |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Hide                  | 4.39                    | 2.21      | 3.34        | 1.97      | 3.25                                | 147       | .073     | 2.73                              | 147       | .101     |
| Share                 | 5.00                    | 1.34      | 4.95        | 1.57      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>           |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Hide                  | 1.20                    | 0.62      | 1.38        | 0.98      | 0.76                                | 147       | .385     | 0.02                              | 147       | .898     |
| Share                 | 1.50                    | 1.30      | 1.64        | 1.40      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Happiness</u>      |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Hide                  | 5.07                    | 2.28      | 3.90        | 2.23      | 4.80                                | 147       | .030     | 3.44                              | 147       | .066     |
| Share                 | 6.44                    | 1.16      | 6.34        | 0.83      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>WTP for E-Card</u> |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Hide                  | 0.66                    | 0.41      | 0.55        | 0.36      | 0.33                                | 147       | .568     | 1.66                              | 147       | .199     |
| Share                 | 0.75                    | 0.36      | 0.80        | 0.28      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 1.

**Table S9.** Study 2 Results by Gender

|               |       | <b>Gender of Target</b> |           |             |           | <b>Comparison of Target Genders</b> |           |          | <b>Decision to Share × Gender</b> |           |          |
|---------------|-------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
|               |       | <b>Female</b>           |           | <b>Male</b> |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
|               |       | <i>M</i>                | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>b</i>                            | <i>SE</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>b</i>                          | <i>SE</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u> |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Known         | Hide  | 2.85                    | 1.60      | 2.73        | 1.58      | -0.02                               | 0.16      | .888     | 0.14                              | 0.29      | .616     |
|               | Share | 1.65                    | 1.18      | 1.64        | 1.10      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Unknown       | Hide  | 1.72                    | 1.23      | 2.25        | 1.42      | -0.04                               | 0.17      | .817     | -0.51                             | 0.24      | .035     |
|               | Share | 1.70                    | 1.17      | 1.73        | 1.12      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>  |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Known         | Hide  | 3.51                    | 1.72      | 3.58        | 1.55      | -0.03                               | 0.22      | .886     | -0.04                             | 0.32      | .900     |
|               | Share | 4.92                    | 1.56      | 4.95        | 1.38      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Unknown       | Hide  | 4.57                    | 1.71      | 4.34        | 1.28      | 0.26                                | 0.22      | .233     | -0.04                             | 0.30      | .893     |
|               | Share | 4.96                    | 1.68      | 4.70        | 1.31      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>   |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Known         | Hide  | 4.46                    | 1.90      | 3.70        | 1.91      | 0.20                                | 0.29      | .489     | 0.56                              | 0.39      | .149     |
|               | Share | 4.13                    | 1.88      | 3.93        | 1.87      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Unknown       | Hide  | 1.81                    | 1.25      | 2.48        | 1.62      | 0.12                                | 0.30      | .682     | -0.79                             | 0.35      | .025     |
|               | Share | 4.22                    | 2.07      | 4.09        | 1.94      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Happy</u>  |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Known         | Hide  | 4.94                    | 1.70      | 4.92        | 1.60      | 0.07                                | 0.19      | .723     | -0.04                             | 0.30      | .885     |
|               | Share | 5.94                    | 1.34      | 5.87        | 1.24      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Unknown       | Hide  | 3.96                    | 1.64      | 4.21        | 1.54      | 0.31                                | 0.18      | .088     | -0.56                             | 0.30      | .060     |
|               | Share | 6.02                    | 1.24      | 5.71        | 1.27      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 2.

**Table S10.** Study 3 Results by Gender

|                              | Gender of Target |           |          |           | Comparison of Target Genders |           |          | Decision to Share × Gender |           |          |
|------------------------------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                              | Female           |           | Male     |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
|                              | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                   | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>                |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Hide                         | 3.99             | 1.62      | 3.53     | 1.72      | 2.04                         | 104       | .157     | 0.15                       | 104       | .703     |
| Share                        | 1.73             | 0.95      | 1.47     | 0.77      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Closeness</u>             |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Hide                         | 2.41             | 1.05      | 2.08     | 1.23      | 0.36                         | 104       | .552     | 0.30                       | 104       | .583     |
| Share                        | 3.53             | 1.68      | 3.52     | 1.87      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Paternalistic motives</u> |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Hide                         | 4.11             | 0.87      | 3.65     | 1.19      | 0.83                         | 104       | .365     | 1.73                       | 104       | .191     |
| Share                        | 2.54             | 1.06      | 2.63     | 1.05      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Affective trust</u>       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Hide                         | 2.23             | 0.81      | 2.17     | 1.06      | 1.19                         | 104       | .278     | 1.81                       | 104       | .182     |
| Share                        | 3.62             | 1.45      | 4.20     | 1.48      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Cooperation</u>           |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Hide                         | 3.63             | 1.28      | 3.35     | 1.44      | 0.60                         | 104       | .442     | 0.09                       | 104       | .769     |
| Share                        | 5.17             | 1.26      | 5.04     | 1.54      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 3.



**Table S11.** Study 4 Results by Gender

|                              |       | Gender of Target |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
|------------------------------|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                              |       | Female           |           | Male     |           | Comparison of Target Genders |           |          | Decision to Share × Gender |           |          |
|                              |       | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                   | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>                |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Success                      | Hide  | 1.73             | 1.27      | 1.75     | 1.44      | 1.29                         | 139       | .258     | 1.04                       | 139       | .309     |
|                              | Share | 1.07             | 0.23      | 1.47     | 0.26      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Failure                      | Hide  | 1.41             | 0.94      | 1.41     | 0.83      | 0.33                         | 137       | .565     | .034                       | 137       | .563     |
|                              | Share | 1.67             | 0.70      | 1.33     | 0.87      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>                 |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Success                      | Hide  | 2.07             | 1.62      | 1.41     | 0.70      | 0.21                         | 139       | .646     | 5.18                       | 139       | .024     |
|                              | Share | 2.02             | 1.56      | 2.46     | 1.56      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Failure                      | Hide  | 2.90             | 1.72      | 1.97     | 1.45      | 5.54                         | 137       | .020     | 1.46                       | 137       | .229     |
|                              | Share | 2.50             | 1.55      | 2.20     | 1.43      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>                  |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Success                      | Hide  | 2.88             | 1.84      | 2.35     | 1.79      | 2.84                         | 139       | .094     | 0.01                       | 139       | .944     |
|                              | Share | 2.66             | 1.76      | 2.18     | 1.59      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Failure                      | Hide  | 1.12             | 0.51      | 1.06     | 0.24      | 3.40                         | 137       | .067     | 5.72                       | 137       | .018     |
|                              | Share | 1.12             | 0.42      | 1.60     | 1.12      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Paternalistic motives</u> |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Success                      | Hide  | 3.43             | 1.15      | 3.45     | 1.41      | 0.53                         | 139       | .469     | 0.35                       | 139       | .556     |
|                              | Share | 1.90             | 0.54      | 2.13     | 0.68      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Failure                      | Hide  | 2.15             | 0.65      | 2.07     | 0.59      | 0.02                         | 137       | .901     | 0.63                       | 137       | .428     |
|                              | Share | 1.89             | 0.73      | 2.00     | 0.79      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Perceived Shame</u>       |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Success                      | Hide  | 2.16             | 1.32      | 2.10     | 1.23      | 0.06                         | 139       | .811     | 0.31                       | 139       | .579     |
|                              | Share | 1.32             | 0.71      | 1.47     | 1.14      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Failure                      | Hide  | 5.12             | 1.34      | 4.30     | 1.87      | 6.08                         | 137       | .015     | 1.12                       | 137       | .291     |
|                              | Share | 1.73             | 1.32      | 1.40     | 0.78      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 4.

**Table S12.** Study 5 Results by Gender

|                              |       | <b>Gender of Target</b> |           |             |           | <b>Comparison of Target Genders</b> |           |          | <b>Decision to Share × Gender</b> |           |          |
|------------------------------|-------|-------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                              |       | <b>Female</b>           |           | <b>Male</b> |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
|                              |       | <i>M</i>                | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                            | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                          | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>                |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Private                      | Hide  | 3.31                    | 1.70      | 3.86        | 1.49      | 2.97                                | 125       | .238     | 0.92                              | 125       | .340     |
|                              | Share | 2.24                    | 1.26      | 2.30        | 1.36      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Public                       | Hide  | 2.73                    | 1.35      | 3.62        | 1.68      | 1.55                                | 81        | .217     | 2.18                              | 81        | .143     |
|                              | Share | 2.42                    | 1.39      | 2.35        | 1.25      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>                 |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Private                      | Hide  | 2.00                    | 1.41      | 2.19        | 1.17      | 0.20                                | 125       | .751     | 0.22                              | 125       | .641     |
|                              | Share | 3.32                    | 1.56      | 3.29        | 1.45      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Public                       | Hide  | 2.31                    | 1.30      | 2.07        | 1.15      | 0.01                                | 81        | .927     | 0.72                              | 81        | .399     |
|                              | Share | 3.20                    | 1.74      | 3.50        | 1.53      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>                  |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Private                      | Hide  | 4.85                    | 1.90      | 4.39        | 1.52      | 1.96                                | 125       | .164     | 0.02                              | 125       | .886     |
|                              | Share | 4.55                    | 1.91      | 4.17        | 1.49      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Public                       | Hide  | 4.50                    | 1.37      | 3.93        | 1.96      | 2.05                                | 81        | .156     | 0.00                              | 81        | .985     |
|                              | Share | 4.93                    | 2.12      | 4.35        | 1.62      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Paternalistic motives</u> |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Private                      | Hide  | 4.30                    | 1.20      | 3.99        | 1.09      | 2.10                                | 125       | .150     | 0.03                              | 125       | .866     |
|                              | Share | 2.72                    | 0.99      | 2.48        | 0.99      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Public                       | Hide  | 3.47                    | 0.98      | 3.92        | 1.21      | 0.12                                | 81        | .730     | 2.14                              | 81        | .148     |
|                              | Share | 2.90                    | 1.18      | 2.62        | 1.05      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Affective trust</u>       |       |                         |           |             |           |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Private                      | Hide  | 2.20                    | 1.55      | 3.00        | 1.53      | 3.47                                | 125       | .065     | 1.11                              | 125       | .294     |
|                              | Share | 3.71                    | 1.77      | 3.93        | 1.34      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Public                       | Hide  | 3.05                    | 1.73      | 2.94        | 1.62      | 1.71                                | 81        | .195     | 2.52                              | 81        | .116     |
|                              | Share | 3.29                    | 1.97      | 4.40        | 1.59      |                                     |           |          |                                   |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 5.

