**Supplementary Table 1**

*Descriptive Statistics and Correlations among Rationale, Perceived Impact, and Cost of the Daily Prosocial Behaviors*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 　 | Rationale\_P | Rationale\_R | Rationale\_S | Perceived impact\_P | Perceived impact\_R | Perceived impact\_S | Cost |
| Rationale\_P | 4.74 (0.89) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale\_R | .74 | 4.84 (0.86) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rationale\_S | .42 | .41 | 4.11 (1.22) |  |  |  |  |
| Perceived impact\_P | .61 | .53 | .38 | 5.60 (0.90) |  |  |  |
| Perceived impact\_R | .55 | .67 | .42 | .74 | 5.75 (0.83) |  |  |
| Perceived impact\_S | .41 | .38 | .62 | .59 | .56 | 5.18 (1.05) |  |
| Cost | .24 | .21 | .34 | .30 | .25 | .30 | 2.97 (1.44) |

*Note. nindividual* = 148, *nresponse* = 1249. P = partner. R = relationship. S = self. Numbers on the diagonal are mean and SD (in parenthesis). All correlations are significant at *p <* .001.

**Supplementary Table 2**

*Fixed Effects Estimates for Multilevel Logistic Regression Models Testing the Consistency and Reciprocity Dynamics Separately*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model for reciprocity |  | Model for consistency |
| Variables | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |
| Block 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Intercept) | -1.25 | \*\*\* | (0.10) | [-1.45, -1.05] |  | -2.03 | \*\*\* | (0.15) | [-2.31, -1.74] |
| Day a | -0.16 |  | (0.03) | [-0.22, -0.09] |  | -0.14 | \*\*\* | (0.03) | [-0.20, -0.07] |
| Partner’s presence b | 0.36 | \*\*\* | (0.14) | [0.45, 1.01] |  | 0.74 | \*\*\* | (0.16) | [0.43, 1.04] |
| Actor’s gender c | -0.82 | \*\*\* | (0.12) | [-1.04, -0.59] |  | -0.30 | \*\*\* | (0.12) | [-0.53, -0.08] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 d | 1.20 | \*\*\* | (0.12) | [0.96, 1.45] |  |  |  | — |  |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1e |  |  | — |  |  | 2.47 | \*\*\* | (0.18) | [2.12, 2.82] |
| Block 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Intercept) | -1.29 | \*\*\* | (0.11) | [-1.50, -1.08] |  | -2.04 | \*\*\* | (0.15) | [-2.34, -1.75] |
| Day | -0.16 | \*\*\* | (0.03) | [-0.23, -0.10] |  | -0.15 | \*\*\* | (0.03) | [-0.21, -0.08] |
| Partner’s presence | 0.66 | \*\*\* | (0.15) | [0.39, 0.97] |  | 0.66 | \*\*\* | (0.16) | [0.35, 0.98] |
| Actor’s gender | -0.79 | \*\*\* | (0.12) | [-1.02, -0.56] |  | -0.30 | \*\* | (0.12) | [-0.53, -0.07] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 | 1.15 | \*\*\* | (0.13) | [0.90, 1.41] |  |  |  | — |  |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 |  |  | — |  |  | 2.36 | \*\*\* | (0.18) | [2.01, 2.71] |
| Actor’s communal motivation f | 0.06 |  | (0.08) | [-0.08, 0.21] |  | 0.02 |  | (0.08) | [-0.14, 0.18] |
| Partner’s communal motivation g | 0.28 | \*\*\* | (0.08) | [0.12, 0.43] |  | 0.12 |  | (0.08) | [-0.03, 0.27] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s communal motivation | 0.05 |  | (0.13) | [-0.21, 0.31] |  |  |  | — |  |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s communal motivation | 0.01 |  | (0.13) | [-0.25, 0.27] |  |  |  | — |  |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s communal motivation |  |  | — |  |  | 0.34 | \*\* | (0.14) | [0.07, 0.62] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s communal motivation |  |  | — |  |  | 0.25 | † | (0.14) | [-0.01, 0.51] |
| *nindividual (nobservation)* | 116 |  (2226) |  |  | 130 |  (2607) |  |

*Note*. PB = prosocial behavior. CI = confidence interval. a Centered at Day 4 (i.e., the middle day of the experience-sampling phase). b -1 = *absence*, 1 = *presence*. c -1 = *female*, 1 = *male*. d 0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*. e 0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*. f Standardized score. g Standardized score. In this table, reciprocity and consistency dynamics were tested in two separate models to maximize the data points included.

† *p* < .10. \**p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p <* .001.

