

## Text S1: Between-subject Analyses

**Context.** In our manuscript, we used a within-subject framework to conduct our pre-registered analyses. An important issue to consider is that when participants read our second prompt and saw that it was similar to the preceding prompt on all but our critical dimension, it is possible that they might have guessed our hypothesis and adjusted their responses to the second questionnaire accordingly. Thus, we re-ran our analyses using a between-subject framework—looking only at participants' responses to the first prompt they completed:

**Study 1a.** There were 50 participants in the happy condition, and 51 participants in the unhappy condition. Participants reported spending significantly more money in the happy condition ( $M = 4.42$ ,  $SD = 1.83$ ; or roughly \$21-\$50) compared to the unhappy condition ( $M = 3.43$ ,  $SD = 2.00$ ; or roughly \$11-20),  $F(1, 99) = 6.70$ ,  $p = .01$ . Thus, we included amount of money spent as a covariate in all of our analyses. In line with our within-subject analyses, there were significant differences in perceived choice, impact, and social connection between the happy and unhappy condition. Participants reported higher levels of perceived choice in the happy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 10.30$ ,  $M_{raw} = 10.56$ ,  $SD = 5.76$ ) compared to the unhappy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = -0.96$ ,  $M_{raw} = -1.22$ ,  $SD = 9.87$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 53.64$ ,  $p < .001$ . Participants also perceived more impact in the happy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.45$ ,  $M_{raw} = 5.63$ ,  $SD = 1.17$ ) compared to the unhappy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 2.95$ ,  $M_{raw} = 2.78$ ,  $SD = 1.67$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 123.45$ ,  $p < .001$ . Finally, participants reported feeling more socially connected on the SCS-R in the happy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.82$ ,  $M_{raw} = 5.82$ ,  $SD = 1.04$ ) compared to the unhappy condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 3.38$ ,  $M_{raw} = 3.38$ ,  $SD = 1.31$ ),  $F(1,98) = 106.12$ ,  $p < .001$ . This is consistent with results on feelings of closeness; participants reported feeling closer to recipients in the happy (vs.

unhappy) condition on the IOS,  $F(1, 98) = 66.36, p < .001$ , and on Dibble et al.'s scale,  $F(1, 98) = 51.41, p < .001$ .

**Study 1b.** There were 51 participants in the lifetime condition, and 49 participants in the recent condition. Participants reported spending significantly more money in the lifetime condition ( $M = 5.20, SD = 1.55$ ; or roughly \$51-100) compared to the recent condition ( $M = 3.88, SD = 1.78$ ; or roughly \$21-50),  $F(1, 98) = 15.69, p < .001$ . Thus, we included amount of money spent as a covariate in all of our analyses. In line with our within-subject analyses, there were significant differences in perceived choice, impact, and social connection between the lifetime and recent condition. Participants reported higher levels of perceived choice in the lifetime condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 8.35, M_{raw} = 8.71, SD = 6.51$ ) compared to the recent condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 6.30, M_{raw} = 5.94, SD = 6.15$ ),  $F(1, 97) = 4.81, p = .03$ . Participants also perceived more impact in the lifetime condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.53, M_{raw} = 5.78, SD = 1.01$ ) compared to the recent condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.27, M_{raw} = 5.02, SD = 1.49$ ),  $F(1, 97) = 11.76, p < .001$ . Finally, on the SCS-R, participants reported feeling more socially connected in the lifetime condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.70, M_{raw} = 5.78, SD = 1.00$ ) than in the recent condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.39, M_{raw} = 5.30, SD = 0.98$ ),  $F(1, 97) = 6.08, p = .02$ . The effect of condition on closeness to recipients was still mixed. On Dibble et al.'s (2011) scale, participants reported feeling closer to recipients in the lifetime,  $F(1, 97) = 9.89, p = .002$ . However, there was no difference between conditions on the IOS,  $F(1, 97) = 0.15, p = .70$ .

**Study 2.** There were 51 participants in the low-impact condition, and 49 participants in the high-impact condition. There was no significant difference in the amount of money spent between the high- and low-impact condition,  $F(1, 98) = 2.84, p = .10$ . Thus, we did not include money spent as a covariate in our analyses. In line with our within-subject analysis, participants

reported higher levels of positive affect in the high-impact condition ( $M = 5.66, SD = 1.12$ ) than in the low-impact condition ( $M = 4.24, SD = 1.94$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 19.84, p < .001$ . Participants also reported lower levels of negative affect in the high-impact condition ( $M = 1.32, SD = 0.62$ ) than in the low-impact condition ( $M = 2.16, SD = 1.33$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 16.54, p < .001$ .

**Study 3.** There were 46 participants in the low-connection condition, and 54 participants in the high-connection condition. Participants reported spending significantly more money in the high-connection condition ( $M = 4.35, SD = 1.68$ ; or roughly \$21-50) compared to the low-connection condition ( $M = 3.17, SD = 1.76$ ; or roughly \$11-20),  $F(1, 98) = 11.69, p < .001$ . Thus, we included amount of money spent as a covariate in all of our analyses. In line with our within-subject analysis, participants reported higher levels of positive affect in the high-connection condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 5.50, M_{raw} = 5.55, SD = 1.21$ ) than in the low-connection condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 3.45, M_{raw} = 3.39, SD = 1.70$ ),  $F(1, 97) = 54.44, p < .001$ . Participants also reported lower levels of negative affect in the high-connection condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 1.44, M_{raw} = 1.51, SD = 1.06$ ) than in the low-connection condition ( $M_{adjusted} = 2.29, M_{raw} = 2.20, SD = 1.62$ ),  $F(1, 97) = 6.66, p = .01$ .

**Study 4.** There were 46 participants in the low-choice condition, and 54 participants in the high-choice condition. There was no significant difference in the amount of money spent between the high- and low-choice condition,  $F(1, 98) = 2.26, p = .14$ . Thus, we did not include money spent as a covariate in our analyses. In line with our within-subject analysis, participants reported higher levels of positive affect in the high-choice condition ( $M = 5.29, SD = 1.38$ ) than in the low-choice condition ( $M = 2.83, SD = 1.74$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 62.14, p < .001$ . Participants also reported lower levels of negative affect in the high-choice condition ( $M = 1.40, SD = 0.77$ ) than in the low-choice condition ( $M = 2.41, SD = 1.18$ ),  $F(1, 98) = 26.43, p < .001$ .