

Supplemental Materials for

Does the Prospect of Fulfilling Belonging affect Social Responses to Rejection?

A Conceptual Replication Attempt

Table of Contents

Prospect of Fulfilling Belonging Manipulation: Conceptual Rationale.....	2
Debrief Coding and Exclusion Procedure.....	3
Order among Outcome Measures	4
Correlations among Outcome Measures	6
Equivalence Tests	8
Exploratory Measures Descriptions.....	9
Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire.....	9
Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale.....	10
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	10
Rejection Sensitivity Scale	11
Exploratory Analyses and Results	11
Weighted Self-Disclosure Score as an Outcome Measure.....	11
Moderation by Gender	14
Moderation by Individual Differences.....	19

Prospect of Fulfilling Belonging Manipulation: Conceptual Rationale

We manipulated two separate components of the prospect of fulfilling belonging. One component was the person's own desire to affiliate with the confederate (participant desire). The other was the confederate's desire to affiliate with the participant (confederate desire).

Prior research about the prospect of fulfilling belonging has largely focused on the other person's desire to affiliate with the participant (i.e., confederate desire). For example, the prospect of fulfilling belonging was manipulated through a paradigm where the confederate did not want to meet the participant (Maner et al., 2007), which signaled low confederate desire. Confederate desire is indeed an important component to fulfilling belonging, as people can only expect to fulfill their belonging when others like them and accept them. Including this manipulated variable thus allowed us to test the 2-way interaction between the rejection manipulation and the confederate desire manipulation—closely mirroring the bulk of prior work.

However, a close inspection of related literature makes it clear that confederate desire is not sufficient on its own—a person's own desire also matters. In other words, for belonging to be fulfilled, a person must also desire a connection with their partner. This idea is most clearly represented in the relationships literature. For example, people felt more connected to and happy with their partner when their partner had characteristics they deemed highly desirable relative to when their partner had less-than-ideal characteristics (Fletcher, Simpson, & Thomas, 2000). We illustrate the importance of a person's own desire with an example using John and Sarah.

Imagine this scenario from Sarah's perspective. John is very interested in affiliating with Sarah (high other desire). However, Sarah is not interested in affiliating with John (low own desire). In this situation, Sarah would perceive a low prospect of fulfilling her belonging with John; she has no interest in connecting with him. In fact, in extreme situations, this scenario

could reflect stalking behavior, with obsessive one-sided desires from the other that are not reciprocated. Since we know that own desire (participant desire in our study) is a key ingredient to fulfilling belonging, as illustrated above, we also incorporated that dimension into our manipulation.

On a related note, own desire alone would not be sufficient. If Sarah was very interested in affiliating with John (high own desire), but John did not reciprocate these feelings (low other desire), Sarah may experience something akin to unrequited love—a love for another person that is not reciprocated.

By including separate manipulations for both own desire (participant desire) and other desire (confederate desire), we covered the relevant constructs necessary to fulfill belonging, thus also covering the constructs that are critical to the prospect of fulfilling belonging hypothesis. Having these manipulations ensured that we created a situation where both own and other desires were high.

Debrief Coding and Exclusion Procedure

Participants answered questions probing for suspicion at the end of the study on Day 2. These questions asked for knowledge about the study's research question (e.g., "During the study, did you wonder about the purpose of the study or procedures?") and deception (e.g., "During the study, did you ever think that you were being given false information?"). Three trained independent coders who were blind to study hypotheses examined responses and flagged participants who (a) expressed major suspicion or (b) figured out the goal of the study. Each participant was coded dichotomously (i.e., include vs. exclude) as the result of this process. The percentage agreement among three coders was 91.18%. The two coders with the highest levels

of agreement were used to select the final codes. When these 2 coders disagreed, the third coder resolved the discrepancy.

Order among Outcome Measures

When designing the study, we had the option to either counterbalance the outcome measures or present them in a fixed order. After much deliberation, we presented the outcome measures in a specific fixed order that would avoid order effects as much as possible. Below we illustrate how we decided to present the self-disclosure task first, followed by the noise blast task, the economic dictator task, and the photo rating task.

