**Supplementary Analyses**

Dummy-coded three group comparisons in Study 1

To further probe the interaction, the confidence condition was dummy coded with the confidence condition variable (Confidence vs. Doubt) comparing the reference group, the confidence condition to the first comparison group, the doubt condition (confidence = 0, doubt = 1, control = 0). The second dummy coded variable (Confidence vs. Control) compares the reference group, the confidence condition to the second comparison group, the control condition (confidence = 0, doubt = 0, control = 1). Both confidence condition variables were entered into a mean-centered regression with commitment and each of the resulting interactions in predicting intentions to engage in pro-relationship behavior. The predicted interaction between the first dummy variable (Confidence vs. Doubt) and commitment was significant, *b* = -.15, *t*(229) = -1.95, *p* = .053, *r* = .13, 95% CI [0, 0.266]. When people were primed with confidence, their commitment predicted pro-relationship significantly better, *b* = .34, *t*(229) = 6.28, *p* < .00001, *r* = .38, 95% CI [0.277, 0.590] than when people were primed with doubt, *b* = .19, *t*(229) = 3.25, *p* = .001, *r* = .21, 95% CI [0.080, 0.354]. There was no interaction between the second dummy variable (Confidence vs. Control) and commitment, *b* = -.10, *t*(229) = -1.41, *p* = .16, *r* = .09, 95% CI [-0.030, 0.224] suggesting that the commitment simple slope for the confidence group did not differ from the control group. In order to compare the control to the doubt group, two additional dummy variables were created using a parallel dummy coding scheme signifying doubt as the reference group (Doubt vs. Control: confidence = 0, doubt = 0, control = 1; Doubt vs. Confidence: confidence = 1, doubt = 0, control = 0). The interaction between the Doubt vs. Control and commitment was not significant, *b* = .05, *t*(229) = 0.70, *p* = .48, *r* = .05, 95% CI [-0.080, 0.182] indicating that the doubt and control groups did not have significantly different commitment simple slopes. In sum, the commitment simple slope for the confidence condition better predicted relationship outcomes than the doubt condition, with no significant comparisons to the control group.

***Table 1. Correlations of key variables for Study 1.***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** |
| 1. Commitment
 |  1.00 |   |   |   |
| 1. Certainty Condition
 | -.02 | 1.00 |   |   |
| 1. Self Esteem
 | -.13\* | .01 | 1.00 |   |
| 1. Pro-relationship Behavior
 | .49\*\* | .03 | .07 | 1.00 |

Note: \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

***Table 2. Correlations of key variables for Study 2A (upper diagonal) and Study 2B (lower diagonal).***

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **1** | **2** | **3** | **4** | **5** |
| 1. Commitment
 | 1.00 | -.13 | -.09 | -.08 | .34\*\* |
| 1. Certainty Condition
 | -.20\* | 1.00 | -.07 | .02 | .05 |
| 1. Self Esteem
 | -.15 | -.01 | 1.00 | .11 | -.06 |
| 1. Metacognitive Reflection
 | .02 | -.05 | -.19\* | 1.00 | -.16\* |
| 1. Pro-relationship Behavior
 | .70\*\* | -.12 | -.15 | -.07 | 1.00 |

Note: \*\* Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed); \* Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)

Coding of Participant Responses to (Un)Certainty Induction

In each study, participants were asked to list thoughts during the (un)certainty induction. Each thought was coded by two independent coders for following two dimensions: 1) amount of expressed certainty and 2) content (i.e., about the partner and/or about the self). Both coders were unaware of study hypotheses and participant condition.

**Inter-rater reliability**. IRR was assessed using a two-way mixed, consistency, average measures intra-class correlation (ICC; McGraw & Wong, 1996; Hallagren, 2012) to assess the degree to which coders providers consistency in their ratings of thought certainty and thought content (partner or self) across participants. The resulting ICC for expressed thought certainty was in the excellent range, ICCs ranged from .90 to .99 indicating that coders had a high degree of agreement and suggesting that thought certainty was rated similarly across coders. The resulting ICC for though content was in the good to excellent range, ICCs ranged from .70 to .98 indicating that coders had a high degree of agreement and suggesting that thought content was rated similarly across coders.

**Expressed certainty.** To assess expressed thought certainty, coders rated each thought for “what the participant wrote conveys (-2 = *extreme doubt*; 2 = *extreme confidence*)”. These thought certainty ratings were averaged to create an index of expressed certainty for each participant.

***Table 3. Means and standard deviations of expressed thought certainty by certainty condition.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Certainty Condition | Doubt Condition | Control Condition |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study 1 | 1.11 | .83 | -1.21 | .82 | .00 | .31 |
| Study 2A | 1.64 | .67 | -1.57 | .72 |  |  |
| Study 2B | 1.13 | .75 | -1.15 | .68 |  |  |

**Thought content**. To assess thought content, coders classified each thought as being about the self (yes or no) and the partner (yes or no). A relative index of thought content was created by subtracting number of partner-thoughts from number of self-thoughts and dividing by total number of thoughts. Values ranged from -1 (only thoughts about the partner) to +1 (only thoughts about the self).

***Table 4. Means and standard deviations of relative thought content by condition.***

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Certainty Condition | Doubt Condition | Control Condition |
|  | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* | *M* | *SD* |
|   |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Study 1 | .81 | .27 | .60 | .55 | .65 | .41 |
| Study 2A | .79 | .43 | .64 | .61 |  |  |
| Study 2B | .81 | .49 | .67 | .59 |  |  |