ONLINE APPENDIX

Supplemental Materials 1: Details about the Experimental Manipulation

SM 1.1. Lexical Decision Task Instructions

Word / Non-Word Identification Task

For the first task, your job is to quickly decide if the letters that appear form a word, or if they form a non-word.

For this task, you will place your left finger on the **"Q"** and your right finger on the **"P"**.

If the letters that appear form a word, press **"P"** with your right finger. If they do not form a word, press **"Q"** with your left finger.

Examples:

"BOAT" is a word (you press "P")

"TBAO" is a non-word (you press "Q")

On the next screens, you will try two examples.

Example 1: since this is NOT a word, you press "Q"

RTECPOMU

"Q" for non-word "P" for word

Example 2: Since this IS a word, you press "P"

COMPUTER

"Q" for non-word "P" for word

Move through the task ***quickly,*** but take as much time as you need to make sure you are ***accurate*** for each string of letters.

Remember, place your right hand on the "P" and your left hand on the "Q".

(When you are ready to start the task, press "P" or "Q")

SM 1.2. Words Embedded in the Lexical Decision Task

Goal conflict 1: career, raise, office, work, title, bonus, promotion // drinks, party, movie, celebrate, bar, fun, relax

Goal conflict 2: healthy, fitness, slim, muscled, toned, active, thin // indulge, sweets, candy, chocolate, dessert, cupcake, decadent

Control: pavement, color, ship, jewelry, heater, key, picture, shoes, pink, diamond, hat, rag, window, blue, chair, radio, stamp, lamp, floor, shelf, garbage

Supplemental Materials 2: Awareness Questions (Experiments 1-4)

Awareness of Conflict Mindset Questions*

To what extent did you feel conflicted during these studies?

To what extent would you describe your state of mind during the experiments as one involving deliberation?

Explicit Endorsement of the Primed Goals*

How important is it for you to achieve in your chosen career?

How important is it for you to go out and have fun / socialize with your friends?

Additional Questions, only asked in Experiment 1*

How important is it for you to watch your weight?

How important is it for you to indulge every now and then?

**Participants indicated their response on an unlabeled 9 point scale anchored with 1= Not at All, 9 = Very*

Mood

How would you describe your mood right now?

Participants indicated response on an unlabeled 9 point scale anchored with 1= Very Bad, 9 = Very Good

Supplemental Materials 3: Pretest 1, testing if the goal pairs used in the experiments are perceived as conflicting

To examine if the goal pairs used in the studies are perceived as conflicting we compared the two Conflict Pairs (career vs. socialize and health vs. indulge) with two Non-conflict Pairs (career vs. health and socialize vs. indulge). We recruited 231 participants (108 males, M_{age} = 32.3, *SD* = 11.2) and randomly assigned them to consider either one of the Conflict Pairs or one of the Non-Conflict Pairs, between subjects. All participants then rated the goal pairs on 3 measures of perceived conflict:

a. To what extent do you think that these two goals conflict with each other? That is, if you had one goal, would it be difficult to pursue the other goal at the same time? (0-100)
b. If you tried to pursue both of these goals at the same time, how much conflict would you anticipate feeling? (0-100)
c. Recall a time in your past when you were trying to pursue both of these goals at the same time. Do you remember experiencing conflict when trying to pursue both goals at the same time? (0-100)

As predicted, participants rated the goals in the Conflict Pairs as more conflicting than the goals in the Non-Conflict pairs, on all three dependent measures.

Table SM3. Measures of Conflict by goal pair condition

	a. (conflict)	b. (feeling)	c. (recall)
Conflict Pairs			
Career Vs. Socialize	48.7(3.6)	52.3(3.9)	46.9(4.4)
Healthy Vs. Indulge	72.1(3.7)	72.0(3.7)	66.6(3.4)
Non-Conflict Pairs			
Career Vs. Healthy	33.8(3.3)	36.2(3.6)	35.1(3.8)
Socialize Vs. Indulge	21.3(3.1)	21.7(3.0)	20.7(3.3)

Notes: Standard Errors in parentheses.

Supplemental Materials 4: Pretest 2, testing the effect of priming two conflicting goals on mood or conflict awareness

We recruited 900 participants from an online national panel (557 males, M_{age} = 31.9, *SD* = 11.1) Participants completed the identical lexical decision task used in the main experiments. They were randomly assigned to complete either the conflict or control manipulation, using the goal conflict stimuli for the Career vs Socialize conflict reported in Experiments 1, 3 and 4 (see Table 1). Immediately after completing the manipulation, participants responded to the same five debrief measures used in the experiments (see SM 2), which measured mood, conflict awareness, and awareness of explicit goal commitment. Participants indicating their response on a 9 point scale, anchored with "1= Very Bad" to "9 = Very Good" for Mood, and"1=Not at all" to "9=Very Much" for the other four questions.