We positioned self-disclosure first because prior research clearly demonstrated that self-disclosure increases feelings of closeness between partners (Aron, Melinat, Aron, Vallone, & Bator, 1997), and thus is clearly a prosocial activity that could increase belonging. Thus, this outcome measure was directly relevant to fulfilling belonging. In addition, we expected few, if any, carryover effects for this task, since participants were selecting topics for discussion at a later point of the study. With that being said, the self-disclosure task only measured prosocial responses on a range of more versus less prosocial (in essence ranging from the neutral to the positive side of social behavior). This task did not allow people to behave in a clearly antisocial fashion (in other words, on the negative side of social behavior). We added additional outcome measures to cover a wider range of behavior.

The second outcome measure, the noise blast task, was added to capture responses ranging on the antisocial side. The responses elicited by this task ranged from more to less antisocial, filling the gap identified in the self-disclosure task.

The third outcome measure, the economic dictator game, measured a range of antisocial to prosocial responses (covering the complete range discussed above). We added this measure as a supplement to the other because of the wide range of response options. However, we did not exclusively use this measure as the only outcome because it wasn't as closely matched to the construct of interest (fulfilling belonging) as the self-disclosure and noise-blast tasks.

The economic dictator game was placed last among the outcomes capturing attempts to fulfill belonging because we anticipated potential order effects. In this task, participants were asked to divide 9 tickets between themselves and their study partner. Participants did not have an opportunity to allocate the tickets evenly because the total number of tickets were not divisible by 2. In addition, participants believed that their study partner would know how many tickets they gave to themselves vs. their partner. Due to the nature of this task, the number of tickets kept for the self vs. allocated to the other may have impacted subsequent outcome measures (if this measure was placed earlier). For example, participants who allocated less tickets to their partner than the self could have compensated with increased prosocial and decreased antisocial responses on subsequent tasks. To avoid this possibility, we placed this outcome measure last among the outcomes capturing attempts to fulfill belonging.

We positioned the photo rating task last because it was not meant to capture attempts to fulfill belonging. The other three outcome measures (i.e., the self-disclosure task, the noise blast task, and the economic dictator game) involved responses directed toward the study partner that ranged from prosocial to antisocial. On the other hand, the photo rating task was a general measure of prosocial volunteering that did not involve the potential to fulfill belonging. In other words, participants were unlikely to anticipate fulfilling their belonging by volunteering to rate

photos for another study. We instead included this measure to examine prosocial behavior, broadly defined to include behaviors with altruistic nature.

Correlations among Outcome Measures

Table S1 shows correlations among the key outcome measures used in the study. The correlations among the outcome measures (self-disclosure, the noise blast index, tickets allocation, and photos volunteered) were weak (r s ranging from $-.20$ to $.11$) and were largely statistically non-significant. These results suggest that the outcome measures did not exert carryover effects on subsequent outcomes. However, we cannot rule out this possibility completely, as described in the discussion section of the paper.

Table S1.
Correlations and Standard Deviations among Outcome Measures

	Self-Disclosure (Sum)	Self-Disclosure (Weighted)	Noise Blast Index	Tickets Allocated to Partner	Photos Volunteered to Rate
Self- Disclosure (Sum)	48.91 (12.25)				
Self- Disclosure (Weighted)	.90**	29.54 (8.56)			
Noise Blast Index	-.03	-.03	0.00 (1.77)		
Tickets Allocated to Partner	< .01	-.02	-.20*	4.40 (1.08)	
Photos Volunteered to Rate	.01	.01	-.10*	.11*	9.17 (6.45)

Note. The diagonals show the means and standard deviations (in parentheses) for the outcome measures. The off-diagonals show correlations. We calculated the self-disclosure scores in two different ways. The summed self-disclosure index was used in the primary analysis reported in the main text, p.12. The weighted self-disclosure index was used in the exploratory analysis reported in the supplementary materials, p.10. * $p < .05$. ** $p < .001$