**Table S13. Study 6 Time 2 Results by Gender**

|                              |       | Gender of Target |           |          |           | Comparison of Target Genders |           |          | Decision to Share $\times$ Gender |           |          |
|------------------------------|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                              |       | Female           |           | Male     |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
|                              |       | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                          | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>                |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 3.44             | 1.89      | 3.48     | 1.79      | 0.32                         | 154       | .571     | 0.17                              | 154       | .679     |
|                              | Share | 1.84             | 1.25      | 2.09     | 1.21      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 2.46             | 1.56      | 2.60     | 1.32      | 2.38                         | 150       | .125     | 4.68                              | 150       | .032     |
|                              | Share | 2.44             | 1.35      | 1.62     | 1.08      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>                 |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 1.63             | 0.69      | 1.88     | 1.23      | 4.87                         | 154       | .029     | 0.92                              | 154       | .338     |
|                              | Share | 2.59             | 1.41      | 3.23     | 1.52      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 1.89             | 1.31      | 1.85     | 1.09      | 1.31                         | 150       | .254     | 1.82                              | 150       | .179     |
|                              | Share | 2.27             | 1.05      | 2.77     | 1.52      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Paternalistic motives</u> |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 4.10             | 1.28      | 4.51     | 0.93      | 0.13                         | 154       | .723     | 4.28                              | 154       | .040     |
|                              | Share | 2.64             | 1.00      | 2.35     | 0.95      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 3.99             | 1.19      | 3.91     | 1.04      | 2.28                         | 150       | .134     | 1.08                              | 150       | .300     |
|                              | Share | 2.92             | 1.08      | 2.47     | 1.07      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Affective trust</u>       |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 2.50             | 1.25      | 3.14     | 1.60      | 7.27                         | 154       | .008     | 0.00                              | 154       | .947     |
|                              | Share | 3.01             | 1.52      | 3.69     | 1.72      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 2.75             | 1.44      | 3.01     | 1.44      | 0.41                         | 150       | .523     | 0.28                              | 150       | .596     |
|                              | Share | 3.10             | 1.31      | 3.12     | 1.26      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>                  |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 4.23             | 2.10      | 4.40     | 1.81      | 0.11                         | 154       | .746     | 0.78                              | 154       | .380     |
|                              | Share | 4.70             | 1.88      | 4.31     | 2.15      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 4.42             | 1.24      | 3.71     | 1.86      | 9.65                         | 150       | .002     | 0.31                              | 150       | .582     |
|                              | Share | 5.02             | 1.80      | 4.00     | 1.88      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Competence</u>            |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 4.41             | 1.01      | 4.76     | 1.16      | .101                         | 154       | .751     | 2.86                              | 154       | .093     |
|                              | Share | 5.37             | 0.84      | 5.13     | 1.35      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 4.69             | 1.02      | 4.53     | 1.17      | 0.25                         | 150       | .615     | 0.20                              | 150       | .659     |
|                              | Share | 5.18             | 1.12      | 5.17     | 1.00      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Warmth</u>                |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 2.91             | 1.28      | 3.27     | 1.36      | .202                         | 154       | .654     | 2.06                              | 154       | .154     |
|                              | Share | 4.08             | 0.84      | 3.89     | 1.29      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Indirect                     | Hide  | 2.87             | 1.03      | 2.97     | 0.97      | 1.22                         | 150       | .272     | 0.24                              | 150       | .624     |
|                              | Share | 3.74             | 0.96      | 4.00     | 1.13      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Modesty</u>               |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Direct                       | Hide  | 5.27             | 1.07      | 4.88     | 1.12      | 0.03                         | 154       | .855     | 4.00                              | 154       | .047     |
|                              | Share | 3.99             | 1.05      | 4.31     | 1.24      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |

|          |       |      |      |      |      |      |     |      |      |     |      |
|----------|-------|------|------|------|------|------|-----|------|------|-----|------|
| Indirect | Hide  | 5.00 | 1.43 | 4.90 | 1.26 | 0.34 | 150 | .208 | 0.85 | 150 | .359 |
|          | Share | 3.88 | 1.22 | 4.17 | 1.25 |      |     |      |      |     |      |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success at Time 2 in Study 6.

**Table S14.** Study 6 Time 1 Results by Gender

|                   |       | Gender of Target |           |          |           | Comparison of Target Genders |           |          | Decision to Share × Gender |           |          |
|-------------------|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|----------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                   |       | Female           |           | Male     |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
|                   |       | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                   | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>     |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 2.12             | 1.37      | 2.29     | 1.32      | 0.99                         | 154       | .321     | 0.03                       | 154       | .863     |
|                   | Share | 1.73             | 1.02      | 1.96     | 1.22      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 1.88             | 0.78      | 2.13     | 1.07      | 0.70                         | 150       | .405     | 5.05                       | 150       | .026     |
|                   | Share | 2.19             | 1.36      | 1.63     | 1.04      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>      |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 2.09             | 1.10      | 2.45     | 1.29      | 2.93                         | 154       | .089     | 0.01                       | 154       | .933     |
|                   | Share | 3.20             | 1.66      | 3.60     | 1.46      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 1.84             | 0.97      | 1.93     | 1.03      | 1.00                         | 150       | .320     | 0.31                       | 150       | .578     |
|                   | Share | 2.93             | 1.20      | 3.23     | 1.55      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>       |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 1.46             | 0.92      | 2.21     | 1.57      | 0.10                         | 154       | .758     | 7.50                       | 154       | .007     |
|                   | Share | 5.26             | 1.71      | 4.66     | 1.80      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 1.71             | 1.18      | 1.76     | 1.26      | 4.72                         | 150       | .031     | 5.58                       | 150       | .019     |
|                   | Share | 5.36             | 1.61      | 4.27     | 1.82      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Competence</u> |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 3.65             | 1.14      | 4.31     | 0.92      | 1.15                         | 154       | .285     | 10.69                      | 154       | .001     |
|                   | Share | 5.37             | 0.71      | 5.03     | 1.06      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 3.78             | 1.07      | 3.93     | 0.86      | 0.51                         | 150       | .478     | 0.05                       | 150       | .825     |
|                   | Share | 5.20             | 1.02      | 5.27     | 0.91      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Warmth</u>     |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 2.91             | 1.27      | 3.32     | 1.33      | 0.44                         | 154       | .509     | 2.28                       | 154       | .133     |
|                   | Share | 4.33             | 0.98      | 4.16     | 1.19      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 2.88             | 1.03      | 3.15     | 0.84      | 2.28                         | 150       | .133     | 0.03                       | 150       | .865     |
|                   | Share | 3.96             | 0.90      | 4.17     | 1.12      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| <u>Modesty</u>    |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Direct            | Hide  | 4.63             | 0.92      | 4.57     | 0.91      | 0.58                         | 154       | .447     | 1.29                       | 154       | .257     |
|                   | Share | 4.42             | 0.89      | 4.71     | 1.11      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |
| Indirect          | Hide  | 4.45             | 0.74      | 4.37     | 0.89      | 0.86                         | 150       | .355     | 2.02                       | 150       | .158     |
|                   | Share | 4.11             | 1.21      | 4.50     | 1.16      |                              |           |          |                            |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success at Time 1 in Study 6.

**Table S15.** Study 7 Results by Gender

|                              |       | Gender of Target |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
|------------------------------|-------|------------------|-----------|----------|-----------|------------------------------|-----------|----------|-----------------------------------|-----------|----------|
|                              |       | Female           |           | Male     |           | Comparison of Target Genders |           |          | Decision to Share $\times$ Gender |           |          |
|                              |       | <i>M</i>         | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                          | <i>df</i> | <i>p</i> |
| <u>Insult</u>                |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 1.82             | 1.20      | 2.55     | 1.50      | 2.33                         | 49        | .134     | 2.57                              | 49        | .115     |
|                              | Share | 1.62             | 1.01      | 1.78     | 1.14      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 2.30             | 1.48      | 2.10     | 1.49      | 0.00                         | 43        | .992     | 0.81                              | 43        | .372     |
|                              | Share | 1.31             | 0.59      | 1.52     | 1.20      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Close</u>                 |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 2.36             | 1.75      | 2.43     | 1.41      | 0.00                         | 49        | .951     | 0.07                              | 49        | .797     |
|                              | Share | 2.68             | 1.74      | 2.65     | 1.53      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 3.58             | 2.19      | 4.43     | 1.87      | 0.44                         | 43        | .510     | 1.78                              | 43        | .190     |
|                              | Share | 4.94             | 1.77      | 4.79     | 2.19      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Happiness</u>             |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 4.32             | 1.96      | 4.26     | 1.84      | 0.00                         | 49        | .974     | 0.13                              | 49        | .718     |
|                              | Share | 4.82             | 1.70      | 4.91     | 1.86      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 5.13             | 2.05      | 5.79     | 1.19      | 0.36                         | 43        | .552     | 2.15                              | 43        | .150     |
|                              | Share | 6.16             | 1.10      | 6.00     | 1.41      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Envy</u>                  |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 3.07             | 2.14      | 3.17     | 1.70      | 0.00                         | 49        | .956     | 0.47                              | 49        | .498     |
|                              | Share | 3.46             | 2.17      | 3.30     | 1.64      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 2.58             | 1.93      | 2.86     | 1.88      | 0.00                         | 43        | .986     | 1.59                              | 43        | .215     |
|                              | Share | 3.23             | 2.16      | 2.93     | 1.90      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Paternalistic motives</u> |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 3.19             | 1.31      | 3.42     | 1.40      | 0.34                         | 49        | .560     | 0.08                              | 49        | .774     |
|                              | Share | 2.21             | 1.10      | 2.33     | 0.96      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 3.10             | 1.74      | 2.37     | 1.27      | 0.66                         | 43        | .420     | 4.22                              | 43        | .046     |
|                              | Share | 1.67             | 0.60      | 1.87     | 0.90      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Cooperate</u>             |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 4.07             | 1.96      | 3.78     | 1.73      | 0.36                         | 49        | .552     | 0.00                              | 49        | .951     |
|                              | Share | 4.39             | 1.81      | 4.13     | 1.66      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 4.84             | 1.73      | 5.57     | 1.74      | 0.44                         | 43        | .511     | 3.82                              | 43        | .057     |
|                              | Share | 5.84             | 1.34      | 5.71     | 1.54      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| <u>Socialize</u>             |       |                  |           |          |           |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Distant                      | Hide  | 2.61             | 1.79      | 2.83     | 1.95      | 0.36                         | 49        | .553     | 0.08                              | 49        | .777     |
|                              | Share | 2.79             | 1.95      | 3.13     | 1.69      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |
| Close                        | Hide  | 3.74             | 1.81      | 3.57     | 2.10      | 0.26                         | 43        | .613     | 0.21                              | 43        | .650     |
|                              | Share | 4.71             | 1.95      | 4.29     | 2.43      |                              |           |          |                                   |           |          |

*Note.* This table reports the main effect of target gender and the interaction effect of target gender and target reactions to hiding and sharing success in Study 7.

**SOM 9. Study S1. Social comparison (communicator perspective)**

We describe all supplemental studies in brief. Exact materials, data, and syntax are available at: <https://tinyurl.com/HidingSuccessOSF>

In Study S1, we explored when and why communicators hide their success. Specifically, we tested whether communicators are more likely to hide their success when they are relatively more successful than the target (i.e., when there is a downward social comparison from the communicator to the target). Details are below.

**Participants**

- N = 300 (44% female; average age = 35.20 years)
- MTurk payment = \$0.40 in exchange for 4 minutes

**Procedure**

- Preregistered on AsPredicted.org (<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=br6js9>)
- Design: We randomly assigned participants from a 2 (Scenario: salary or dieting) x 3 (Comparison: upwards, downwards, or none) mixed within-between subjects design. Scenario was manipulated within-subjects and comparison was manipulated between-subjects.
- Details:
  - Participants read scenarios about getting a raise and losing weight in a counter-balanced order.
  - Within each scenario, participants decided whether they would tell their brother (salary scenario) or friend (dieting scenario) about their success. In the upwards social comparison condition the brother made more money and the friend lost more weight than the participant, in the downwards social comparison condition the brother made less money than the participant and the friend did not lose weight, and in the no social comparison condition participants did not have information about the brother’s salary or the friend’s weight loss.

