

# Electronic Supplementary Material

## ESM 4. Overview of studies reporting empirical evidence for/against an association between emotion recognition and subcomponents of communication

Study (year)	Sample size	Social cognition measure	Communication measure	Statistical measure	Results
McDonald et al. (2004)	25	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 1	<i>Global communication</i> Setting Spontaneous videoed interaction Rating of videoed interaction BRISS-R	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i> )	Better emotion recognition (dynamic) – appropriate personal conversation style (e.g., use of humor)
McDonald & Flanagan (2004)	34	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 1	<i>Pragmatics (sarcasm)</i> TASIT	Linear regression analysis	No significant association between emotion recognition (dynamic) and reception of social inference (i.e., sarcasm)
McDonald et al. (2015)	30	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 1	<i>Pragmatics (insincerity) (exp.)</i> Identification of insincerity	Regression analysis	Emotion recognition (dynamic) did not predict sensitivity to sincerity
McDonald et al. (2016)	31	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 1	<i>Pragmatics (hints) (exp.)</i> Audiovisual hinting task	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i> )	No correlation between emotion recognition (dynamic) and understanding of hints
Milders et al. (2008)	33	<i>Emotion Recognition</i> Composite Score Recognizing facial expressions (Ekman & Friesen, 1976), FAB	<i>Global communication (proxy)</i> NBAP → Subscale 'Pragnosia'	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i> )	Poorer emotion recognition abilities (static/auditive) – poorer pragmatic rating (proxy)
Rigon et al. (2018)	46	<i>Emotion Recognition</i> ERT	<i>Global communication (self/proxy)</i> LC	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i> )	Poorer facial emotion recognition (dynamic) – poorer global communication rating (proxy); poorer facial emotion predicts proxy-rating of disinhibition and conversational effectiveness
Saxton et al. (2013)	24	<i>Emotion recognition</i> Montreal Set of Facial Displays of Emotion	<i>Global communication (self)</i> Key Behaviors Change Inventory (KBCI; Koltz et al., 2003; Vanderploeg et al., 2007) → Domain 'Communication Problems'	Simultaneous regression analysis	no correlations between facial emotion recognition (static) and global communication rating (self)
Watts & Douglas (2006)	12	<i>Emotion Recognition</i> TASIT – Part 1	<i>Global communication (self/proxy)</i> LCQ	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i> )	poorer facial emotion recognition (dynamic) – poorer global communication rating (proxy)

Note. TASIT: The Awareness of Social Inference Test (McDonald et al., 2003); ERT: Emotion Recognition Test (Kessels et al., 2014); FAB: Florida Affect Battery; BRISS-R: Subscales of Behaviourally Referenced Rating System of Intermediate Social Skills, Revised (Wallander, Conger & Conger, 1985); NBAP: Neuropsychology Behavior and Affect Profile (Nelson et al., 1998); LCQ: La Trobe Communication Questionnaire (Douglas et al., 2000).