Equivalence Tests

We used equivalence testing to determine if our observed effects sizes were smaller than the *smallest effect size of interest* (SESOI; Lakens, 2017; Schuirmann, 1987). We calculated the SESOI in two ways. The primary SESOI, as described in the paper, was calculated using the following steps. First, we obtained the effect sizes focusing on the prospect of fulfilling belonging hypothesis, those focusing on the interaction between rejection and the prospect of fulfilling belonging, from previously published work (Maner, DeWall, Baumeister, & Schaller, 2007). Among the 5 studies in the paper upon which these estimates are based, we used effect sizes from Studies 4 and 5 because they tested the interaction between the prospect of fulfilling belonging and social rejection. Specifically, we used the following interaction terms: (a) the Target (original vs. new partner) x Rejection (control vs. rejection) interaction predicting perceived sociability from Study 4, (b) the Target (original vs. new partner) x Rejection (control vs. rejection) interaction predicting perceived hostility from Study 4, and (c) the Target (new vs. old partner) x Rejection (control vs. rejection) interaction predicting money allocated to the partner from Study 5. Following previous recommendations (Simonsohn, 2015), we calculated the effect sizes for these studies assuming that the original studies had 33% power. We used the *pwr R* package to estimate the effect sizes (Champely et al., 2017). For the two effect sizes for Study 4, we used the degrees of freedom and *p*-values reported in the *F*-tests for the target interaction (for the sociability outcome: *df* numerator = 1, *df* denominator = 30, *p*-value = .001, and power = .33; for the hostility outcome: *df* numerator = 1, *df* denominator = 30, *p*-value = .01, and power = .33). The obtained effect sizes were $f^2 = .31$ and $f^2 = .16$, respectively. For Study 5, we used the degrees of freedom and *p*-value reported in the *t*-test for the interaction term (*df* = 42, *p*-value = .002, and power = .33). The obtained effect size was $f^2 = .18$. Then we averaged

these three estimated effect sizes to derive the SESOI ($f^2 = .21$). See the primary paper, p. 24, for a description of the results of these equivalence tests.

In addition to the equivalence tests reported in the main text and described above, we conducted an additional set of equivalence tests. This secondary set used a different method to calculate the SESOI, verifying that multiple methods of calculating this information led to the same conclusions. The second set used the smallest effect size from the Maner et al, 2007 studies as the SESOI. The smallest estimated effect size was $f^2 = .16$ (Study 4, the hostility outcome). The 90% or 95% confidence intervals for the obtained outcomes in the current study did not contain this value (the largest upper confidence limit was $f^2 = .02$; see Table 3 in the manuscript). Consistent with the results reported in the main text, these results indicate that the obtained effects were practically non-significant.

Exploratory Measures Descriptions

We examined socially-relevant characteristics as moderators of rejection-elicited responses. These analyses also allowed us to preemptively explore if these variables were acting as hidden moderators for the null effects. The moderators were gender, attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, fear of negative evaluation, rejection sensitivity, and self-esteem, since prior research suggested their relevance to rejection-elicited behavior (e.g., Ayduk, Gyurak, & Luerksen, 2008; DeWall et al., 2012; Ford & Collins, 2010; Maner et al., 2007; Williams & Sommer, 1997).

Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire

We used the anxious and avoidant attachment subscales from the Modified Experiences in Close Relationships Questionnaire to measure attachment style (Wei, Russell, Mallinckrodt, &

Vogel, 2007). The scale consisted of 6 items measuring anxious attachment (e.g., “I am nervous when other people get too close to me.”) and 6 items measuring avoidant attachment (e.g., “I try to avoid getting too close to other people.”; total of 12 items). Participants indicated their agreement to each item on a 7-point scale ranging from -3 (*strongly disagree*) to $+3$ (*strongly agree*). We created separate composites for anxious and avoidant subscales by averaging the corresponding items. Due to a programming error during data collection, 28 participants in the final analytical sample had missing data. Thus, the moderation analyses for this individual difference measure only included 510 participants. The Cronbach’s alphas for anxious attachment and avoidant attachment were .73 and .74 respectively.

Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale

The Brief Fear of Negative Evaluation Scale measured fear of being evaluated negatively (Leary, 1983). Sample items included, “I worry about what other people will think of me even when I know it doesn't make any difference”. Participants indicated how characteristic each description was of them on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all characteristic of me*) to 5 (*very characteristic of me*). We created an averaged composite from the items in this scale. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .91.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) included 10 items measuring a sense of self-worth (e.g., “I feel that I have a number of good qualities.”). Participants indicated their answers on a 7-point scale ranging from -3 (*strongly disagree*) to $+3$ (*strongly agree*). We created an averaged composite from the items in the scale. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .89.