**Table S16.** Scenario for Study S1

| Salary Scenario:  |  |   |
|---|--|---|
| Imagine that you work for a market research company. After working in the same position for two years, you receive a raise and your annual salary increases from \$60,000 to \$80,000.      |  |   |
| Upward comparison:  | Downward comparison:   | No comparison:  |
| Later in the week you are talking with your older brother. During the conversation your brother asks how your job has been going. You know your brother makes a salary of \$110,000 a year. | Later in the week you are talking with your older brother. Your brother asks you how your job has been going. You know your brother makes a salary of \$50,000 a year. | Later in the week you are talking with your older brother. Your brother asks you how your job has been going. |

| <b>Diet Scenario:</b>   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Imagine that you are trying to lose weight and have been on a diet for three months. You have been successful at sticking with your diet and have lost 15 pounds.                     |   |  |
| <b>Upward comparison:</b>   | <b>Downward comparison:</b>   | <b>No comparison:</b>  |
| Later in the week you are talking with your friend. During the conversation your friend asks how your diet has been going. Your friend is also on a diet and recently lost 20 pounds. | Later in the week you are talking with your friend. During the conversation your friend asks how your diet has been going. Your friend is also on a diet but has not lost any weight. | Later in the week you are talking with your friend. During the conversation your friend asks how your diet has been going. |

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Main dependent measure: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Likelihood of sharing success
    - How likely are you to tell [your brother about your raise / your friend about your weight loss]?
- Exploratory measures:
  - Decision to share success
    - Would you tell [your brother about your raise / your friend about your weight loss]? (1 = yes, 0 = no)
  - Discomfort sharing ( $\alpha = .84$ ; 1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
    - How uncomfortable would it be to tell [your brother / your friend]?
    - How awkward would it be to tell [your brother / your friend]?
- Manipulation check:
  - In this scenario, how does your [salary compare to your brother's salary / dieting compare to your friend's dieting]? (1 = you make much less / you lost much less weight, 7 = you make much / you lost much more weight)

### ***Analyses***

- We ran OLS regressions on the dependent and exploratory variables, using social comparison condition as the IV (to do so we created two dummy codes: Downward where the downward comparison = 1, all other conditions = 0; and Upward where the upward comparison = 1 and all other conditions = 0). To account for the fact that each participant made multiple judgments, we clustered robust standard errors at the participant level.
  - As with Study 2 in the main manuscript, this analysis differed from the analysis in the preregistration, which did not account for the fact that each participant made two judgments in different conditions.
- For completeness, we replicated this analysis adding Scenario, and the Scenario x Downward and Scenario x Upward interactions as IVs.
- For the dichotomous choice variable (decision to share success), we analyzed how social comparison affected choice using a chi-square test of proportions, collapsing across scenario.

### ***Results***

- *Dichotomous Choice:* Chi-squared tests reveal a significant difference of Condition,  $\chi^2(1, N = 599) = 31.52, p < .001$ . Participants were less likely to share their success when there was a downward social comparison between them and the target (74%) than when there was an upward social comparison between them and the target (92%) or no social comparison information (91%) given a dichotomous choice to either share or hide.
- See tables below for OLS regression results and descriptive statistics:

**Table S17.** Descriptive statistics for Study S1

|                              |               | Upward   |           | Downward |           | None     |           |
|------------------------------|---------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|
|                              |               | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
| <b>Manipulation check</b>    | <b>Salary</b> | 2.49     | 1.23      | 6.10     | 0.85      | 4.68     | 1.14      |
|                              | <b>Diet</b>   | 3.37     | 0.99      | 5.69     | 1.51      | 4.65     | 1.06      |
|                              | <b>Total</b>  | 2.93     | 1.20      | 5.90     | 1.24      | 4.67     | 1.10      |
| <b>Likelihood of sharing</b> | <b>Salary</b> | 5.60     | 1.39      | 5.01     | 1.83      | 5.82     | 1.42      |
|                              | <b>Diet</b>   | 6.08     | 1.25      | 4.94     | 1.72      | 5.84     | 1.20      |
|                              | <b>Total</b>  | 5.84     | 1.34      | 4.98     | 1.77      | 5.83     | 1.31      |
| <b>Discomfort sharing</b>    | <b>Salary</b> | 2.33     | 1.64      | 3.40     | 1.90      | 2.30     | 1.61      |
|                              | <b>Diet</b>   | 2.03     | 1.41      | 3.42     | 1.87      | 2.30     | 1.58      |
|                              | <b>Total</b>  | 2.18     | 1.53      | 3.41     | 1.88      | 2.30     | 1.59      |

**Table S18.** OLS Regression for Study S1

|                           |                      | (1)                | (2)                | (3)                |
|---------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|
| <b>Manipulation Check</b> | Intercept            | 4.67***<br>(0.08)  | 4.60***<br>(0.10)  | 4.68***<br>(0.11)  |
|                           | Upwards              | -1.73***<br>(0.12) | -1.73***<br>(0.12) | -2.19***<br>(0.15) |
|                           | Downwards            | 1.23***<br>(0.12)  | 1.23***<br>(0.12)  | 1.42***<br>(0.17)  |
|                           | Scenario             |                    | 0.14<br>(0.10)     | -0.03<br>(0.14)    |
|                           | Upwards x Scenario   |                    |                    | 0.91***<br>(0.20)  |
|                           | Downwards x Scenario |                    |                    | -0.38<br>(0.22)    |
|                           | R-squared            | 0.52               | 0.52               | 0.54               |
|                           |                      |                    |                    |                    |
| <b>Tell</b>               | Intercept            | 5.83***<br>(0.10)  | 5.76***<br>(0.11)  | 5.82***<br>(0.14)  |
|                           | Upwards              | 0.01<br>(0.13)     | 0.01<br>(0.13)     | -0.22<br>(0.20)    |
|                           | Downwards            | -0.86***<br>(0.16) | -0.86***<br>(0.16) | -0.81***<br>(0.23) |
|                           | Scenario             |                    | 0.14<br>(0.10)     | 0.02<br>(0.18)     |
|                           |                      |                    |                    |                    |



|                   |                      |                   |                   |                   |
|-------------------|----------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|
|                   | Upwards x Scenario   |                   |                   | 0.46<br>(0.26)    |
|                   | Downwards x Scenario |                   |                   | -0.09<br>(0.31)   |
|                   | R-squared            | 0.07              | 0.07              | 0.08              |
| <b>Discomfort</b> | Intercept            | 2.30***<br>(0.12) | 2.35***<br>(0.13) | 2.30***<br>(0.16) |
|                   | Upwards              | -0.12<br>(0.16)   | -0.12<br>(0.16)   | 0.03<br>(0.23)    |
|                   | Downwards            | 1.11***<br>(0.17) | 1.11***<br>(0.17) | 1.09***<br>(0.25) |
|                   | Scenario             |                   | -0.09<br>(0.10)   | -0.002<br>(0.21)  |
|                   | Upwards x Scenario   |                   |                   | -0.30<br>(0.30)   |
|                   | Downwards x Scenario |                   |                   | 0.03<br>(0.35)    |
|                   | R-squared            | 0.10              | 0.10              | 0.10              |

*Note.* \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . Standard error in parenthesis. Model 1 includes Upwards and Downwards. Model 2 includes Upwards, Downwards, and Scenario. Model 3 includes Upwards, Downwards, Scenario, Upwards x Scenario, and Downwards x Scenario.

### ***Discussion***

- This study explores the situations in which communicators are most likely to hide their success from targets.
- Across two scenarios, participants were most likely to hide their success when there was a downward social comparison (when the communicator was in a relatively better position than the target) than when there was an upward social comparison (when the communicator was in a worse position than the target) or no social comparison (when the relative position of the communicator and target were unknown).
- Participants were also more uncomfortable sharing their success when there was a downward social comparison between themselves and a target rather than an upward social comparison or no social comparison.

**SOM 10. Study S2. Social comparison (target perspective)**

In Study S2, we used the same situations as Study S1 to explore targets’ reactions when communicators hide their success. Specifically, we tested how targets respond when communicators hide their success when the communicator is relatively more successful than the target (i.e., when there is a downward social comparison from the communicator to the target). Details are below.

**Participants**

- N = 299 (45% female; average age = 35.28 years)
- MTurk payment = \$0.40 in exchange for 4 minutes

**Procedure**

- Preregistered on AsPredicted.org (<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=pr6kk3>)
- Design: We randomly assigned participants from a 2 (Scenario: salary or dieting) x 3 (Comparison: upwards, downwards, or none) mixed within-between subjects design. Scenario was manipulated within-subjects and comparison was manipulated between-subjects.
- Details:
  - Participants read a scenario about getting a raise and losing weight in a counter-balanced order.
  - Within each scenario, participants learned their brother (salary scenario) or friend (dieting scenario) accomplished a success (raise or weight loss). In the downwards social comparison condition the brother made more money and the friend lost more weight than the participant, in the upwards social comparison condition the brother made less money than the participant and the friend did not lose weight, and in the no social comparison condition participants did not have information about the brother’s salary or the friend’s weight loss.

**Table S19.** Scenario for Study S2

| Salary Scenario:   |   |  |
|--|---|--|
| Upward comparison:   | Downward comparison:  | No comparison:   |
| Imagine that you live in a mid-size city and have been working at a market research company for a few years. You make an annual salary of \$110,000.   | Imagine that you live in a mid-size city and have been working at a market research company for a few years. You make an annual salary of \$50,000. | Imagine that you live in a mid-size city and have been working at a market research company for a few years. |
| You are talking with your mother one day, and she mentions that your younger brother recently received a raise. His yearly salary increased from \$60,000 to \$80,000. Later that day, you also talk to your brother. You ask him how his job has been going. Your brother tells you that nothing is new at work. He does not mention the raise. |   |  |
| Diet Scenario:   |   |  |
| Upward comparison:   | Downward comparison:  | No comparison:   |
| Imagine that you are trying  | Imagine that you are trying   | Imagine that you are trying  |

|  |  |   |
|--|--|---|
| to lose weight and have been on a diet for three months. You have been successful at sticking with your diet and have lost 20 pounds. You live in the same city with your close friend Rebecca, who is also on a diet.   | to lose weight and have been on a diet for three months. However, you have not been successful at sticking with your diet and have not lost any weight. You live in the same city with your close friend Rebecca, who is also on a diet. | to lose weight and have been on a diet for three months. You live in the same city with your close friend Rebecca, who is also on a diet. |
| You are talking with your friend Erik one day, and he mentions that your close friend Rebecca recently lost 15 pounds. Later that day, you also talk to Rebecca. You ask her how her diet has been going. Rebecca tells you that nothing is new with her diet. |  |   |

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Main dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Closeness
    - To what extent do you feel close to [your brother / Rebecca]?
  - Insult ( $\alpha = .94$ )
    - To what extent do you feel insulted?
    - To what extent do you feel offended?
    - To what extent do you feel angry with [your brother / Rebecca]?
  - Regulate and assume mechanism ( $\alpha = .91$ )
    - To what extent would you believe [your brother / Rebecca] was:
      - Attempting to regulate your emotions?
      - Attempting to manipulate your feelings?
      - Being condescending
    - To what extent would you believe [your brother / Rebecca] thought:
      - You would be upset?
      - You could not handle the truth?
      - You would be envious?
      - You would be happy for him?
      - You could not handle learning about his success?
      - You would feel threatened?
- Exploratory measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Affective trust ( $\alpha = .96$ )
    - Soon after this interaction, I would feel comfortable sharing my most outlandish ideas and hopes with this person.
    - Soon after this interaction, I would feel comfortable talking with this person about difficulties I am having at work.
    - Soon after this interaction, I would feel comfortable admitting my worst mistakes to this person.
    - Soon after this interaction, I would feel comfortable relying on this person for support when I need it.

- Soon after this interaction, I would feel comfortable revealing information to this person that I don't want others to know about.
- Manipulation check:
  - In this scenario, how does your [salary compare to your brother's salary / dieting compare to Rebecca's dieting]? (1 = you make much less / you lost much less weight], 7 = you make much / you lost much more weight)

### *Analyses*

- We ran OLS regressions on all of the dependent variables, using social comparison condition as the IV (to do so we created two dummy codes: Downward where the downward comparison = 1, all other conditions = 0; and Upward where the upward comparison = 1 and all other conditions = 0). To account for the fact that each participant made multiple judgments, we clustered robust standard errors at the participant level.
- For completeness, we replicated this analysis adding Scenario, and the Scenario x Downward and Scenario x Upward interactions as IVs.

