

Study 8

One person's data was lost due to a technical error. There were 267 participants (108 men, 158 women, and one who did not report gender; mean age = 22.97, $SD = 8.83$) in the value claiming analyses. The full model was run. Participants negotiated using the Used Car (Rothbard & Barsade unpublished case) single-item distributive negotiation.

Study 9

There were 158 participants (56 men and 102 women; mean age = 19.90, $SD = 1.41$) in the analyses. The full model was run. Participants negotiated using the Rio Copa scenario (Bontempo, 1994) which was modified to include only 2 distributive items.

Study 10

There were 100 participants (42 men, 56 women, and two who did not report gender; mean age = 22.09, $SD = 2.71$) in the value claiming analyses. The full model was run. There were changes in how this study was run relative to the others. First, participants negotiated using the Used Car (Rothbard & Barsade, unpublished case) single-item distributive scenario, which was rewritten to reduce previously observed effects of negotiator role, see Appendix A.² Second, this study was also the only study which had performance-based pay – in addition to each participant's \$10 show-up fee, there was \$10 of bonus money per dyad which was paid out as a function of how the positive bargaining zone was split in the negotiation. Lastly, the mindfulness and mind-wandering control inductions were positioned *directly* before the negotiation (after participants read their scenario role) to maximize the possibility of a carryover effect. The only impasse occurred in a dyad in which both participants were in the control condition.

Meta-Analyses: Results

Value Claiming

In meta-analyses using the METAN command in STATA (Harris et al., 2008), there was a very small significant negative total effect of state mindfulness on value claiming, standardized mean difference (SMD) = 0: $z = 2.32$, $p = 0.020$. See Table 2 and Figure 2. As an estimate of the true effect, the aggregate d (SMD) was = -0.138, 95% confidence interval [-.256, -.021]. This is a very small effect in the sense that it is even smaller than the $d = .2$ threshold for it to be considered "small" (Cohen, 1992). However, this effect size could be similar to that of moral licensing effects, which have been predicted to have a Cohen's d between .08 and .21 (Ebersole et al., 2015; Mullen & Monin, 2016).

² Specifically, in the prior version the seller needed desperately to sell the Jeep to avoid a large bank debt, whereas in this version there was no bank debt and the seller wanted to sell the Jeep to finance a study abroad semester to Switzerland. Another benefit of this change is that, in contrast to the prevention-related motivation to avoid the bank debt, both roles subsequently had approach motivations related to taking a trip – the buyer's being to the mountains with her/his friends in the Jeep.

