

Supplemental Material**Table S1-1***Participant Inclusion by Experimental Condition Based on Recognition of Crying*

Crying manner	Context	Stimulus gender	Initially assigned (<i>n</i>)	Recognized as crying (<i>n</i>)	Recognition rate
Static	Loss	Female	86	70	.81
Static	Loss	Male	94	48	.51
Static	Failure	Female	97	72	.74
Static	Failure	Male	91	37	.41
Dynamic	Loss	Female	86	76	.88
Dynamic	Loss	Male	85	49	.58
Dynamic	Failure	Female	94	72	.77
Dynamic	Failure	Male	90	33	.37
Total (<i>N</i>)			723	457	.63

Note. Only participants who recognized the individual in the image as crying were included in the analyses. Recognition of tears was treated as a necessary precondition for examining the interpersonal functions of emotional crying.

Table S1-2*Effect of Crying Manner and Situational Context on Social Support Intentions, Controlling for Recognition of Crying*

	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.21	0.13	17.49	< .001
Crying manner (Static)	0.31	0.10	3.11	< .01
Context (Loss)	-0.01	0.10	-0.09	.93
Stimulus gender (Female)	0.05	0.11	0.49	.62
Participant gender (Female)	-0.11	0.10	-1.10	.27
Recognition	0.35	0.11	3.14	< .01
adjusted $R^2 = .03$				

Note. Reference categories were Dynamic crying, Failure context, Male, and unrecognized cry

Table S2-1*Results of the Linear Mixed-Effects Model for the Manipulation Check of Onomatopoeia Congruency Ratings*

Fixed effects	Estimate	SE	df	t	p
(Intercept)	4.55	0.12	686.17	39.52	< .001
Crying manner (Static)	-2.04	0.11	898.60	-18.57	< .001
Onomatopoeia type (Static)	-2.87	0.11	451.00	-26.40	< .001
Context (Loss)	-0.21	0.08	448.00	-2.72	.01
Stimulus gender (Female)	0.12	0.08	448.00	1.42	.16
Participant gender (Female)	-0.06	0.08	448.00	-0.70	.49
Crying manner × Onomatopoeia type	3.76	0.15	451.00	24.42	< .001

Note. Linear mixed-effects model with restricted maximum likelihood estimation. Crying style (static vs. dynamic), onomatopoeia type (static vs. active), and context (loss vs. failure) were included as fixed effects. Stimulus gender and participant gender were included as covariates. Participant ID was included as a random intercept.

Table S2-2*Estimated Marginal Means of Onomatopoeia–Crying Congruency Ratings*

Manner of Crying	Onomatopoeia type	EMM	SE
Static	Static	3.32	0.08
Static	Active	2.43	0.08
Active	Static	1.60	0.08
Active	Active	4.48	0.08

Table S3-1*Effect of Crying Manner and Situational Context on Social Support Intentions*

	Estimate	SE	t	p
(Intercept)	2.50	0.16	15.15	< .001
Crying manner (Static)	0.36	0.13	2.81	< .01
Context (Loss)	0.06	0.13	0.51	.61
Stimulus gender (Female)	0.15	0.13	1.11	.27
Participant gender (Female)	-0.22	0.13	-1.72	.09
adjusted $R^2 = .02$				

Note. Reference categories were Dynamic crying, Failure context, and Male

Table S3-2*Interactive Effects of Crying Style and Situational Context on Social Support Intentions*

	Estimate	SE	<i>t</i>	<i>p</i>
(Intercept)	2.50	0.18	13.83	< .001
Crying manner (Static)	0.35	0.19	1.85	.06
Context (Loss)	0.05	0.18	0.30	.76
Stimulus gender (Female)	0.15	0.13	1.11	.27
Participant gender (Female)	-0.22	0.13	-1.72	.09
Crying style × Context	0.02	0.26	0.08	.94
adjusted $R^2 = .02$				

Note. Reference categories were Dynamic crying, Failure context, and Male

Table S4*Parallel Mediation Analysis Examining Impressions Mediating the Effect of Crying Manner on Social Support Intentions*

Mediator	a path (crying manner → mediator)	b path (mediator → support)	Indirect effect	95% CI	<i>p</i>
Warmth	0.370 (0.117)	0.228 (0.050)	0.084	[0.027, 0.160]	.013
Helplessness	-0.107 (0.129)	0.122 (0.044)	-0.013	[-0.053, 0.019]	.469
Social connectedness	0.198 (0.113)	0.437 (0.052)	0.087	[-0.013, 0.189]	.090
Total indirect effect	—	—	0.158	[0.020, 0.299]	.027

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported. Standard errors are shown in parentheses. Indirect effects were estimated using bootstrap resampling (5,000 samples). Participant gender, stimulus gender, and context were included as covariates in all equations.

Table S5*Regression Coefficients Predicting Perceived Warmth*

Predictor	Estimate	SE	<i>p</i>	95% CI
Crying manner (X)	0.247	0.113	0.029	[0.027, 0.469]
Unhelpful beliefs (Z)	0.108	0.061	0.076	[-0.016, 0.224]
Crying manner × Beliefs (X × Z)	-0.393	0.119	0.001	[-0.633, 0.161]
Appropriateness	0.178	0.046	< .001	[0.084, 0.264]
Context	-0.002	0.120	0.988	[-0.233, 0.236]
Participant gender	-0.156	0.116	0.18	[-0.379, 0.077]
Stimulus gender	-0.333	0.119	0.005	[-0.567, -0.092]

Note. Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients obtained from structural equation modeling with bootstrap standard errors (5,000 resamples). Crying manner was effect-coded (static = 0.5, dynamic = -0.5). Unhelpful social beliefs were standardized. Context, participant gender, and stimulus gender were included as covariates.