Supplemental Materials:

Alternative Study 1 models to account for results obtained in Studies 2 and 3

Using Study 1 data, we explored three alternative structural models that closer reflect the pattern of relationships obtained in Studies 2 and 3. In these models, we were interested to shed further light on the relationship between MIL judgments and coherence, which was non-significant in our main Study 1 analysis (see Figure 1 of the main paper). As in the original model, mattering was modelled as a precursor of MIL judgments, and positive and negative affect were again included to control for effects of mood. Because the correlational design of Study 1 was insensitive to causal direction, the fit of all three models was identical to the Study 1 measurement model and path model reported in the main paper: (579) = 1006.01, *p* < .001; CFI = .924; RMSEA = .048 (90% CI [.043, .053]); SRMR = .053.

In the first model, depicted in Figure S1, MIL judgments predicted purpose which, in turn, predicted coherence. MIL judgments did not significantly predict coherence directly (β = .14, *p* = .312, 95% CI [-.09, .37]), but indirectly predicted coherence through purpose (β = .30, *p* = .001, 95% CI [.12, .48]). In the second model, shown in Figure S2, coherence and purpose were parallel covarying outcomes of MIL judgments. In this case, MIL judgments were significantly predictive of coherence (β = .45, *p* < .001, 95% CI [.26, .63]). We also ran a final model where purpose and coherence are parallel outcomes, alongside MIL judgments, as shown in Figure S3. Here, coherence showed a significant residual covariance with MIL judgments (*r* = .42, *p <* .001, 95% CI [.25, .59]). These results are consistent with our longitudinal findings that coherence is not a precursor of MIL judgments, but may be a consequence of, or a parallel experience to, MIL judgments.
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Figure S1. Alternative Study 1 model with MIL judgments predicting purpose, and purpose predicting coherence. Structural equation model with latent factors showing standardized estimates of correlations and paths. Solid lines show significant paths and dotted lines show non-significant paths. \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001.
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Figure S2. Alternative Study 1 model with coherence and purpose as concurrent outcomes of MIL judgments. Structural equation model with latent factors showing standardized estimates of correlations and paths. Solid lines show significant paths and dotted lines show non-significant paths. \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001.
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Figure S3. Alternative Study 1 model with. Structural equation model with latent factors showing standardized estimates of correlations and paths. Solid lines show significant paths and dotted lines show non-significant paths. \*p < .05, \*\*p < .01, \*\*\* p < .001.