Appendix A

Pilot Study Method

We recruited 60 U.S. and Canadian Prolific workers and excluded one for failing the attention check. The final sample comprised 59 participants (34 women, 24 men, 1 non-binary/other), ranging in age from 21 to 72 years (M = 35.5, SD = 10.8). Participants imagined that a friend told them that the friend and a mutual friend were planning to visit a nearby museum. Participants then imagined that they found themselves wanting to attend. Next, they indicated how likely they would be to say six different kinds of self-invitations (see Table A1; 1 = *not at all likely*, 7 = *very likely*). Three of the self-invitations involved asking to come, whereas the other three involved stating that they were coming.

Pilot Study Results

As Table A1 shows, participants were far more likely to self-invite by asking to come (vs. stating that they were coming).

Table A1

Pilot Study Results

Self-Invitation	Likelihood Rating
That sounds like a great time. Can I come with you?	$M = 5.08_a$, $SD = 1.76$
Can I come with you?	$M = 4.80_a$, $SD = 1.79$
I haven't had any time for fun lately and really need to get out of the house. Can I come with you?	$M = 3.63_b$, $SD = 1.75$
That sounds like a great time. I'll join you.	$M = 2.36_c$, $SD = 1.49$
I'll join you.	$M = 2.20_c$, $SD = 1.51$
I haven't had any time for fun lately and really need to get out of the house. I'll join you.	$M = 2.14_c$, $SD = 1.21$

Note. Means that do not share a subscript differ at the p = .05 level.

Appendix B

Study A1 Method

We preregistered this study (https://aspredicted.org/sfbv-7y2y.pdf). We recruited 160 U.S. and Canadian Prolific workers (no exclusions: 77 women, 81 men, 2 non-binary/other), ranging in age from 18 to 80 years (M = 35.6, SD = 12.3). We randomly assigned them to the two conditions of the role manipulation: potential self-inviter (n = 80) versus plan-holder (n = 80).

Study A1 was similar to Study 1c, except for the following. First, the vignette specified that the potential self-inviter would say "I'll join you" (rather than ask to join), so potential self-inviters chose whether they would say this ("no" or "yes"), and plan-holders chose whether they would want the potential self-inviter to say this. Second, participants only responded to this dependent variable (i.e., and not any others).

Study A1 Results

In line with H1, potential self-inviters were less likely to self-invite (25%) relative to what plan-holders would have preferred (50%), χ^2 (1, N = 160) = 10.67, p = .001, φ = .26; $CI_{95\%}$ for difference = [11%, 39%].

Appendix C

Study A2 Method

We preregistered this study (https://aspredicted.org/hp88-42g7.pdf). We recruited 200 U.S. Prolific workers and excluded one (from the plan-holder condition) for failing the attention check. The final sample comprised 199 participants (140 women, 56 men, 1 non-binary/other, 2 prefer not to answer), ranging in age from 19 to 74 years (M = 38.5, SD = 12.1). We randomly assigned them to the two conditions of the role manipulation: potential self-inviter (n = 99) versus plan-holder (n = 100).

Study A2 was similar to Study 1c, except for the following. First, the vignette involved a phone call (rather than a video chat). Second, the plans involved two of the friends going for a walk in a park near the potential self-inviter's home. Thus, the vignette specified that the potential self-inviter would meet the two friends at the park (in the event they joined the plans). Third, the vignette specified that since the potential self-inviter and the plan-holder were such good friends, the plan-holder would definitely say yes if the potential self-inviter asked to join. Fourth, rather than complete the irritation measures, participants completed the IMS (Paulhus, 1991), a 20-item individual difference measure of socially desirable response tendencies (sample item: "I have never dropped litter on the street; α = .83).

Study A2 Results

In line with H1, potential self-inviters were less likely to self-invite (65%) relative to what plan-holders would have preferred (93%), χ^2 (1, N = 199) = 24.02, $p < .001$, φ = .35; $CI_{95\%}$ for difference = [18%, 39%].

To examine the potential influence of socially desirable responding, we followed prior research (Flynn & Adams, 2009) and averaged participants' responses to the IMS (with the necessary items reverse-coded). We then ran two logistic regressions: one with participants' roles as the only predictor of their self-invitation preferences, and another with the IMS scores included as an additional predictor. The effect of role was virtually the same regardless of whether the IMS was not (B = -1.98, Wald = 19.88, $p < .001$) or was (B = -2.05, Wald = 20.47, p

< .001) included in the regression (though, the IMS did predict preferences: B = -.47, Wald = 4.89, p = .027). The fact that the effect of role was unchanged when the effect of the IMS was accounted for suggests that H1 is not driven by socially desirable responding. Further, note that in an additional regression that included the role × IMS interaction, the interaction was not significant (B = -.66, Wald = 1.90, p = .168), indicating that the conditions were not differentially influenced by social desirability.

Appendix D

Table A2

Sensitivity Power Analyses

Sensitivity Power Analyses	
Study 1a	The ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .15$
Study 1b	The chi-square test had 80% power to detect an effect size of $w = .22$ The ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .22$
Study 1c	The chi-square test had 80% power to detect an effect size of $w = .22$ The ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .22$
Study 2a	The ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .15$
Study 2b	The chi-square test had 80% power to detect an effect size of $w = .22$ The first ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .22$ The second ANOVA had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .22$
Study 3	The ANOVA's interaction had 80% power to detect an effect size of $f = .14$
Study A1	The chi-square test had 80% power to detect an effect size of $w = .22$
Study A2	The chi-square test had 80% power to detect an effect size of $w = .20$

Note. All power analyses assumed an alpha significance criterion of .05.