|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Hypothesis | Result | Markdown Name |
| H1.1: Those with higher ego betweenness centrality will show higher activity in the mentalizing system than those with lower ego betweenness centrality when learning about group ratings and when making final ratings in Phase 2 of the Application Recommendation Task (Contrasts: group feedback vs. no group feedback conditions; group feedback different vs. group feedback similar conditions). | Null | On server – Brain is pretty much blank when looking at high vs low betweenness in the two contrasts.  On server – Brain is also pretty blank when using the continuous measure. Also when using the smaller network ego betweenness. |
| H1.2: Those with higher ego betweenness centrality will show higher activity in the mentalizing system when reading article abstracts and while making sharing decisions in the Sharing Task than those with lower ego betweenness centrality (Contrasts: Sharing conditions [broad- & narrowcasting] vs. no sharing conditions [self and topic conditions]). | Null  t (39) =  -0.371 | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H2.1: The higher a participant’s score on the resistance to peer influence and/or the lower their score on the susceptibility to peer pressure scale, the lower the likelihood of conformity to peer ratings in trials of contradictive peer feedback (higher and lower conditions) of the Application Recommendation Task. | Null | Individual\_Differences\_  Social\_Influence.Rmd |
| H2.2: The higher a participant’s score on the resistance to peer influence and/or the lower their score on the susceptibility to peer pressure scale, the lower the activation in the mentalizing system while receiving peer feedback and while making recommendation decisions in the presence of peer feedback in Phase 2 of the Application Recommendation Task (Contrast: peer feedback vs. no peer feedback conditions). | Null | On server – Brain does not seem to show meaningful patterns |
| H2.3: The higher a participant’s score on the resistance to peer influence and/or the lower their score on the susceptibility to peer pressure scale, the lower the activation in the mentalizing system while reading article abstracts and while making sharing decisions in Phase 2 of the Sharing Task (Contrasts: sharing vs. no sharing conditions). | Null  t (39) = 0.796  t(39) = 0.252 | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H3.1: The higher a participant’s score on the interdependence subscale of the self-construal scale, the stronger the activation in the mentalizing system and the more self-other overlap in the ventral-dorsal gradient of self/other-related MPFC activation when incorporating peer feedback in Phase 2 of the Application Recommendation Task (Contrasts: Peer feedback vs. no peer feedback; peer opinion different vs. similar). |  | On server, null results – brain not meaningfully significant |
| H3.2: The lower a participant’s score on the independence subscale of the self-construal scale, the stronger the activation in the mentalizing system and the more self-other overlap in the ventral-dorsal gradient of self/other-related MPFC activation when incorporating peer feedback in Phase 2 of the Application Recommendation Task (Contrasts: Peer feedback vs. no peer feedback; peer opinion different vs. similar). |  |  |
| H3.3: The higher a participant’s score on the interdependence subscale of the self-construal scale, the stronger the activation in the mentalizing system and the more self-other overlap in the ventral-dorsal gradient of self/other-related MPFC activation when making sharing decisions in the Sharing Task (Contrast: Sharing vs. no sharing conditions). | Null (ventral-dorsal gradient not tested) | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H3.4: The higher a participant’s score on the independence subscale of the self-construal scale, the stronger the activation in the mentalizing system and the more self-other overlap in the ventral-dorsal gradient of self/other-related MPFC activation when making sharing decisions in the Sharing Task (Contrast: Sharing vs. no sharing conditions). | Null (ventral-dorsal gradient not tested) | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H3.5: The higher a participant’s score on the interdependence subscale of the self-construal scale, the more social words (as defined by the LIWC dictionary) the participant will use in their mobile game app reviews for the Application Recommendation Task (Phase 3). |  |  |
| H3.6: The lower a participant’s score on the independence subscale of the self-construal scale, the more social words (as defined by the LIWC dictionary) the participant will use in their mobile game app reviews for the Application Recommendation Task (Phase 3). |  |  |
| H3.7: The higher a participant’s score on the interdependence subscale of the self-construal scale, the more social words (as defined by the LIWC dictionary) the participant will use in their posts/messages for the Sharing Task (Phase 2). | Null | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H3.8: The lower a participant’s score on the independence subscale of the self-construal scale, the more social words (as defined by the LIWC dictionary) the participant will use in their posts/messages for the Sharing Task (Phase 2). | Null | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H4.1: Other-oriented participants will show more mentalizing activity in both while receiving and incorporating peer feedback in the Application Recommendation Task (Contrasts: peer feedback vs. no peer feedback; peer opinion different vs. peer opinion similar) and while reading and rating articles in the Sharing Task (Contrasts: sharing vs. no sharing conditions) than self-oriented participants. |  |  |
| H4.2: Other-oriented participants will use more social words in their reviews of mobile games in the Application Recommendation Task (Phase 3) as well as in their posts/messages in the Sharing Task (Phase 2). |  |  |
| H5.1: The higher a participant scores on empathy, the more activity will be found in the mentalizing system both when receiving and incorporating peer feedback in the Application Recommendation (Contrasts: peer feedback vs. no peer feedback; peer opinion different vs. peer opinion similar), and when reading and rating article abstracts in the Sharing Task (Contrasts: sharing vs. no sharing conditions). | Null for sharing task | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H6.1: The higher a participant places the value of expression, the more likely they are to share articles, irrespective of the audience condition. | Supported | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H6.2: The higher a participant places the value of expression, the less sensitive are their sharing ratings in the Sharing Task to neural activity in social reward and social pain regions in Phase 2 (Contrast: Broadcasting vs. no sharing conditions; Narrowcasting vs. no sharing conditions). |  |  |
| H7.1: Those who score higher on narcissism will be more sensitive to social feedback in the Application Recommendation Task (Phase 2), as indicated by stronger social pain signals when receiving feedback about differing group opinions. |  |  |
| H7.2: Those who score higher on narcissism will use more self-related language (first person singular) when writing Application reviews and Facebook messages in the Application Recommendation (Phase 3) and Sharing Tasks (Phase 2). | Null – but they do use less second-person language | Individual\_Differences\_  Sharing.Rmd |
| H7.3: Those who score higher on narcissism will be more sensitive to social feedback in the Application Recommendation Task (Phase 2), as indicated by stronger social pain signals when receiving feedback about differing group opinions. |  |  |
|  |  |  |