**Supplementary Table 3**

*Fixed Effects Estimates of Communal Motivation and Relationship Commitment as Predictors of the Likelihood of Actor’s Prosocial Behaviors at Signal T*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model for base rate |  | Model forreciprocity and consistency |
|  |  | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |
| Block 1 (Commitment Only) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Intercept) | - | 1.37 | \*\*\* | (0.10) | [-1.56, -1.18] |  | - | 2.23 | \*\*\* | (0.20) | [-2.62, -1.84] |
| Day a | - | 0.33 | \*\*\* | (0.03) | [-0.39, -0.27] |  | - | 0.11 | \* | (0.04) | [-0.19, -0.02] |
| Partner’s presence b |  | 1.13 | \*\*\* | (0.14) | [0.86, 1.41] |  |  | 0.59 | \*\* | (0.19) | [0.21, 0.96] |
| Actor’s gender c | - | 0.43 | \*\*\* | (0.09) | [-0.61, -0.26] |  | - | 0.67 | \*\*\* | (0.14) | [-0.95, -0.39] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 d |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 1.01 | \*\*\* | (0.18) | [0.65, 1.37] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 e |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 2.44 | \*\*\* | (0.23) | [2.00, 2.88] |
| Actor’s relationship commitment  | - | 0.08 |  | (0.05) | [-0.18, 0.03] |  | - | 0.07 |  | (0.12) | [-0.30, 0.16] |
| Partner’s relationship commitment  | - | 0.01 |  | (0.05) | [-0.11, 0.09] |  |  | 0.22 | † | (0.12) | [-0.02, 0.45] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.02 |  | (0.20) | [-0.38, 0.35] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.22 |  | (0.18) | [-0.41, 0.30] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.02 |  | (0.19) | [-0.41, 0.37] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.06 |  | (0.18) | [-0.56, 0.14] |
| Block 2 (Commitment and Communal Motivation) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (Intercept) | - | 1.39 | \*\*\* | (0.10) | [-1.58, -1.19] |  | - | 2.18 | \*\*\* | (0.20) | [-2.56, -1.80] |
| Day | - | 0.32 | \*\*\* | (0.03) | [-0.38, -0.26] |  | - | 0.11 | \*\* | (0.04) | [-0.19, -0.03] |
| Partner’s presence |  | 1.10 | \*\*\* | (0.14) | [0.82, 1.37] |  |  | 0.56 | \*\* | (0.19) | [0.19, 0.94] |
| Actor’s gender | - | 0.44 | \*\*\* | (0.09) | [-0.62, -0.26] |  | - | 0.68 | \*\*\* | (0.15) | [-0.97, -0.40] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 1.03 | \*\*\* | (0.18) | [0.67, 1.39] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 2.21 | \*\*\* | (0.21) | [1.78, 2.63] |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | (Continued) |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model for base rate |  | Model forreciprocity and consistency |
|  |  | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* |  | (*SE*) | 95% CI |
| Actor’s communal motivation  |  | 0.31 | \*\*\* | (0.07) | [0.17, 0.44] |  |  | 0.00 |  | (0.14) | [-0.27, 0.26] |
| Partner’s communal motivation  |  | 0.47 | \*\*\* | (0.07) | [0.33, 0.60] |  |  | 0.12 |  | (0.14) | [-0.15, 0.39] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s communal motivation |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.03 |  | (0.23) | [-0.47, 0.41] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s communal motivation |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 0.03 |  | (0.23) | [-0.43, 0.48] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s communal motivation |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 0.47 | \* | (0.22) | [0.03, 0.91] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s communal motivation |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 0.25 |  | (0.23) | [-0.19, 0.70] |
| Actor’s relationship commitment | - | 0.22 | \*\* | (0.07) | [-0.36, -0.08] |  | - | 0.07 |  | (0.15) | [-0.36, 0.22] |
| Partner’s relationship commitment | - | 0.28 | \*\*\* | (0.07) | [-0.41, -0.14] |  |  | 0.11 |  | (0.15) | [-0.19, 0.41] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.04 |  | (0.25) | [-0.53, 0.45] |
| Partner’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.20 |  | (0.23) | [-0.66, 0.26] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Actor’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.18 |  | (0.24) | [-0.65, 0.29] |
| Actor’s PB at signal T-1 × Partner’s relationship commitment |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.10 |  | (0.23) | [-0.56, 0.36] |
| *nindividual* (*nresponse*) |  | 150 | (4105) |  |  |  | 109 | (1889) |  |

*Note*. PB = prosocial behavior. CI = confidence interval. a Centered at Day 4 (i.e., the middle day of the experience-sampling phase). b -1 = *absence*, 1 = *presence*. c -1 = *female*, 1 = *male*. d 0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*. e 0 = *no*, 1 = *yes*. Communal motivations and relationship commitments are standardized scores.

† *p* < .10. \* *p* < .05. \*\* *p* < .01. \*\*\* *p <* .001.

