

Electronic Supplementary Material

ESM 6. Overview of studies reporting empirical evidence against/for an association between ToM and communication subcomponents

Study (year)	Sample size	Social cognition measure	Communication measure	Statistical measure	Results
Bosco et al. (2017; 2018)	35	Composite Score: <i>First-order ToM</i> Smarties Task (Perner et al., 1989); Sally-Anne Task (Baron-Cohen et al., 1985) <i>Second-order ToM</i> Selection of 6 Strange Stories (Happé, 1994)	<i>Pragmatics (indirect speech acts, irony, deceit)</i> ABaCo	Hierarchical regression analysis	Better ToM – better linguistic comprehension of deceit, better extralinguistic comprehension of deceit, better extralinguistic production of deceit, better linguistic production of irony
Byom & Turkstra (2012)	5	<i>ToM (exp.)</i> Manipulated version of RCIT in terms of ToM demands (intimacy) → Analysis of MST	<i>Discourse production</i> RCIT	Wilcoxon signed rank test	Less adequate adjustment to increase of intimacy level in conversation than control group in terms of production of MST
Byom & Turkstra (2017)	21	<i>ToM (exp.)</i> Manipulated version of discourse task (high ToM demands) → view of a fictional character holding the opposite opinion → analysis of MST	<i>Discourse production (exp.)</i> → production of MST in discussion of controversial topics (e.g., animal testing) → rating of social communication (naive raters)	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	More mental state words – more socially acceptable communication
Channon et al. (2005)	19	<i>ToM (exp.)</i> Action Comprehension Task	<i>Pragmatics (sarcasm; exp.)</i> Sarcasm Comprehension Task	Pearson product moment correlations	Better ToM – better sarcasm comprehension
Honan et al. (2015)	25	<i>ToM (exp.)</i> High-ToM-condition of discourse task	<i>Discourse comprehension (exp.)</i> Comprehension of everyday conversations	Regression analysis	No significant influence of ToM on comprehension of everyday conversations
Martin & McDonald (2005)	16	<i>ToM (exp.)</i> Mental Inference Stories (Bibby & McDonald, 2005)	<i>Pragmatics (irony; exp.)</i> Pragmatic Interpretation Stories	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	No significant association of ToM and irony comprehension
McDonald & Flanagan (2004)	34	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Subtest 2 & 3	<i>Pragmatics (sarcasm)</i> TASIT	Linear regression analysis	Better second-order ToM – better ability to understand social conversational inferences
McDonald et al. (2004)	21	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 2 & 3	<i>Global communication</i> BRIS-R for video-recording of spontaneous interaction	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	Better ToM – appropriate personal conversation style (e.g., use of humor)
McDonald et al. (2014)	25	<i>ToM</i> High-ToM-condition of naturalistic speech production task (Exp.)	<i>Discourse production (exp.)</i> Naturalistic speech production task → analysis of number and adequacy of correct	Regression analysis	Influence of ToM on discourse production with high demand on inhibitory control

Electronic Supplementary Material

Study (year)	Sample size	Social cognition measure	Communication measure	Statistical measure	Results
			details in picture description/ association tasks		
McDonald et al. (2015)	31	<i>ToM, emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 2 & 3	<i>Pragmatics (insincerity; exp.)</i> Identification of insincerity	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	Better ToM – better detection of insincerity
McDonald et al. (2016)	30	<i>ToM emotion recognition</i> TASIT – Part 2 & 3	<i>Pragmatics (hints; exp.)</i> Audiovisual hinting task	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	Better ToM – better understanding of hints
Milders et al. (2008)	33	<i>ToM</i> Faux Pas Test (Stone et al., 1998); Cartoon test (Happé et al., 1999)	<i>Global communication (proxy)</i> NBAP	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	No correlation between ToM and proxy rating of social behavior (incl. pragmatic behavior)
Muller et al. (2010)	15	<i>ToM verbal</i> Faux Pas Test; First-order false belief & second-order false belief task (Exp.) <i>ToM nonverbal</i> Character intention task (Brunet et al., 2000); Reading The Mind in The Eyes Test (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001)	<i>Pragmatics (indirect speech acts)</i> MEC	Correlation (Spearman's <i>r</i>)	Better ToM (verbal tasks) – better understanding of indirect speech acts
Saxton et al. (2013)	24	<i>ToM</i> Adapted Stories Task (Bibby & McDonald, 2005) The Eyes Test (Baron-Cohen et al., 2001)	<i>Global communication (self)</i> Key Behaviors Change Inventory (KBCI; Kolitz et al., 2003; Vanderploeg et al., 2007) → Domain "Communication Problems"	Simultaneous regression analysis	No correlations between TOM and global communication rating (self)

Note. ToM: Theory of Mind; MST: mental state term; TASIT: The Awareness of Social Inference Test (McDonald et al., 2003); ABaCo: Assessment Battery of Communication (Angeleri et al., 2012); RCIT: Relationship Closeness Induction Task (Sedikides, Campbell et al., 1998); BRISS-R: Behavioural Referenced Rating System of Intermediate Social Skills, Revised (Wallander et al., 1985); NBAP: Neuropsychology Behavior and Affect Profile (Nelson et al., 1998); MEC: Montreal Protocol for the Evaluation of Communication (Joanette et al., 2004).