Results indicate that relative to control, participants who complete the conflict manipulation report the same mood, conflict awareness and explicit goal commitment, see Table SM 4.

Table SM 4. Dependent Measures and Results from Pretest 2.

	Control	**Conflict**	***F***	***p***
How would you describe your mood right now?	6.8 (0.07)	6.7 (0.07)	0.39	.534
To what extent did you feel conflicted during this Experiment?	2.4 (0.09)	2.3 (0.09)	0.01	.929
To what extent would you describe your state of mind during the experiments as one involving deliberation, thinking about different opposing options, or conflict?	4.7 (0.11)	4.7 (0.11)	0.04	.837
How important is it for you to achieve in your chosen career?	7.3 (0.08)	7.3 (0.08)	0.00	.984
How important is it for you to go out and have fun / socialize with your friends?	6.3 (0.10)	6.3 (0.09)	0.03	.859

Notes: Standard Errors in parentheses.

Supplemental Materials 5: Additional Analyses for all four experiments

Table SM 5.1. Logistic Regression, with standard errors clustered by participant.

- Conducted using STATA "logit" function, with a vce(cl) parameter.

	Experiment 1 ^	Experiment 2	Experiment 3^^	Experiment 4
Wald $Chi^2(1)$	4.42	5.56	4.2	6.32
Prob > Chi^2	0.036	0.018	0.041	0.012
Pseudo Log-likelihood	-253.36	-213.70	-98.40	-217.13
Pseudo R^2	0.010	0.014	0.021	0.014
Observations	416	395	202	318
Number of Clusters	208	79	101	159
Constant	.49(.20)	.90(.20)	1.1(.25)	-.36(.15)
Conflict	0.51(.24)	0.59(.25)	0.74(.36)	0.56(.22)
zP>|z|	2.10	2.36	2.05	2.51
P	*0.036*	*0.018*	*0.041*	*0.012*

Notes: Standard Errors in parentheses. ^Experiment 1 model tests for differences between Control and the pooled Conflict conditions ^^Experiment 3 model tests for differences between Control and Conflict condition for Choice participants only

Table SM 5.2. Generalized Linear Mixed Model

- Conducted using SPSS GENLINMIXED function, Binomial Probability distribution, Logit Link Function, Diagonal Covariance Structure. Includes Fixed effect for Condition, Random Effect for Question

	Experiment 1 ^	Experiment 2	Experiment 3^^	Experiment 4
Condition Coefficient	0.51	0.69	0.79	0.56
Significance	*0.023*	*0.008*	*0.036*	*0.014*
Residual Effects+				
Q1	.98(.10)	1.0(.17)	.89(13)	.99(11)
Q2	1.03(.10)	1.1(.17)	1.1(1.5)	1.0(.11)
Q3		.96(.16)		
Q4		1.0(.73)		
Q5		.85(1.4)		
Information Criterion	1843	1908	968	1353
% correct	69.5%	78.2%	80.2%	56.9%

Notes: Standard Errors in parentheses. ^Experiment 1 model tests for differences between Control and the pooled Conflict conditions ^^Experiment 3 model tests for differences between Control and Conflict condition for Choice participants only

Supplemental Materials 6: Additional Analyses for Experiment 2

Experiment 2 results include a competitive mediation model (Figure 1), in which we show that the indirect effect of conflict mindset on choice through the proposed process measures is significant [CI: .001 to .088], but the indirect effect through awareness of conflict [CI: -.131 to .027] is non-significant. A potential question one can explore with a competitive mediation model is whether one indirect effect is statistically more predictive as compared to another indirect effect. Rather than relying on the somewhat arbitrary distinction that one indirect effect is "significant" at conventional levels, and the other effect is "non-significant," we can directly test if there is a reliable difference in the predictive power of the two competing paths.

Using the data and model reported in Experiment 2 we conducted a direct test of whether the two indirect paths are statistically different from one another, using the Process Macro for SPSS, Model 6 (Hayes 2013). The pairwise comparison (obtained by using the comment "contrast = 1") between these two indirect effects suggests the serial mediation path does have more predictive validity than the conflict awareness path. Specifically the "upper" serial mediation path, minus the "lower" experienced conflict path yielded a significant difference, with a 95% confidence interval that did not include $\beta = 0.05$ (.02) [95% CI .01, .10].