### *Results*

- See tables below for OLS regression results and descriptive statistics:

**Table S20.** Descriptive statistics for Study S2

|                           |               | <b>Upward</b> |           | <b>Downward</b> |           | <b>None</b> |           |
|---------------------------|---------------|---------------|-----------|-----------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|
|                           |               | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>        | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> |
| <b>Manipulation check</b> | <b>Salary</b> | 3.59          | 1.83      | 2.98            | 2.01      | 3.59        | 1.83      |
|                           | <b>Diet</b>   | 4.99          | 1.29      | 2.79            | 2.05      | 3.26        | 1.86      |
|                           | <b>Total</b>  | 5.40          | 1.37      | 2.89            | 2.03      | 3.42        | 1.85      |
| <b>Insult</b>             | <b>Salary</b> | 3.77          | 1.86      | 3.62            | 1.95      | 3.58        | 1.96      |
|                           | <b>Diet</b>   | 3.37          | 1.91      | 3.29            | 1.90      | 3.54        | 1.89      |
|                           | <b>Total</b>  | 3.57          | 1.89      | 3.46            | 1.92      | 3.56        | 1.92      |
| <b>Close</b>              | <b>Salary</b> | 3.68          | 1.92      | 3.81            | 1.89      | 3.91        | 1.83      |
|                           | <b>Diet</b>   | 3.83          | 1.74      | 3.90            | 1.81      | 3.67        | 1.90      |
|                           | <b>Total</b>  | 3.76          | 1.83      | 3.86            | 1.85      | 3.79        | 1.86      |
| <b>Regulate mechanism</b> | <b>Salary</b> | 3.58          | 1.68      | 4.17            | 1.27      | 4.11        | 1.57      |
|                           | <b>Diet</b>   | 3.55          | 1.58      | 4.01            | 1.41      | 4.09        | 1.55      |
|                           | <b>Total</b>  | 3.56          | 1.63      | 4.10            | 1.34      | 4.10        | 1.56      |
| <b>Affective trust</b>    | <b>Salary</b> | 4.91          | 1.72      | 4.68            | 1.95      | 4.77        | 2.01      |
|                           | <b>Diet</b>   | 4.57          | 1.93      | 4.24            | 2.12      | 4.44        | 2.12      |
|                           | <b>Total</b>  | 4.74          | 1.83      | 4.46            | 2.04      | 4.60        | 2.07      |

**Table S21.** OLS Regression for Study S2

|                           |           | <b>Social Comparison Target</b> |         |         |
|---------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------|---------|---------|
|                           |           | (1)                             | (2)     | (3)     |
| <b>Manipulation check</b> | Intercept | 3.42***                         | 3.65*** | 3.59*** |
|                           |           | (0.15)                          | (0.15)  | (0.19)  |

|                            |                      |                    |                    |                   |
|----------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                            | Upwards              | 1.97***<br>(0.18)  | 1.98***<br>(0.17)  | 2.22***<br>(0.23) |
|                            | Downwards            | -0.54**<br>(0.20)  | -0.54**<br>(0.20)  | -0.61*<br>(0.27)  |
|                            | Scenario             |                    | -0.45***<br>(0.10) | -0.33<br>(0.23)   |
|                            | Upwards x Scenario   |                    |                    | -0.49<br>(0.30)   |
|                            | Downwards x Scenario |                    |                    | 0.13<br>(0.39)    |
|                            | R-squared            | 0.27               | 0.29               | 0.29              |
| <b>Insult</b>              | Intercept            | 3.56***<br>(0.16)  | 3.69***<br>(0.16)  | 3.58***<br>(0.20) |
|                            | Upwards              | 0.01<br>(0.19)     | 0.01<br>(0.19)     | 0.19<br>(0.27)    |
|                            | Downwards            | -0.11<br>(0.20)    | -0.11<br>(0.20)    | 0.04<br>(0.28)    |
|                            | Scenario             |                    | -0.26**<br>(0.08)  | -0.04<br>(0.23)   |
|                            | Upwards x Scenario   |                    |                    | -0.36<br>(0.38)   |
|                            | Downwards x Scenario |                    |                    | -0.29<br>(0.38)   |
|                            | R-squared            | 0.001              | 0.01               | 0.01              |
|                            | Intercept            | 3.79***<br>(0.15)  | 3.78***<br>(0.15)  | 3.91***<br>(0.19) |
| <b>Close</b>               | Upwards              | -0.03<br>(0.18)    | -0.03<br>(0.18)    | -0.23<br>(0.27)   |
|                            | Downwards            | 0.07<br>(0.18)     | 0.07<br>(0.18)     | -0.09<br>(0.26)   |
|                            | Scenario             |                    | 0.001<br>(0.09)    | -0.24<br>(0.24)   |
|                            | Upwards x Scenario   |                    |                    | 0.39<br>(0.37)    |
|                            | Downwards x Scenario |                    |                    | 0.32<br>(0.37)    |
|                            | R-squared            | 0.001              | 0.001              | 0.002             |
|                            | Intercept            | 4.10***<br>(0.13)  | 4.13***<br>(0.13)  | 4.11***<br>(0.16) |
|                            | Upwards              | -0.53***<br>(0.16) | -0.53***<br>(0.16) | -0.52*<br>(0.23)  |
| <b>Assume and regulate</b> | Downwards            | -0.002<br>(0.15)   | -0.003<br>(0.15)   | 0.06<br>(0.20)    |

|                        |                      |                   |                    |                   |
|------------------------|----------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
|                        | Scenario             |                   | -0.07<br>(0.06)    | -0.02<br>(0.19)   |
|                        | Upwards x Scenario   |                   |                    | -0.02<br>(0.32)   |
|                        | Downwards x Scenario |                   |                    | 0.12<br>(0.29)    |
|                        | R-squared            | 0.03              | 0.03               | 0.03              |
| <b>Affective trust</b> | Intercept            | 4.60***<br>(0.16) | 4.79***<br>(0.17)  | 4.77***<br>(0.20) |
|                        | Upwards              | 0.14<br>(0.20)    | 0.04<br>(0.20)     | 0.15<br>(0.27)    |
|                        | Downwards            | -0.14<br>(0.21)   | -0.15<br>(0.21)    | -0.09<br>(0.28)   |
|                        | Scenario             |                   | -0.37***<br>(0.10) | -0.32<br>(0.25)   |
|                        | Upwards x Scenario   |                   |                    | -0.02<br>(0.39)   |
|                        | Downwards x Scenario |                   |                    | -0.12<br>(0.41)   |
|                        | R-squared            | 0.003             | 0.01               | 0.01              |

*Note.* \*\*\*  $p \leq .001$ , \*\*  $p \leq .01$ , \*  $p < .05$ . Standard error in parenthesis. Model 1 includes Upwards and Downwards. Model 2 includes Upwards, Downwards, and Scenario. Model 3 includes Upwards, Downwards, Scenario, Upwards x Scenario, and Downwards x Scenario.

### **Discussion**

- This study explored targets' reactions to hiding success when there was an upward social comparison (the target was in a better position than the communicator), downward social comparison (the target was in a worse position than the communicator), or no social comparison information (information about the relative position between the communicator and target was unknown).
- Across two scenarios, targets felt similar feelings of insult, closeness, and affective trust for the communicator when the communicator hid their success, regardless of whether there was an upward social comparison, downward social comparison, or no social comparison information.
- We also found that participants inferred the communicator had less paternalistic motives when they hid their success in an upward social comparison (when the target is in a better position than the communicator).
- While this study explored the negative relational consequences of hiding success, it did not compare reactions to hiding success with sharing success in any of the conditions.

**SOM 11. Study S3. Communicator mispredictions about hiding success**

In Study S3, we explored communicators’ predictions about how targets would respond if they hide their success (when the target already knows about it) or share their success (when the target does not already know about it). We also explored targets’ reactions to these same situations to understand if communicators make systematic mispredictions about the costs of hiding success. Details are below.

**Participants**

- N = 200 (39% female; average age = 40.16 years)
- Participant payment = \$1.00 in exchange for 5 minutes

**Procedure**

- Preregistered on AsPredicted.org (<https://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=pc2y9s>)
  - The preregistration includes three different studies, which intended to test the same effects with different samples and scenarios. However, after analyzing the results of this study we decided not to complete the additional two studies. Therefore, only the results of the engagement scenario study were collected and reported in the supplement.
- Design: We randomly assigned participants from a 2(Decision to Share: Know and Hide vs. Don’t know and Tell) x 2(Perspective: Communicator vs. Target) between subjects design.
- Details:
  - Adults recruited from downtown Chicago read a scenario in which a communicator either shared or hid good news about their engagement (the success) with the target. Participants were randomly assigned to either read the scenario from the perspective of the target or the communicator.
  - In the share condition, the communicator shared the information directly, and the target had no prior knowledge of the success. In the hide condition, the communicator did not share the information, but the target learned of the success from a third party.

**Table S22.** Scenario for Study S3

| Target Perspective:   |   |
|---|---|
| Imagine that you are a young adult living in a mid-size city. You recently went through a serious breakup. You live in the same city with your close friend Sarah. She has been in a committed relationship for the past two years. |   |
| Know and Hide:  | Don’t know and Share:   |
| You talk to Sarah one day and ask her how her relationship has been going. Sarah tells you that she recently got engaged.   | You talk to your friend Derek one day, and he mentions that Sarah recently got engaged.<br>Later that day you also talk to Sarah. You ask her how her relationship has been going. Sarah tells you that nothing is new with her relationship. |
| Communicator Perspective:   |   |

Imagine that you are a young adult living in a mid-size city. You have been in a committed relationship for the past two years, and you recently got engaged. You live in the same city with your close friend Sarah. She recently went through a serious breakup. Now, imagine that you haven't told Sarah about your engagement yet.

| <b>Know and Hide:</b>  | <b>Don't know and Share:</b>  |
|--|---|
| You talk to Sarah one day and she asks you how your relationship has been going. You tell her that you recently got engaged. | You talk to Sarah one day and she asks you how your relationship has been going. You tell her that nothing is new with your relationship.<br>Later that day you find out that your friend Derek already told Sarah that you recently got engaged. |

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Main dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Insult ( $\alpha = .94$ )
    - Target: How insulted do you feel? / Communicator: How insulted would your friend feel?
    - Target: How offended do you feel? / Communicator: How offended would your friend feel?
    - Target: How angry with your friend do you feel? / Communicator: How angry with you would your friend feel?
  - Closeness
    - Target: How close do you feel your friend? / Communicator: How close would your friend feel to you?
- Exploratory measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Happiness
    - Target: How happy for your friend do you feel? / Communicator: How happy for you would your friend feel?
  - Envy
    - Target: How envious of your friend do you feel? / Communicator: How envious of you would your friend feel?

### ***Analyses***

- We conducted a two-way ANOVA on each of the dependent variables, using Perspective and Decision to Share as between-subject factors.