Rejection Sensitivity Scale

The Rejection Sensitivity Scale (Downey & Feldman, 1996) included eight potentially rejection-evoking scenarios (e.g., “You ask your parents for help in deciding what programs to apply to.”). For each scenario, participants were asked to report (a) how concerned or anxious they were that they would be socially rejected and (b) how much they expected rejection to happen. Responses were made on a 6-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all concerned* or *very unlikely*) to 6 (*very concerned* or *very likely*). Following the scoring guidelines, we created a scale composite by multiplying the two responses for each scenario (a and b) and averaging across the multiplied scores. The scale had a Cronbach’s alpha of .70.

Exploratory Analyses and Results

In our OSF preregistration, we planned several exploratory analyses. They included (a) analyses using a second method of calculating degree of self-disclosure (a weighted self-disclosure score), (b) probing moderation by gender, and (c) probing moderation by individual differences.

Weighted Self-Disclosure Score as an Outcome Measure

As per our preregistration, we calculated an alternative self-disclosure index and used it in exploratory analyses. During the self-disclosure task, participants first chose 5 questions that they wanted to discuss with their study partner and then ranked those 5 questions in order of preference for the discussion. The self-disclosure composite reported in the paper utilized the items selected as the top 5 topics, but did not account for participants’ ranking of the 5 choices within those selected. So, we calculated an alternative composite that used this ranking information, allowing us to account for relative preference within the participants’ 5 choices. To

account for the rankings, we calculated a weighted score by multiplying the chosen item's disclosure score by the position in the ranking: the top-selected topic received the highest weight ($\times 5$), followed by the second ($\times 4$), the third ($\times 3$), the fourth ($\times 2$), and the fifth ($\times 1$). For example, if the participant chose the item, "For what in your life do you feel most grateful?" (the original disclosure score = 9, based on the scoring method described in the paper), and ranked it as the first item, the resulting weighted score for this particular item was 45 ($9 \times 5 = 45$). For each participant, this procedure produced five weighted scores, and they were summed and divided by 5 to make a weighted self-disclosure score. (Higher numbers indicated more self-disclosure.)

We performed a 2 (Participant Desire: higher vs. lower) \times 2 (Confederate Desire: higher vs. lower) \times 2 (Rejection: rejection vs. control) between-subjects ANOVA on the weighted disclosure scores. Consistent with the results using the primary scoring method reported in the main text, the results were consistent with Hypothesis 2: the 3-way participant desire \times confederate desire \times rejection interaction was not significant. Table S1 summarizes the results.

Table S1

Summary of Results with Weighted Self-Disclosure Score as the Outcome Variable

Predictor	Type	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Participant Desire	Main effect	1.28	.258	.002
Confederate Desire	Main effect	0.01	.917	< .001
Rejection	Main effect	1.06	.303	.002
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	2-way interaction	2.77	.096	.005
Participant Desire × Rejection	2-way interaction	0.45	.501	.001
Confederate Desire × Rejection	2-way interaction	0.01	.932	< .001
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	3-way interaction	0.45	.503	.001

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sum of squares.

Moderation by Gender

We examined gender as a possible moderator based on prior findings suggesting gender difference in responses to rejection (e.g., Williams & Sommer, 1997). We dropped one participant identifying as transgender from the analysis (due to the small number of people in this category) and included only female and male participants ($N = 537$). We ran separate 2 (Participant Desire: higher vs. lower) \times 2 (Confederate Desire: higher vs. lower) \times 2 (Rejection: rejection vs. control) \times 2 (Gender: female vs. male) between-subjects ANOVAs on the self-disclosure score (sum and weighted), the noise blast index, the number of tickets allocated to the confederate, and the number of photos volunteered for rating. Results of these analyses were consistent with Hypothesis 2. The 4-way interaction probing gender moderation was non-significant across the tested outcomes ($ps > .05$; see Table S2). Overall, female participants (vs. male participants) had higher self-disclosure scores (sum), $F(1,528) = 4.31, p = .038, \eta_p^2 = .01$, higher weighted self-disclosure scores, $F(1,528) = 5.14, p = .024, \eta_p^2 = .01$, a lower noise blast index, $F(1,528) = 19.97, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .036$, a higher number of tickets allocated to the confederate, $F(1,528) = 6.34, p = .012, \eta_p^2 = .012$, and a higher number of photos they volunteered to rate, $F(1,528) = 12.889, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .024$. Nevertheless, the 2- and 3- way interactions involving gender with one or more other predictor variables (i.e., participant desire, confederate desire, and rejection) remained non-significant in predicting these outcomes ($ps > .05$; see Table S2).