**Supplementary Table 4**

*Fixed Effects Estimates of Communal Motivation and Relationship Commitment as Predictors of the Rationale, Perceived Impact, and Cost of the Daily Prosocial Behaviors*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Actor’s gender a |  | Actor’scommunal motivation |  | Partner’scommunal motivation |  | Actor’srelationship commitment |  | Partner’srelationship commitment |
| Dependent variables |  | *B* | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* | (*SE*) | 95% CI |  |  | *B* | (*SE*) | 95% CI |
| Rationale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Partner |  | **0.20** | **(0.05)** | **[0.10, 0.29]** |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | **0.21** | **(0.04)** | **[0.13, 0.29]** |  |  | 0.07 | (0.04) | [0.00, 0.15] |
|  Relationship |  | **0.22** | **(0.05)** | **[0.12, 0.32]** |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | **0.17** | **(0.04)** | **[0.10, 0.25]** |  |  | **0.12** | **(0.04)** | **[0.04, 0.20]** |
|  Self |  | 0.09 | (0.07) | [-0.04, 0.23] |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | 0.05 | (0.06) | [-0.06, 0.16] |  |  | **0.14** | **(0.05)** | **[0.03, 0.25]** |
| Perceived impact  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Partner | - | 0.06 | (0.05) | [-0.15, 0.04] |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | **0.17** | **(0.04)** | **[0.08, 0.25]** |  |  | 0.08 | (0.04) | [-0.01, 0.16] |
|  Relationship |  | 0.04 | (0.05) | [-0.05, 0.13] |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | **0.18** | **(0.04)** | **[0.11, 0.26]** |  |  | 0.07 | (0.04) | [-0.01, 0.14] |
|  Self |  | 0.05 | (0.05) | [-0.06, 0.15] |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  |  | **0.13** | **(0.05)** | **[0.03, 0.22]** |  |  | 0.01 | (0.05) | [-0.08, 0.11] |
| Cost | **-** | **0.39** | (0.07) | [-0.53, -0.24] |  |  |  | — |  |  |  |  | — |  |  | - | 0.08 | (0.07) | [-0.22, 0.06] |  |  | 0.03 | (0.07) | [-0.10, 0.17] |
| Rationale |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Partner |  | **0.23** | **(0.05)** | **[0.12, 0.33]** |  |  | **0.23** | **(0.05)** | **[0.13, 0.34]** |  |  | 0.08 | (0.05) | [-0.02, 0.18] |  |  | 0.07 | (0.05) | [-0.03, 0.16] |  |  | 0.04 | (0.05) | [-0.05, 0.14] |
|  Relationship |  | **0.24** | **(0.05)** | **[0.14, 0.34]** |  |  | **0.12** | **(0.06)** | **[0.01, 0.23]** |  |  | 0.02 | (0.06) | [-0.09, 0.13] |  |  | 0.10 | (0.05) | [0.00, 0.20] |  |  | **0.12** | **(0.05)** | **[0.02, 0.22]** |
|  Self |  | 0.11 | (0.07) | [-0.03, 0.26] |  |  | **0.17** | **(0.08)** | **[0.02, 0.33]** |  |  | 0.07 | (0.08) | [-0.08, 0.22] |  | - | 0.05 | (0.07) | [-0.19, 0.09] |  |  | 0.11 | (0.07) | [-0.03, 0.25] |
| Perceived impact  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Partner | - | 0.03 | (0.05) | [-0.12, 0.07] |  |  | **0.21** | **(0.06)** | **[0.09, 0.33]** |  |  | 0.05 | (0.06) | [-0.06, 0.17] |  |  | 0.04 | (0.05) | [-0.07, 0.15] |  |  | 0.06 | (0.05) | [-0.04, 0.17] |
|  Relationship |  | 0.05 | (0.05) | [-0.04, 0.15] |  |  | 0.11 | (0.05) | [0.00, 0.21] |  |  | 0.03 | (0.05) | [-0.07, 0.14] |  |  | **0.12** | **(0.05)** | **[0.02, 0.22]** |  |  | 0.06 | (0.05) | [-0.04, 0.15] |
|  Self |  | 0.06 | (0.05) | [-0.04, 0.17] |  |  | **0.20** | **(0.07)** | **[0.06, 0.33]** |  |  | 0.10 | (0.07) | [-0.03, 0.23] |  |  | 0.01 | (0.06) | [-0.11, 0.14] |  | - | 0.03 | (0.06) | [-0.15, 0.09] |
| Cost | **-** | **0.36** | **(0.07)** | **[-0.50, -0.21]** |  |  | **0.22** | **(0.10)** | **[0.03, 0.42]** |  |  | 0.08 | (0.10) | [-0.11, 0.27] |  | **-** | **0.21** | **(0.09)** | **[-0.39, -0.03]** |  |  | 0.00 | (0.09) | [-0.17, 0.18] |

*Note*. *nindividual* = 148, *nresponse* = 1249. CI = confidence interval. Numbers in bold indicate significant predictors at *p* < .05. a -1 = *female*, 1 = *male*. Communal motivations and relationship commitments are standardized scores.