### ***Results***

- See tables below for ANOVA results and descriptive statistics:



**Table S23.** Descriptive statistics for Study S3

|               |                             | <b>Communicator</b> |           | <b>Target</b> |           |
|---------------|-----------------------------|---------------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|
|               |                             | <i>M</i>            | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> |
| <b>Insult</b> | <b>Share and Don't know</b> | 2.59                | 1.79      | 1.82          | 1.43      |
|               | <b>Hide and Know</b>        | 4.55                | 1.65      | 2.45          | 1.74      |
| <b>Close</b>  | <b>Share and Don't know</b> | 4.47                | 1.78      | 4.47          | 1.88      |
|               | <b>Hide and Know</b>        | 3.02                | 1.82      | 3.10          | 1.70      |
| <b>Envy</b>   | <b>Share and Don't know</b> | 3.60                | 1.91      | 3.09          | 2.21      |
|               | <b>Hide and Know</b>        | 3.96                | 1.98      | 2.88          | 1.88      |
| <b>Happy</b>  | <b>Share and Don't know</b> | 5.51                | 1.30      | 5.80          | 1.47      |
|               | <b>Hide and Know</b>        | 4.58                | 1.53      | 4.49          | 1.78      |

**Table S24.** ANOVA results for Study S3

|                  | <b>Main Effect of Perspective</b> | <b>Main Effect of Decision to Share</b> | <b>Perspective x Decision to Share Interaction</b> |
|------------------|-----------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Insult</b>    | $F(1,185) = 35.10, p < .001$      | $F(1,185) = 28.75, p < .001$            | $F(1,185) = 7.68, p = .006$                        |
| <b>Closeness</b> | $F(1,185) = 0.02, p = .879$       | $F(1,185) = 29.04, p < .001$            | $F(1,185) = 0.03, p = .874$                        |
| <b>Happiness</b> | $F(1,185) = 0.19, p = .661$       | $F(1,185) = 25.13, p < .001$            | $F(1,185) = 0.74, p = .392$                        |
| <b>Envy</b>      | $F(1,185) = 7.48, p = .007$       | $F(1,185) = 0.07, p = .795$             | $F(1,185) = 0.98, p = .324$                        |

### Discussion

- This study explored whether communicators mispredict the negative emotional consequences of hiding success compared to sharing success.
- We replicated previous findings on the negative consequences of hiding success: We find that both communicators and targets believed targets would feel more insulted by, less close to, less happy for, and similarly envious of communicators when they hid their success compared to when they shared their success.
- We also find that communicators believed targets felt more insulted and more envious than they actually did when they learned about the communicator's success. In particular, communicators believed targets would feel more insulted when communicators hid their success than targets actually felt.

**SOM 12. Study S4. Hiding success vs. failure replication**

In Study S4, we explored targets' reactions to hiding and sharing both success and failure. By comparing the reactions to hiding success with hiding failure, we are able to test whether hiding success is insulting because it leads to unique inferences of paternalistic motives. This study replicates Study 4 from the main manuscript, using an online sample and hypothetical scenario. Details are below.

**Participants**

- N = 407 (45% female; mean age = 37.04)
- MTurk payment = \$0.60 in exchange for 6 minutes

**Procedure**

- Preregistered on AsPredicted.org (<http://aspredicted.org/blind.php?x=dq22nw>)
- Design: We randomly assigned participants to a condition from a 2 (Outcome: success or failure) x 2 (Decision to Share: share or hide) between-subjects design
- Details: All participants read a scenario describing a situation in which their brother decided to either share or hide a success or failure. In this scenario, all participants first learned about their brother's success (receiving a raise) or failure (getting fired) from their mother. The brother then either shared or hid this news.

**Table S25.** Scenario for Study S4

| <b>Failure Scenario:</b>  |  |
|---|--|
| You are talking with your mother one day, and she mentions that your younger brother was recently fired from his job. Later that day, you also talk to your brother. You ask him how his job has been going.                            |  |
| <b>Hide Failure:</b>  | <b>Share Failure:</b>  |
| Your brother tells you that nothing is new at work.   | Your brother tells you that he was recently fired from his job.                            |
| <b>Success Scenario:</b>  |  |
| You are talking with your mother one day, and she mentions that your younger brother recently received a raise from \$60,000 to \$80,000 a year. Later that day, you also talk to your brother. You ask him how his job has been going. |  |
| <b>Hide Success:</b>  | <b>Share Success:</b>  |
| Your brother tells you that nothing is new at work.   | Your brother tells you that he recently received a raise from \$60,000 to \$80,000 a year. |

**Dependent Measures**

- Main dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Insult ( $\alpha = .93$ )
    - To what extent do you feel offended?
    - To what extent do you feel angry with your brother?
    - To what extent do you feel insulted?
  - Closeness
    - To what extent do you feel close your brother?

- Paternalistic motives ( $\alpha = .84$ )
  - To what extent do you believe your brother was:
    - Attempting to regulate your emotions
    - Attempting to manipulate your feelings
    - Being condescending
  - To what extent would do believe your brother thought:
    - You would be upset
    - You could not handle the truth
    - You would be envious
    - You would be happy for him
    - You could not handle learning about his success
    - You would feel threatened
- Perceived shame ( $\alpha = .94$ )
  - To what extent would you believe your brother feels:
    - Ashamed
    - Embarrassed
    - Afraid of your judgment
    - Afraid of your pity
- Manipulation check: (1 = you make much less, 7 = you make much more)
  - In this scenario, how does your salary compare to your brother's salary?

### Analyses

- We conducted a two-way ANOVA on each of the dependent variables, using Decision to Share and Outcome as between-subject factors.

### Results

- See tables below for ANOVA results and descriptive statistics:

**Table S26.** Descriptive statistics for Study S4

|                              |                | Share    |           | Hide     |           | Share vs. Hide            |
|------------------------------|----------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|---------------------------|
|                              |                | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>             |
| <b>Manipulation check</b>    | <b>Failure</b> | 5.21     | 1.32      | 5.12     | 1.35      | $t(200) = 0.46, p = .648$ |
|                              | <b>Success</b> | 2.38     | 1.38      | 2.41     | 1.41      | $t(203) = 0.19, p = .851$ |
| <b>Insult</b>                | <b>Failure</b> | 1.72     | 1.31      | 3.06     | 1.70      | $t(200) = 6.25, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Success</b> | 1.94     | 1.48      | 3.01     | 1.72      | $t(203) = 4.75, p < .001$ |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | <b>Failure</b> | 5.33     | 1.48      | 3.47     | 1.68      | $t(200) = 8.38, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Success</b> | 4.96     | 1.62      | 3.44     | 1.79      | $t(203) = 6.37, p < .001$ |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | <b>Failure</b> | 2.49     | 1.04      | 2.98     | 0.95      | $t(200) = 3.49, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Success</b> | 2.28     | 1.32      | 3.48     | 1.3       | $t(203) = 6.52, p < .001$ |
| <b>Perceived shame</b>       | <b>Failure</b> | 3.91     | 1.67      | 5.43     | 1.36      | $t(200) = 7.07, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Success</b> | 1.96     | 1.56      | 2.29     | 1.29      | $t(203) = 1.62, p = .107$ |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S27.** ANOVA results for Study S4

|                              | <b>Main Effect of Outcome</b> | <b>Main Effect of Decision to Share</b> | <b>Outcome x Decision to Share Interaction</b> |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Manipulation check</b>    | $F(1,403)=418.28, p < .001$   | $F(1,403)=0.03, p = .856$               | $F(1,403)=0.21, p = .651$                      |
| <b>Insult</b>                | $F(1,403)=0.31, p = .580$     | $F(1,403)=60.00, p < .001$              | $F(1,403)=0.77, p = .382$                      |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | $F(1,403)=1.48, p = .225$     | $F(1,403)=107.46, p < .001$             | $F(1,403)=1.12, p = .290$                      |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | $F(1,403)=1.54, p = .215$     | $F(1,403)=53.07, p < .001$              | $F(1,403)=9.26, p = .003$                      |
| <b>Perceived shame</b>       | $F(1,403)=299.31, p < .001$   | $F(1,403)=39.39, p < .001$              | $F(1,403)=16.51, p < .001$                     |

**Discussion**

- We replicated previous findings on the relational costs of hiding success.
- We then compared reactions to hiding success with hiding failure. Hiding information – regardless whether it is success or failure – led to greater insult and less closeness. However, hiding success leads to a stronger inference that the communicator had paternalistic motives than hiding failure. These results are consistent with the results of Study 4 in the main manuscript.
- While hiding information can damage relationships more generally, hiding success is insulting for a different reason than hiding failure.

**SOM 13. Study S5. Closeness and social comparison**

In Study S5, we explore the circumstances in which hiding success is offensive. Specifically, we compare hiding success to sharing success in relationships characterized by closeness versus distance and high versus low social comparison. We predict that hiding success will have greater relational costs in close rather than distant relationships and low rather than high social comparison, because the norms of sharing are stronger in close relationships and when there is low social comparison. Details are below.

**Participants**

- N = 361 adults (51% female; mean age = 34.65): 77 current medical students and 284 participants on MTurk
  - 46 current medical students from university email lists and online platforms intended for medical students and 31 current medical students from Prolific Academic in exchange for \$0.45
- MTurk payment = \$0.50 in exchange for 5 minutes

**Procedure**

- Design: We randomly assigned participants to a condition from a 2 (Decision to Share: share or hide) x 2 (Relationship: close or distant) x 2 (Social Comparison: high or low) mixed within-between subject design. Decision to Share was a within-subject factor; Relationship and Social Comparison were between-subject factors.
- Details:
  - The two samples in our study (current medical students and MTurk participants) read two different scenarios:
    - Medical students were recruited for one month following Match Day, which is the annual release of the results from the Natural Resident Matching Program for applicants seeking residency and fellowship training positions in the United States, to read a scenario about Match Day
    - MTurk participants instead read a scenario about a job promotion.
  - In the Match Day scenario, the success was being matched to a top-choice program. The communicator was either a close or distant classmate who was in the same specialty (high social comparison) or a different specialty (low social comparison) in medical school.
  - In the promotion scenario, the success was receiving a promotion at work. The communicator was either a close or distant co-worker who was in the same department (high social comparison) or a different department (low social comparison) at the company.

**Table S28.** Promotion scenario for Study S5

| Promotion Scenario:  |
|--|
| Imagine that you live in a mid-size city and have been working at a market research company for a few years. |

Yesterday, all of the employees in your company learned whether or not they received a promotion this year. At your company, all employees receive a promotion on the same day and only a small percentage of employees are promoted.

This year, you did not receive a promotion.