Table S2.

Summary of Analyses with Gender as a Moderator

Outcome	Predictor	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	η_p^2
Self-Disclosure (sum)	Participant Desire	0.72	.396	.001
	Confederate Desire	0.37	.544	< .001
	Rejection	0.66	.419	.002
	Gender	4.31	.038	.009
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	2.23	.136	.003
	Participant Desire × Rejection	2.27	.133	.003
	Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.05	.826	.001
	Participant Desire × Gender	0.02	.877	< .001
	Confederate Desire × Gender	0.65	.420	.001
	Rejection × Gender	0.05	.819	< .001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.44	.509	< .001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Gender	1.48	.225	.003
	Participant Desire × Rejection × Gender	0.40	.527	.001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.65	.200	.003
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.09	.298	.002	
Self-Disclosure (weighted)	Participant Desire	0.95	.330	.002
	Confederate Desire	0.21	.646	< .001
	Rejection	0.58	.445	.001
	Gender	5.14	.024	.010
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	3.15	.077	.006

	Participant Desire × Rejection	0.56	.456	.001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.41	.524	.001
	Participant Desire × Gender	0.11	.736	.000
	Confederate Desire × Gender	2.26	.133	.004
	Rejection × Gender	0.11	.741	.001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.07	.790	.001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Gender	0.35	.552	.001
	Participant Desire × Rejection × Gender	0.05	.827	< .001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.60	.207	.003
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.56	.212	.003
Noise Blast Index	Participant Desire	0.43	.510	< .001
	Confederate Desire	0.03	.873	< .001
	Rejection	0.23	.634	.001
	Gender	19.07	< .001	.037
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	1.59	.208	.001
	Participant Desire × Rejection	0.08	.775	.001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.14	.711	.001
	Participant Desire × Gender	1.03	.311	.002
	Confederate Desire × Gender	0.85	.356	.002
	Rejection × Gender	0.81	.368	.001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	0.08	.778	< .001
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Gender	2.51	.113	.005
	Participant Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.38	.240	.003
	Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	2.13	.145	.004
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	0.05	.823	< .001

Tickets Allocated	Participant Desire	0.79	.376	.001
	Confederate Desire	13.45	< .001	.025
	Rejection	0.54	.461	< .001
	Gender	6.77	.010	.012
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	0.22	.641	< .001
	Participant Desire × Rejection	0.11	.737	< .001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection	1.64	.200	.001
	Participant Desire × Gender	0.16	.686	< .001
	Confederate Desire × Gender	0.17	.678	< .001
	Rejection × Gender	1.35	.245	.002
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	2.74	.098	.003
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Gender	0.98	.323	.002
	Participant Desire × Rejection × Gender	0.01	.935	< .001
	Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	2.80	.095	.006
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	2.47	.116	.005	
Photos Volunteered to Rate	Participant Desire	0.35	.557	.001
	Confederate Desire	0.01	.927	< .001
	Rejection	0.79	.374	< .001
	Gender	13.04	< .001	.024
	Participant Desire × Confederate Desire	< 0.01	.952	< .001
	Participant Desire × Rejection	3.00	.084	.006
	Confederate Desire × Rejection	4.82	.029	.013
	Participant Desire × Gender	0.31	.576	.001
Confederate Desire × Gender	0.49	.486	.001	

Rejection × Gender	1.58	.209	.003
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection	1.25	.264	.004
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Gender	0.53	.468	.001
Participant Desire × Rejection × Gender	< 0.01	.993	< .001
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	1.08	.300	.002
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Gender	0.67	.412	< .001

Note. Analyses were based on Type III sums of squares.

