Supplement C

Investigating non-disclosure, regression analysis.

To answer the first research question, we investigated data of those participants who disclosed in 2015 (n = 189) to predict whether they disclosed again in 2016 (n = 147, 78%) or did not disclose again in 2016 (n = 42, 22%). Response rate per item differed: For the items attitude, descriptive norm 2015, and pleasantness of reactions 2015, data were available from 188, 174, and 107 participants, respectively. For pleasantness of reactions 2015, we thus only had data of 22 people who did not disclose in 2016. All variables were significantly non-normal: all W = 0.52 - 0.92, all $p < .01$.

In regression model 1, the predictors were the three variables X1: pleasantness of reactions, X2: descriptive norm and X3: attitude. This model did not significantly improve the model fit compared to the null model, $\chi2$ = 1.0, p = .792. Regression model 2 included the three variables as well as the interaction terms X3*X2 as well as X3*X1. This second model also did not significantly improve the model fit compared to the null model, $\chi2$ = 12.66, p = .027. Effect sizes, pseudo-R^2-values and variance inflation factors (VIF) of regression model 1 and 2 can be seen in Table C1. The pseudo-R^2-values, being very low, indicate that this prediction model is of poor quality. We further explored the data by investigating whether participants who disclosed in 2016 had systematically different values on the main outcomes from the participants who did not disclose in 2016. Results from the performed Wilcoxon tests provided no indication for systematic differences between the groups (all $p < .01$).

Supplemental material

BMJ Publishing Group Limited (BMJ) disclaims all liability and responsibility arising from any reliance placed on this supplemental material which has been supplied by the author(s)

BMJ Open

Table C1

Logistic Regression Coefficients and Effect Sizes of Regression Model 1 and 2

	B (SE)	p	OR
Regression model 1: Only main effects			
Intercept	1.54 (0.28)	.000	4.66
Pleasantness of reactions	0.24 (0.27)	.373	1.27
Descriptive norm	0.13 (0.37)	.717	1.14
Attitude	-0.10 (0.32)	.753	0.90
Regression model 2: Main effects and interaction terms			
Intercept	2.31 (0.60)	.000	10.11
Pleasantness of reactions	0.61 (0.42)	.142	1.84
Descriptive norm	-0.06 (0.46)	.891	0.94
Attitude	-1.57 (1.08)	.145	0.21
Attitude*pleasantness of reactions	-1.27 (0.64)	.048	0.28
Attitude*descriptive norm	0.98 (0.67)	.140	2.67

Note. Model fit regression model 1: R^2 = .01 (Hosmer-Lemeshow), .01 (Cox-Snell), .02 (Nagelkerke); model 1 compared to null model: $\chi^2(3)$ = 1.04, p = .792, all *VIF* < 10; Model fit regression model 2: R^2 = .01 (Hosmer-Lemeshow), .01 (Cox-Snell), .02 (Nagelkerke); model 2 compared to null model: $\chi^2(5)$ = 12.66, p = .027; model 2 compared to model 1: $\chi^2(2)$ = 11.63, p = .003, all *VIF* < 10.