#### Hide Success

| <b>Close Relationship<br/>/ High Social Comparison:</b>  | <b>Close Relationship<br/>/ Low Social Comparison:</b>  |
|--|---|
| The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you are very close with who is in the same department as you at your company, which means you were competing for the same promotion.                    | The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you are very close with who is in a different department as you at your company, which means you were not competing for the same promotion.                    |
| You start talking with them about the promotions, and they quickly change the subject. They do not tell you whether or not they were promoted.   | You start talking with them about the promotions, and they quickly change the subject. They do not tell you whether or not they were promoted.  |
| Later you find out that they were promoted yesterday.  | Later you find out that they were promoted yesterday.   |
| <b>Distant Relationship<br/>/ High Social Comparison:</b>  | <b>Distant Relationship<br/>/ Low Social Comparison:</b>  |
| The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you have met before but are not close with who is in the same department as you at your company, which means you were competing for the same promotion. | The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you have met before but are not close with who is in a different department as you at your company, which means you were not competing for the same promotion. |
| You start talking with them about the promotions, and they quickly change the subject. They do not tell you whether or not they were promoted.   | You start talking with them about the promotions, and they quickly change the subject. They do not tell you whether or not they were promoted.  |
| Later you find out that they were promoted yesterday.  | Later you find out that they were promoted yesterday.   |

#### Share Success

| <b>Close Relationship<br/>/High Social Comparison:</b>  | <b>Close Relationship<br/>/Low Social Comparison:</b>  |
|---|--|
| The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you are very close with who is in the same department as you at your company, which means you were competing for the same promotion. | The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you are very close with who is in a different department as you at your company, which means you were not competing for the same promotion. |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| You start talking with them about the promotions. They tell you that they were promoted yesterday.   | You start talking with them about the promotions. They tell you that they were promoted yesterday.  |
| <b>Distant Relationship<br/>/High Social Comparison:</b>   | <b>Distant Relationship<br/>/Low Social Comparison:</b>   |
| The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you have met before but are not close with who is in the same department as you at your company, which means you were competing for the same promotion. | The next day at work, you see a co-worker that you have met before but are not close with who is in a different department as you at your company, which means you were not competing for the same promotion. |
| You start talking with them about the promotions. They tell you that they were promoted yesterday.   | You start talking with them about the promotions. They tell you that they were promoted yesterday.  |

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Main dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Insult ( $\alpha = .90$ )
    - To what extent do you feel offended?
    - To what extent do you feel angry with your co-worker [classmate]?
    - To what extent do you feel insulted?
  - Closeness
    - To what extent do you feel close your co-worker [classmate]?
  - Paternalistic motives ( $\alpha = .90$ )
    - To what extent do you believe your co-worker [classmate] was:
      - Attempting to regulate your emotions
      - Attempting to manipulate your feelings
      - Being condescending
    - To what extent would do believe your co-worker [classmate] thought:
      - You would be upset
      - You could not handle the truth
      - You would be envious
      - You would be happy for them
      - You could not handle learning about their success
      - You would feel threatened
  - Cooperation intentions
    - How much do you to want to work on the same team as your coworker in the future?" [Match Day scenario: "How much do you to want to work with your classmate on a medical team in the future?"]
  - Trust
    - "How likely would you be to go to your coworker when you have a question in regards to work?" [Match Day scenario: "How likely

would you be to go to your classmate for a consultation in regards to a patient?""]

### Analyses

- We conducted a mixed within-between subject ANOVA on all of our dependent variables, using Relationship and Social Comparison as between-subject factors and Decision to Share as a within-subject factor.

### Results

- See tables below for descriptive statistics. We first report the results combined across sample and then separated by sample.

**Table S29.** Descriptive statistics for Study S5

|                              |                               | Share    |           | Hide     |           | Share vs. Hide             |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------|----------------------------|
|                              |                               | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>              |
| <b>Insult</b>                | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 2.58     | 1.78      | 3.23     | 1.84      | $t(176) = 4.77, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.30     | 1.59      | 2.50     | 1.65      | $t(183) = 1.76, p = .080$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 2.80     | 1.78      | 3.00     | 1.88      | $t(180) = 1.43, p = .155$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 2.07     | 1.52      | 2.72     | 1.66      | $t(179) = 5.66, p < .001$  |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 4.21     | 1.74      | 3.08     | 1.61      | $t(176) = 7.76, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 3.01     | 1.58      | 2.40     | 1.58      | $t(183) = 4.64, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 3.37     | 1.81      | 2.76     | 1.67      | $t(180) = 4.46, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 3.83     | 1.70      | 2.71     | 1.59      | $t(179) = 8.00, p < .001$  |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 2.55     | 1.34      | 4.12     | 1.30      | $t(176) = 13.29, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.40     | 1.23      | 3.55     | 1.30      | $t(183) = 11.21, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 2.63     | 1.33      | 3.90     | 1.34      | $t(180) = 11.05, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 2.31     | 1.23      | 3.77     | 1.30      | $t(179) = 13.39, p < .001$ |
| <b>Cooperation</b>           | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 5.05     | 1.44      | 4.15     | 1.56      | $t(176) = 7.19, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 4.60     | 1.28      | 4.18     | 1.35      | $t(183) = 3.82, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 4.69     | 1.52      | 4.24     | 1.52      | $t(180) = 3.39, p = .001$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 4.96     | 1.20      | 4.09     | 1.39      | $t(179) = 8.46, p < .001$  |
| <b>Trust</b>                 | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 5.11     | 1.59      | 4.16     | 1.68      | $t(176) = 7.32, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 4.73     | 1.40      | 4.24     | 1.62      | $t(183) = 4.07, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 4.72     | 1.66      | 4.24     | 1.64      | $t(180) = 3.58, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 5.12     | 1.30      | 4.16     | 1.66      | $t(179) = 8.29, p < .001$  |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S30a.** ANOVA results for Study S5

|  | Upset    |          | Closeness |          | Paternalistic motives |          |
|--|----------|----------|-----------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i> | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>  | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>              | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 23.41    | <.001    | 80.43     | <.001    | 303.42                | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 10.22    | .002     | 44.80     | <.001    | 10.32                 | .001     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 10.22    | .002     | 2.40      | .122     | 3.91                  | .049     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 6.69     | .010     | 7.30      | .007     | 7.68                  | .006     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 6.99     | .009     | 7.18      | .008     | 1.54                  | .215     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 0.55     | .460     | 0.54      | .465     | 0.55                  | .458     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 0.28     | .599     | 0.53      | .468     | 0.05                  | .818     |



**Table S30b.** ANOVA results for Study S5

|  | <b>Cooperation</b> |          | <b>Trust</b> |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i>           | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>     | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 64.22              | <.001    | 67.65        | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 2.92               | .089     | 1.13         | .289     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 0.25               | .618     | 1.29         | .257     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 8.99               | .003     | 7.25         | .008     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 6.77               | .010     | 7.51         | .006     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 0.86               | .354     | 0.26         | .609     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 0.02               | .892     | 0.01         | .936     |

**Results split by sample****Match Day Scenario (*N* = 77)****Table S31.** Match day scenario descriptive statistics

|                              |                               | <b>Share</b> |           | <b>Hide</b> |           | <b>Share vs. Hide</b>    |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|--------------------------|
|                              |                               | <i>M</i>     | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>            |
| <b>Insult</b>                | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 1.72         | 1.32      | 3.18        | 1.84      | $t(35) = 4.89, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 1.74         | 1.39      | 2.26        | 1.70      | $t(40) = 1.98, p = .055$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 2.07         | 1.62      | 2.85        | 2.09      | $t(38) = 2.59, p = .013$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 1.39         | 0.90      | 2.53        | 1.50      | $t(37) = 4.16, p < .001$ |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 4.97         | 1.61      | 3.06        | 1.87      | $t(35) = 5.78, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 3.27         | 1.80      | 2.63        | 1.74      | $t(40) = 2.10, p = .042$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 4.23         | 1.68      | 3.13        | 1.79      | $t(38) = 3.12, p = .003$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 3.89         | 2.13      | 2.53        | 1.78      | $t(37) = 4.45, p < .001$ |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 2.0          | 1.17      | 4.02        | 1.41      | $t(35) = 8.39, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.10         | 1.15      | 3.00        | 1.47      | $t(40) = 4.85, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 2.47         | 1.34      | 3.83        | 1.53      | $t(38) = 6.25, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 1.71         | 0.75      | 3.12        | 1.44      | $t(37) = 6.15, p < .001$ |
| <b>Cooperation</b>           | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 5.75         | 1.18      | 4.47        | 1.70      | $t(35) = 5.10, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 5.02         | 1.48      | 4.59        | 1.63      | $t(40) = 1.61, p = .115$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 5.08         | 1.53      | 4.51        | 1.62      | $t(38) = 1.81, p = .078$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 5.66         | 1.17      | 4.55        | 1.70      | $t(37) = 5.12, p < .001$ |
| <b>Trust</b>                 | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 5.83         | 1.21      | 4.69        | 1.79      | $t(35) = 4.51, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 5.17         | 1.45      | 4.88        | 1.65      | $t(40) = 1.21, p = .235$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 5.26         | 1.43      | 4.79        | 1.53      | $t(38) = 1.53, p = .135$ |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 5.71         | 1.29      | 4.79        | 1.89      | $t(37) = 4.85, p < .001$ |

**Table S32a.** Match day scenario ANOVA results

|  | <b>Upset</b> |          | <b>Closeness</b> |          | <b>Paternalistic motives</b> |          |
|--|--------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i>     | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>         | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 24.54        | <.001    | 31.26            | <.001    | 91.62                        | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 1.80         | .184     | 9.65             | .003     | 3.04                         | .086     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 2.42         | .124     | 1.09             | .300     | 7.71                         | .007     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 5.95         | .017     | 8.39             | .005     | 12.40                        | .001     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 1.26         | .266     | 0.65             | .423     | 0.26                         | .611     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 0.07         | .800     | 1.29             | .259     | 0.00                         | .978     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 0.03         | .872     | 0.52             | .472     | 0.18                         | .671     |

**Table S32b.** Match day scenario ANOVA results

|  | <b>Cooperation</b> |          | <b>Trust</b> |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i>           | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>     | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 20.77              | <.001    | 16.21        | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 1.36               | .247     | 0.72         | .400     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 1.43               | .235     | 0.63         | .429     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 5.71               | .019     | 6.52         | .013     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 2.57               | .113     | 2.14         | .148     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 0.18               | .670     | 0.02         | .884     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 1.28               | .261     | 2.35         | .129     |

**Promotion Scenario (n = 284)****Table S33.** Promotion scenario descriptive statistics

|                              |                               | <b>Share</b> |           | <b>Hide</b> |           | <b>Share vs. Hide</b>      |
|------------------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|----------------------------|
|                              |                               | <i>M</i>     | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>              |
| <b>Insult</b>                | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 2.80         | 1.82      | 3.24        | 1.84      | $t(140) = 2.99, p = .003$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.46         | 1.61      | 2.57        | 1.63      | $t(142) = 0.87, p = .385$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 3.01         | 1.77      | 3.04        | 1.83      | $t(141) = 0.21, p = .837$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 2.25         | 1.60      | 2.77        | 1.70      | $t(141) = 4.18, p < .001$  |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 4.01         | 1.73      | 3.09        | 1.54      | $t(140) = 5.88, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.94         | 1.51      | 2.34        | 1.53      | $t(142) = 4.13, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 3.13         | 1.77      | 2.66        | 1.62      | $t(141) = 3.31, p = .001$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 3.81         | 1.58      | 2.76        | 1.54      | $t(141) = 6.69, p < .001$  |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 2.67         | 1.36      | 4.16        | 1.28      | $t(140) = 10.91, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 2.49         | 1.24      | 3.71        | 1.21      | $t(142) = 10.14, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 2.68         | 1.33      | 3.92        | 1.32      | $t(141) = 9.29, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 2.48         | 1.28      | 3.94        | 1.20      | $t(141) = 11.86, p < .001$ |
| <b>Cooperation</b>           | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 4.87         | 1.45      | 4.07        | 1.52      | $t(140) = 5.63, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 4.49         | 1.20      | 4.07        | 1.24      | $t(142) = 3.50, p = .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 4.58         | 1.51      | 4.17        | 1.48      | $t(141) = 2.86, p = .005$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 4.77         | 1.15      | 3.97        | 1.27      | $t(141) = 6.92, p < .001$  |
| <b>Trust</b>                 | <b>Close Relationship</b>     | 4.93         | 1.62      | 4.02        | 1.63      | $t(140) = 6.03, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>Distant Relationship</b>   | 4.61         | 1.36      | 4.06        | 1.57      | $t(142) = 3.95, p < .001$  |
|                              | <b>High Social Comparison</b> | 4.58         | 1.70      | 4.09        | 1.65      | $t(141) = 3.24, p = .002$  |
|                              | <b>Low Social Comparison</b>  | 4.96         | 1.26      | 3.99        | 1.55      | $t(141) = 7.03, p < .001$  |