Moderation by Individual Differences

For the moderation analyses with individual difference measures, we first created a regression model including participant desire, confederate desire, rejection, the given individual difference predictor, and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms (the predictors were fully crossed). The categorical predictors were effects-coded, and the continuous predictor was mean-centered. Then, we ran separate analyses using this set of predictors for each outcome variable: self-disclosure scores (sum and weighted), noise blast index, number of tickets allocated, and number of photos volunteered for rating. Across all the tested models, the results were largely consistent with Hypothesis 2. The 4-way participant desire \times confederate desire \times rejection \times the corresponding individual difference interaction terms were consistently non-significant across models (21 out of the 25 models had a non-significant 4-way term). The analyses did not reveal consistent patterns of moderation by the individual difference measures, although there was some sporadic moderation within the results. Significant p -values ($< .05$) are highlighted in red. Given the inconsistent moderation results, we suggest that readers should be cautious about Type I error because (a) these analyses were exploratory, and (b) multiple tests were run within and across the outcome variables (thus leading to a high familywise error rate due to uncorrected multiple comparisons). We conclude that the measured individual differences did not consistently moderate the rejection by prospect of fulfilling belonging interaction predicting the outcome variables. Tables S3, S4, S5, S6, and S7 summarize the results for attachment anxiety, attachment avoidance, fear of negative evaluation, self-esteem, and rejection sensitivity respectively.

Table S3

Results of an Exploratory Model with Attachment Anxiety as a Moderator

Term	Outcome Measure									
	Self-Disclosure Scores. (Sum)		Self-Disclosure Scores. (Weighted)		Noise Blast Index		Tickets Allocated to Confederate		Photos Volunteered to Rate	
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Attachment Anxiety	0.64	.424	0.74	.391	0.18	.673	0.04	.842	0.16	.688
Participant Desire × Attachment Anxiety	0.60	.437	0.91	.341	2.55	.111	0.74	.389	3.36	.067
Rejection × Attachment Anxiety	1.24	.265	0.50	.479	0.20	.652	1.62	.204	0.00	.946
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Attachment Anxiety	0.29	.593	0.63	.427	1.85	.175	4.06	.044	0.01	.929
Participant Desire × Rejection × Attachment Anxiety	3.57	.060	1.17	.280	0.07	.785	0.26	.611	0.00	.953
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Attachment Anxiety	0.17	.681	0.54	.464	0.09	.761	0.00	.961	1.38	.240
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Attachment Anxiety	0.05	.822	0.04	.851	2.21	.138	4.96	.026	1.44	.231

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sums of squares. The model tested in the analyses included the main effects of participants' desire, confederate desire, rejection, and attachment anxiety (moderator), and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms. For simplicity, we only report the term for the moderator and other interaction terms including the moderator, as those were the novel pieces of these analyses. Numbers highlighted in red are significant at $p < .05$.

Table S4

Results of an Exploratory Model with Attachment Avoidance Moderator

Term	Outcome Measure									
	Self-Disclosure Scores (Sum)		Self-Disclosure Scores (Weighted)		Noise Blast Index		Tickets Allocated to Confederate		Photos Volunteered to Rate	
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Attachment Avoidance	1.06	0.303	0.83	0.362	0.67	0.412	0.04	0.842	1.03	0.310
Participant Desire × Attachment Avoidance	< 0.01	0.977	0.04	0.839	0.24	0.626	0.74	0.389	0.98	0.324
Rejection × Attachment Avoidance	0.04	0.837	0.02	0.888	1.08	0.298	2.06	0.152	1.94	0.164
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Attachment Avoidance	0.01	0.904	0.17	0.683	< 0.01	0.958	1.62	0.204	0.03	0.864
Participant Desire × Rejection × Attachment Avoidance	1.24	0.267	1.07	0.301	0.01	0.940	4.06	0.044	0.03	0.858
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Attachment Avoidance	0.50	0.479	0.08	0.778	0.02	0.894	0.26	0.611	0.31	0.581
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Attachment Avoidance	0.34	0.562	0.46	0.496	0.19	0.659	< 0.01	0.961	5.99	0.015

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sums of squares. The tested model had the main effects of participant desire, confederate desire, rejection, and attachment avoidance (moderator), and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms. For simplicity, we report the term for the moderator and other interaction terms including the moderator. Numbers highlighted in red are significant at $p < .05$.