**Table S34a.** Promotion scenario ANOVA results

|  | <b>Upset</b> |          | <b>Closeness</b> |          | <b>Paternalistic Motives</b> |          |
|--|--------------|----------|------------------|----------|------------------------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i>     | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>         | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>                     | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 8.26         | .004     | 51.87            | <.001    | 221.61                       | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 8.11         | .005     | 35.68            | <.001    | 6.58                         | .011     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 8.26         | .004     | 6.20             | .013     | 0.58                         | .449     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 2.95         | .087     | 2.25             | .135     | 2.18                         | .141     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 6.39         | .012     | 7.47             | .007     | 1.52                         | .219     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 0.65         | .421     | 0.06             | .811     | 0.40                         | .528     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 0.13         | .723     | 1.87             | .172     | 0.01                         | .929     |

**Table S34b.** Promotion scenario ANOVA results

|  | <b>Cooperation</b> |          | <b>Trust</b> |          |
|--|--------------------|----------|--------------|----------|
|  | <i>F</i>           | <i>p</i> | <i>F</i>     | <i>p</i> |
| <b>Decision to Share</b>                     | 43.75              | <.001    | 51.29        | <.001    |
| <b>Relationship</b>                          | 2.25               | .134     | 0.82         | .366     |
| <b>Social Comparison</b>                     | 0.00               | .964     | 0.85         | .358     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Relationship</b>      | 4.65               | .032     | 3.13         | .078     |
| <b>Decision to Share x Social Comparison</b> | 4.48               | .035     | 5.55         | .019     |
| <b>Relationship x Social Comparison</b>      | 1.28               | .260     | 0.79         | .375     |
| <b>3-way interaction</b>                     | 0.73               | .392     | 0.64         | .425     |

### Discussion

- Overall, Study S5 provided additional evidence that hiding success has negative relational consequences. Targets felt more insulted by, less close to, inferred more paternalistic motives from, trusted less, and intended to cooperate less with communicators when they hid, rather than shared, their success.
- Study S5 also explored the circumstances in which hiding success is seen as more or less offensive. Hiding success was more damaging in close than in distant relationships. Hiding success in distant relationships still led targets to feel less close, infer more paternalistic motives, cooperate less, trust less, and feel marginally more insulted than sharing success, but these penalties were significantly greater in close relationships.
- Hiding success was more damaging when there was low rather than high social comparison. Hiding success when there was high social comparison still led targets to infer more paternalistic motives, cooperate less, trust less, and feel less close than sharing success, but these penalties were significantly greater when there was low social comparison. When social comparison was high, targets felt insulted regardless of whether the communicator shared or hid their success.
- Our results split by sample suggest that the norms of sharing information may differ between the two populations and scenarios we used. Hiding success increased feelings of insult compared to sharing success in distant relationships and when social comparison was high (i.e., when the norms of sharing were less strong) with medical students in the Match Day scenario,  $t(40) = 1.98, p = .055$

(distant relationships) and  $t(38) = 2.59, p = .013$  (high social comparison), but not with online participants in the promotion scenario,  $t(142) = 0.87, p = .385$  (distant relationships) and  $t(141) = 0.21, p = .837$  (high social comparisons).

## **SOM 14. Study S6. Paternalistic motives pilot**

Study S6 was the pilot study in which we first developed the paternalistic motives scale. Additionally, Study S6 was intended to be a pre-test for a naturalistic lab paradigm, in which communicators would be assigned to either share or hide their success in an academic competition with targets in an in-person conversation. In Study S6, MTurk participants were assigned to the role of the target and were asked to imagine having a conversation with a friend (i.e., the communicator) who performed in the top 5% of a speech, resume, writing, or IQ test competition and therefore won a cash prize. Then, participants rated their reactions as well as their inferences about the communicator.

Because we never ran the naturalistic lab paradigm outlined in this study, we primarily focus on the paternalistic motives variables below for clarity and brevity. However, the full materials for this study are available on OSF.

### ***Participants***

- N = 401 (37% female; mean age = 35.76)
- MTurk payment = \$0.60 in exchange for 6 minutes

### ***Procedure***

- Design: We randomly assigned participants to a condition from a 2 (Decision to Share: share or hide) x 2 (Previous knowledge: known or unknown) x 4 (Competition: speech, resume, essay, or test) between-subjects design
- Details: Participants first reported the initials of a friend who lives in the same city as them, which was piped as the name of the communicator for the remainder of the study. Then, participants read a scenario where they were asked to imagine participating in a research study at a university lab along with the communicator, in which they were competing in a speech, resume, essay, or IQ test competition along with the communicator. Based on ratings of the participants' speech, resume, essay, or IQ test, the top 5% of all performers would win a \$20 cash prize.
- Participants then read that they did not win the cash prize in the competition.
- In the known success condition, participants read that experimenter told them the communicator won the cash prize in the competition, while participants in the unknown success condition did not receive this information.
- Then, participants were asked to imagine having a five-minute conversation with the communicator where the communicator either shared their success in the competition (share condition) or did not (hide condition). Thus, this study replicates the design of Study 2 in the main manuscript, but with a scenario about a naturalistic laboratory paradigm instead. Finally, participants rated their reactions, inferences about the communicator's motives, and several exploratory behavioral consequences.

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Insult ( $\alpha = .94$ )
  - To what extent do you feel offended?
  - To what extent do you feel angry with [initials]?

- To what extent do you feel insulted?
- Closeness: To what extent do you feel close to [initials]?
- Positive emotions ( $a = .89$ )
  - To what extent do you feel happy for [initials]?
  - To what extent do you feel proud of [initials]?
- Envy: To what extent do you feel envious of [initials]?
- Inferences of paternalistic motives ( $a = .93$ )
  - To what extent would you believe [initials] was:
    - Attempting to regulate your emotions
    - Attempting to manipulate your feelings
    - Being condescending
  - To what extent would you believe [initials] thought:
    - You would be envious
    - You would be upset
    - You would be happy for them
    - You could not handle the truth
    - You could not handle learning about their success
    - You would feel threatened by their success
- Inferences of lower status ( $a = .74$ )
  - To what extent would you believe [initials] thought:
    - You would be sensitive about your performance in the speech competition
    - You performed poorly in the speech competition
- Inferences of impressiveness ( $a = .67$ )
  - To what extent would you believe [initials] thought:
    - The speech test signaled intelligence
    - Winning the speech competition was very impressive
- Behavioral outcomes ( $a = .77$ )
  - How likely are you to share the experimenter's tip with [initials]?
  - How many candy bars would you like to give to [initials]?
  - Would you tell [initials] about the opportunity to participate in this lab study?
  - Would you sign up to participate in this lab study with [initials]?

### *Analyses*

- We conducted a factor analysis with principal axis factoring and varimax rotation on inferences of paternalistic motives.
- We conducted a two-way ANOVA on the relational consequences, emotional consequences, and inferences, using Decision to Share and Previous Knowledge as between-subject factors and collapsing across Competition.
- We conducted a moderated mediation analysis to explore whether the inferences explain the difference between hiding success when the success is previously known versus unknown. Specifically, we ran a model that includes Decision to Share as the independent variable, inferences of paternalistic motives, lower status, and impressiveness as the mediator variables, Previous Knowledge as the

moderator, and insult as the dependent variable (Model 8 of SPSS Macro MEDIANTE with 10,000 samples; Preacher, Rucker, & Hayes, 2007).

### Results

- See tables below for the factor analysis results descriptive statistics, ANOVA results, and moderated mediation results:

**Table S35.** Factor analysis results for Study S6

|   | <b>Factor 1</b> | <b>Factor 2</b> | <b>Communality</b> |
|---|-----------------|-----------------|--------------------|
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b>  |                 |                 |                    |
| You could not handle learning about their success                       | <b>.906</b>     | -.137           | .840               |
| You would be upset  | <b>.889</b>     | -.120           | .806               |
| You would feel threatened by their success                              | <b>.888</b>     | -.079           | .795               |
| You could not handle the truth  | <b>.867</b>     | -.077           | .758               |
| Attempting to manipulate your feelings                                  | <b>.770</b>     | -.039           | .594               |
| You would be envious  | <b>.763</b>     | .037            | .583               |
| Attempting to regulate your emotions                                    | <b>.762</b>     | -.099           | .591               |
| Being condescending   | <b>.757</b>     | -.005           | .574               |
| You would be happy for them   | .267            | <b>-.418</b>    | .246               |
| <b>Lower Status</b>   |                 |                 |                    |
| You would be sensitive about your performance in the speech competition | <b>.664</b>     | .094            | .449               |
| You performed poorly in the speech competition                          | <b>.639</b>     | .092            | .417               |
| <b>Impressiveness</b>   |                 |                 |                    |
| Winning the speech competition was very impressive                      | .266            | <b>.809</b>     | .725               |
| The speech test signaled intelligence                                   | .494            | <b>.454</b>     | .449               |
| Eigenvalue  | 7.06            | 1.55            |                    |
| % of Total Variance   | 54.31           | 11.92           |                    |
| Total Variance  |                 | <b>66.23%</b>   |                    |

**Table S36.** Descriptive statistics for Study S6

|                              |                | <b>Share</b> |           | <b>Hide</b> |           | <b>Share vs. Hide</b>     |
|------------------------------|----------------|--------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|---------------------------|
|                              |                | <i>M</i>     | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>    | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>             |
| <b>Insult</b>                | <b>Unknown</b> | 2.17         | 1.67      | 2.04        | 1.44      | $t(200) = 0.56, p = .575$ |
|                              | <b>Known</b>   | 2.01         | 1.58      | 2.77        | 1.91      | $t(197) = 3.03, p = .003$ |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | <b>Unknown</b> | 4.40         | 1.52      | 4.25        | 1.87      | $t(200) = 0.63, p = .526$ |
|                              | <b>Known</b>   | 4.39         | 1.73      | 3.82        | 1.81      | $t(197) = 2.26, p = .025$ |
| <b>Positive emotions</b>     | <b>Unknown</b> | 5.50         | 1.44      | 4.53        | 1.83      | $t(200) = 4.22, p < .001$ |
|                              | <b>Known</b>   | 5.59         | 1.44      | 5.32        | 1.53      | $t(197) = 1.25, p = .212$ |
| <b>Envy</b>                  | <b>Unknown</b> | 3.68         | 2.01      | 2.96        | 1.89      | $t(200) = 2.62, p = .010$ |
|                              | <b>Known</b>   | 3.28         | 1.84      | 3.47        | 1.90      | $t(197) = 0.72, p = .475$ |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | <b>Unknown</b> | 2.39         | 1.53      | 2.82        | 1.31      | $t(200) = 2.17, p = .031$ |
|                              | <b>Known</b>   | 2.21         | 1.39      | 3.30        | 1.50      | $t(197) = 5.27, p < .001$ |
| <b>Lower status</b>          | <b>Unknown</b> | 2.99         | 1.65      | 3.48        | 1.64      | $t(200) = 2.14, p = .034$ |

|                            |                |      |      |      |      |                           |
|----------------------------|----------------|------|------|------|------|---------------------------|
|                            | <b>Known</b>   | 3.27 | 1.61 | 4.37 | 1.72 | $t(197) = 4.65, p < .001$ |
| <b>Impressiveness</b>      | <b>Unknown</b> | 4.41 | 1.52 | 4.03 | 1.64 | $t(200) = 1.74, p = .083$ |
|                            | <b>Known</b>   | 4.42 | 1.51 | 4.29 | 1.65 | $t(197) = 0.59, p = .559$ |
| <b>Behavioral outcomes</b> | <b>Unknown</b> | 5.23 | 1.13 | 5.04 | 1.30 | $t(200) = 1.10, p = .274$ |
|                            | <b>Known</b>   | 5.25 | 1.20 | 5.35 | 1.12 | $t(197) = 0.60, p = .548$ |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S37.** ANOVA results for Study S6

|                              | <b>Main Effect of<br/>Previous Knowledge</b> | <b>Main Effect of<br/>Decision to Share</b> | <b>Previous Knowledge<br/>x Decision to Share<br/>Interaction</b> |
|------------------------------|--|---|---|
| <b>Insult</b>                | $F(1,397)=2.91, p=.089$                      | $F(1,397)=3.63, p=.057$                     | $F(1,397)=7.02, p=.008$   |
| <b>Closeness</b>             | $F(1,397)=1.63, p=.203$                      | $F(1,397)=4.29, p=.039$                     | $F(1,397)=1.43, p=.233$   |
| <b>Positive emotions</b>     | $F(1,397)=7.83, p=.005$                      | $F(1,397)=15.71, p<.001$                    | $F(1,397)=5.18, p=.023$   |
| <b>Envy</b>                  | $F(1,397)=0.08, p=.784$                      | $F(1,397)=1.91, p=.168$                     | $F(1,397)=5.65, p=.018$   |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | $F(1,397)=1.09, p=.296$                      | $F(1,397)=28.00, p<.001$                    | $F(1,397)=5.09, p=.025$   |
| <b>Lower status</b>          | $F(1,397)=12.41, p<.001$                     | $F(1,397)=23.23, p<.001$                    | $F(1,397)=3.35, p=.068$   |
| <b>Impressiveness</b>        | $F(1,397)=0.78, p=.378$                      | $F(1,397)=2.69, p=.101$                     | $F(1,397)=0.66, p=.419$   |
| <b>Behavioral outcomes</b>   | $F(1,397)=1.83, p=.177$                      | $F(1,397)=0.14, p=.709$                     | $F(1,397)=1.46, p=.228$   |

**Table S38.** Moderated mediation results for Study S6

|                              | <b>Moderated Mediation</b> |           |                | <b>Unknown Success</b> |           |                | <b>Known Success</b> |           |                |
|------------------------------|----------------------------|-----------|----------------|------------------------|-----------|----------------|----------------------|-----------|----------------|
|                              | <i>index</i>               | <i>SE</i> | <i>95% CI</i>  | <i>index</i>           | <i>SE</i> | <i>95% CI</i>  | <i>index</i>         | <i>SE</i> | <i>95% CI</i>  |
| <b>Paternalistic motives</b> | -0.58                      | 0.26      | [-1.08, -0.08] | -0.39                  | 0.18      | [-0.72, -0.03] | -0.96                | 0.19      | [-1.34, -0.60] |
| <b>Lower status</b>          | 0.01                       | 0.04      | [-0.08, 0.09]  | 0.01                   | 0.03      | [-0.05, 0.07]  | 0.01                 | 0.06      | [-0.11, 0.13]  |
| <b>Impressiveness</b>        | -0.01                      | 0.02      | [-0.06, 0.02]  | 0.02                   | 0.02      | [-0.01, 0.06]  | 0.01                 | 0.01      | [-0.02, 0.04]  |

### Discussion

- We replicated previous findings on the relational and emotional consequences of hiding success. Hiding success had relational costs when the success was previously known, such as increased feelings of insult and reduced feelings of closeness. Hiding success had mixed emotional consequences when the success was previously unknown, such as decreased feelings of happiness, pride, and envy.



- We conducted a factor analysis on the potential mediators of hiding success. We found a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy of .923 and significant Bartlett's Test of Sphericity ( $p < .001$ ), which indicates the variables are related enough to perform a factor analysis. The analysis yielded two factors that explain 66.23% of the variance. However, we separated the factors further based on theoretical distinctions between inferences of lower status and paternalistic motivations.
- We then explore three potential mediators of hiding success: inferences of paternalistic motives, lower status, and impressiveness. We find that only inferences of paternalistic motives significantly mediates the effect of hiding success on feelings of insult, both when the success was previously known and previously unknown. Thus, in the remainder of the studies we continue to explore paternalistic motives – or the extent to which targets perceive the communicator both thinks the target will be threatened and attempts to regulate the target's threat – as the primary inference from hiding success in the remainder of the studies.

**SOM 15. Study S7. Hiding success naturalistic lab study pre-test**

Study S7 was the pre-test for another naturalistic lab study, in which communicators would be given the opportunity to share or hide their success on a logic assessment with targets in an in-person conversation. This study was inspired by comments from our review team after the first submission of this paper. However, we were not able to execute the actual laboratory study that corresponded with the pretest, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, which resulted in the closing of our lab facilities. Nonetheless, we believe these pretest results, along with the pretest results of Study S6, provide some evidence that our results are likely to replicate in a naturalistic laboratory paradigm.

In this pilot study, students on Prolific were randomly assigned to either perform well on an assessment of their math and logic skills (i.e., the communicator) or perform poorly (i.e., the target) and then rate their reactions to having a conversation with another participant. Details are below.

***Participants***

- N = 101 (52% female; mean age = 25.41)
- Prolific payment = \$1.35 in exchange for 10 minutes

***Procedure***

- Design: We randomly assigned participants to a condition from a 2-condition (Role: communicator vs. target) between subjects design. Participants in the communicator role provided judgments at one time-point, but participants in the target role provided judgments at two time-points. Therefore, Time (time 1: before vs. time 2: after success revealed) was a within-subjects factor, nested within the target role.
- Details: Participants completed seven multiple-choice math and logic questions. Three of the seven questions in the logic assessment were the same in both conditions, while four of the seven questions were easy in the communicator condition and difficult in the target condition. Therefore, participants in the communicator condition were more likely to perform in the top half of all participants and win a bonus prize. After completing the logic assessment, communicators were told they performed in the top half of all participants and targets were told they did not.
- Participants in both roles were then asked to imagine that they were having a conversation with another person who recently completed the logic assessment. Communicators were asked how uncomfortable they would be sharing their success on the logic assessment and how likely they would be to hide their success.
- Targets were asked how they would feel after the conversation if their partner did not reveal their performance on the logic assessment (time 1) and then again after discovering that their partner performed well on the logic assessment (time 2).

***Independent Measures***

- At time 1 and time 2, we measured target's perception of communicator's hiding, using the item "To what extent would you feel your partner was trying to hide their performance from you?" We intended to use this measure as an independent variable, to predict relational and emotional outcomes of perceived success hiding.

### ***Dependent Measures***

- Manipulation checks (measured for both communicators and targets): (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - How difficult was the logic assessment?
  - To what extent do you think that you preformed in the top half of participants on the logic assessment?
- Target dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Insult ( $\alpha = .95$ )
    - To what extent do you feel offended?
    - To what extent do you feel angry with your partner?
    - To what extent do you feel insulted?
  - Closeness: To what extent do you feel close your partner?
  - Envy: To what extent do you feel envious of your partner?
  - Write message: To what extent would you want to write a message to your partner to congratulate them on their accomplishment?
- Communicator dependent measures: (1 = not at all, 7 = extremely)
  - Discomfort sharing ( $\alpha = .83$ )
    - During the conversation, how uncomfortable would you feel telling your partner that you performed well in the logic assessment?
    - During the conversation, how hesitant would you be to tell your partner that you performed well in the logic assessment?
    - During the conversation, how worried would you be about telling your partner that you performed well in the logic assessment?
  - Likelihood of hiding success
    - During the conversation, how likely are you to try to avoid telling your partner that you performed well in the logic assessment?

### ***Analyses***

- We conducted an independent samples t-test on the manipulation checks, with Role (Target vs. Communicator) as the between-subjects factor.
- We conducted a paired samples t-test on the target's reactions, with Time (1 vs. 2) as the within-subjects factor.
- We conducted OLS regressions on the target reactions at time 1 and time 2, with perceived hiding as the independent variable and insult, closeness, envy, and the desire to write a message to the communicator as the dependent variables.

### ***Results***

- See tables below for regression results and descriptive statistics:

**Table S39.** Manipulation check descriptive statistics for Study S7

|                              | <b>Target</b> |           | <b>Communicator</b> |           | <b>Target vs. Communicator</b> |
|------------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------------|-----------|--------------------------------|
|                              | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>            | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>                  |
| <b>Total correct</b>         | 2.35          | 1.28      | 5.42                | 1.28      | $t(99)=12.05, p<.001$          |
| <b>Perceived difficulty</b>  | 5.75          | 1.00      | 3.64                | 1.47      | $t(99)=8.45, p<.001$           |
| <b>Perceived performance</b> | 2.63          | 1.64      | 4.88                | 1.57      | $t(99)=7.05, p<.001$           |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S40.** Communicator descriptive statistics for Study S7

|                             | <i>M</i> | <i>SD</i> |
|-----------------------------|----------|-----------|
| <b>Discomfort sharing</b>   | 3.74     | 1.56      |
| <b>Likelihood of hiding</b> | 4.16     | 1.95      |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S41.** Target descriptive statistics for Study S7

|                         | <b>Time 1</b> |           | <b>Time 2</b> |           | <b>Time 1 vs. Time 2</b> |
|-------------------------|---------------|-----------|---------------|-----------|--------------------------|
|                         | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> | <i>M</i>      | <i>SD</i> | <i>t test</i>            |
| <b>Perceived hiding</b> | 4.29          | 1.91      | 3.64          | 2.01      | $t(50) = 2.94, p = .005$ |
| <b>Insult</b>           | 2.14          | 1.38      | 1.99          | 1.52      | $t(50) = 1.20, p = .235$ |
| <b>Closeness</b>        | 2.80          | 1.76      | 2.69          | 1.64      | $t(50) = 0.71, p = .479$ |
| <b>Envy</b>             | 2.94          | 1.86      | 3.47          | 1.86      | $t(50) = 2.14, p = .038$ |
| <b>Write message</b>    |               |           | 4.57          | 2.15      |                          |

*Note.* Means in all descriptive statistic tables reflect raw means.

**Table S42.** Effect of perceived hiding on Target reactions at Time 1 for Study S7

| <b>Dependent Variable</b> | <b><i>B</i></b> | <b><i>SE</i></b> | <b><i>p</i></b> | <b><i>r</i><sup>2</sup></b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Insult                    | 0.36            | 0.09             | < .001          | .228                        |
| Closeness                 | 0.10            | 0.13             | .430            | .007                        |
| Envy                      | 0.09            | 0.14             | .533            | .012                        |

**Table S43.** Effect of perceived hiding on Target reactions at Time 2 for Study S7

| <b>Dependent Variable</b> | <b><i>B</i></b> | <b><i>SE</i></b> | <b><i>p</i></b> | <b><i>r</i><sup>2</sup></b> |
|---------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------|
| Insult                    | 0.36            | 0.10             | < .001          | .215                        |
| Closeness                 | 0.00            | 0.12             | .999            | .020                        |
| Envy                      | 0.28            | 0.13             | .030            | .074                        |
| Write message             | -0.18           | 0.15             | .226            | .010                        |

### **Discussion**

- In a hypothetical conversation about the logic assessment with another participant, 52% of communicators indicated they would want to hide their success and 34% indicated they would want to share their success. The remaining participants were unsure about whether they would avoid mentioning their success to the target.

- The extent to which the target perceived the communicator as hiding their success predicted the target's feelings of insult at time 1 and both insult and envy at time 2. In other words, consistent with previous findings, the target's perception that the communicator was hiding their success led to relational costs. These pre-test results suggest hiding success has the potential to increase feelings of insult in a naturalistic conversation paradigm.
- However, perceptions of hiding success did not significantly predict target's feelings of closeness to the communicator at time 1 or time 2. This is consistent with Study 4, which also featured interactions with strangers.
- Targets' feelings of insult and closeness did not vary between time 1 and time 2. Additionally, targets perceived the communicator to be hiding success significantly *less* at time 2 than time 1, which suggests some participants may have misinterpreted the information about the success at time 2 to be from the communicator (i.e., that the communicator shared their success) rather than from the experimenter (i.e., that the communicator hid their success).