Table S5

Results of an Exploratory Model with Fear of Negative Evaluation Moderator

Term	Outcome Measure									
	Self-Disclosure Scores (Sum)		Self-Disclosure Scores (Weighted)		Noise Blast Index		Tickets Allocated to Confederate		Photos Volunteered to Rate	
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Fear of Negative Evaluation	0.12	0.732	0.17	0.676	0.46	0.496	0.32	0.574	0.13	0.715
Participant Desire × Fear of Negative Evaluation	0.03	0.873	0.05	0.815	1.09	0.296	0.11	0.738	0.51	0.474
Rejection × Fear of Negative Evaluation	1.18	0.278	0.22	0.640	0.10	0.757	0.14	0.705	3.32	0.069
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Fear of Negative Evaluation	0.01	0.919	0.10	0.753	0.02	0.890	1.34	0.248	0.38	0.538
Participant Desire × Rejection × Fear of Negative Evaluation	1.49	0.223	0.02	0.887	2.80	0.095	0.63	0.428	0.33	0.563
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Fear of Negative Evaluation	0.37	0.545	0.08	0.777	0.73	0.393	1.79	0.182	0.29	0.589
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Fear of Negative Evaluation	0.36	0.547	1.13	0.289	0.02	0.894	0.28	0.596	1.36	0.244

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sums of squares. The tested model had the main effects of participant desire, confederate desire, rejection, and fear of negative evaluation (moderator), and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms. For simplicity, we report the term for the moderator and other interaction terms including the moderator.

Table S6

Results of an Exploratory Model with Self-Esteem Moderator

Term	Outcome Measure									
	Self-Disclosure Scores (Sum)		Self-Disclosure Scores (Weighted)		Noise Blast Index		Tickets Allocated to Confederate		Photos Volunteered to Rate	
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Self-Esteem	2.69	0.102	2.57	0.110	0.75	0.387	3.58	0.059	0.17	0.677
Participant Desire × Self-Esteem	0.38	0.536	0.71	0.401	0.39	0.535	0.07	0.785	0.19	0.662
Rejection × Self-Esteem	0.01	0.909	0.79	0.374	0.81	0.368	0.85	0.357	3.07	0.080
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Self-Esteem	0.44	0.507	0.21	0.651	0.03	0.865	0.04	0.839	0.08	0.777
Participant Desire × Rejection × Self-Esteem	5.94	0.015	2.78	0.096	0.59	0.443	5.38	0.021	0.35	0.556
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Self-Esteem	5.47	0.020	2.47	0.117	0.01	0.936	0.56	0.456	0.1	0.751
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Self-Esteem	3.31	0.069	5.48	0.020	1.77	0.184	1.08	0.299	2.64	0.105

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sums of squares. The tested model had the main effects of participant desire, confederate desire, rejection, and self-esteem (moderator), and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms. For simplicity, we report the term for the moderator and other interaction terms including the moderator. Numbers highlighted in red are significant at $p < .05$.

Table S7

Results of an Exploratory Model with Rejection Sensitivity Moderator

Term	Outcome Measure									
	Self-Disclosure Scores (Sum)		Self-Disclosure Scores (Weighted)		Noise Blast Index		Tickets Allocated to Confederate		Photos Volunteered to Rate	
	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>
Rejection Sensitivity	2.69	0.102	2.57	0.110	0.75	0.387	3.58	0.059	0.17	0.677
Participant Desire × Rejection Sensitivity	0.38	0.536	0.71	0.401	0.39	0.535	0.07	0.785	0.19	0.662
Rejection × Rejection Sensitivity	0.01	0.909	0.79	0.374	0.81	0.368	0.85	0.357	3.07	0.080
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection Sensitivity	0.44	0.507	0.21	0.651	0.03	0.865	0.04	0.839	0.08	0.777
Participant Desire × Rejection × Rejection Sensitivity	5.94	0.015	2.78	0.096	0.59	0.443	5.38	0.021	0.35	0.556
Confederate Desire × Rejection × Rejection Sensitivity	5.47	0.020	2.47	0.117	0.01	0.936	0.56	0.456	0.10	0.751
Participant Desire × Confederate Desire × Rejection × Rejection Sensitivity	3.31	0.069	5.48	0.020	1.77	0.184	1.08	0.299	2.64	0.105

Note. Analyses were based on the Type III sums of squares. The tested model had the main effects of participant desire, confederate desire, rejection, and self-esteem (moderator), and their 2-way, 3-way, and 4-way interaction terms. For simplicity, we report the term for the moderator and other interaction terms including the moderator. Numbers highlighted in red are significant at $p < .05$.