

Supplemental File

Sham Meditation Script

Session 1

ENGAGING THE BREATH

When you are comfortable, gently close your eyes, keep your hands together on your lap and let us start our meditation practice. Just relax and let's go ahead and take a couple of deep breathes, in through the nose out through the nose as we sit here in meditation. **[pause 10 seconds]** Just relax and sit in stillness, that is essentially the practice. Just breathe normally as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 minute]** Try to control feelings of frustration or hunger. Just take some deep breaths, relax as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 minutes]**

A gentle reminder of the instructions you are to follow. Just relax, feet flat on the ground and just take a couple of deep breaths. Then, breathe normally in stillness. Breathe in deep through your nose, and breathe out deep through your nose as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 minutes]** The point of this meditation practice is to teach you to cultivate this practice by taking deep breaths every minute or so. **[Pause 2 minute]** Let us take a deep breath together [deep inhalation], [long exhalation] and relax, as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 minute]**

Remember you do not want to fall asleep or get too relaxed, you want to balance a state of attention and relaxation. Hence, let us start over together and take a deep breath as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 10 seconds]** Just breathe and relax **[Pause until finish]**

[Ring first bell.] [Pause 5s.] [Ring second bell.] [Pause 5s.] [Ring third bell.]

Okay, great. So quick question: How long did that feel to you? (5-10 minutes)
Great, that was 20 minutes. Do you have any questions? **[Pause]**

CLOSING STATEMENT

Mindfulness is really about mindful living in daily life. While I don't want you to practice sitting meditation at home until the study is over, I encourage you throughout the rest of your day to slow down and be mindful of mundane little things as much as possible. Try to bring what you've learned today into your daily life.

END

NOTES FOR FACILITATOR:

(How do you deal with sleeping? = Open your eyes)

**Say that we will do something different tomorrow to get them more engaged and then the research assistant will give them the post-assessment

**Is this something I can do to better facilitate this for you?

Am I talking too much? Too little? Just right? The goal of the intervention is to teach them how to meditate. There is nothing more or less to it.

This is someone that hasn't meditated before so you try to make it comfortable.

Q&A timing: As long as the people need. Usually a couple of questions. Usually there is one person that is a bit more vocal.

Full First Session: 25 minutes for greeting and introduction, 20 minutes for the meditation, and post-assessment for a few minutes. If they don't have questions they may leave, but if they have them they can stay.

Session 2

START

[Give them a message and manage their expectations:] First of all, no matter what happened in Session 1, I want you to forget about it. Let go of anything that you experienced in Session 1 because more than likely it will not be the same in Session 2. The point of this practice is to relax and sit in the stillness. When you base your interpretation of the stillness on your previous experiences, the reality you shape will be changed by your expectations. We're training in stillness, which involves letting go of expectations – even expectations about meditation.

Now this time, when you hear the sound of the bell at the end of this session, I want you to pay attention to your breath and to the sound of the bell as each moment passes. You will hear it 3 times, and the last sound – the last note of the third bell – is when you will open your eyes and the session will conclude. Let's get into the meditative posture. Feet flat on the ground. Hands together in your lap in a comfortable position, or palms down on your thighs. Gently close your eyes and go ahead and start taking some deep breaths and relaxing. **[Pause 20s.]**

Deep cleansing breaths, as we dedicate the next 20 minutes to meditation. Breathe in for a couple of seconds, holding it in for a few seconds, and then blowing out slowly. **[Pause 20s.]** Just relax. **[Pause 30s.]** Just relax and sit in stillness **[Pause 2 mins]** Don't change your breathing on purpose. Just continue taking deep breaths, and relax as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 mins]**

Make little adjustments to stay relaxed and vigilant. Remember, if you are sleepy, you can open your eyes until you get reoriented. If your position in the chair is uncomfortable you may adjust to find a more comfortable seated position. **[Pause 2 mins]**

Now we will do a brief breath counting task. First, I will lead us in this task and then you will continue the task on your own. **[Pause 10 seconds]** Now let's begin. Breathe in, 2... 3... 4... and out 2... 3... 4.... Breathe in 2... 3... 4... and out 2.. 3.. 4.... In 2... 3... 4... and out 2... 3... 4.... In 2... 3... 4... out 2... 3... 4.... Just continue this breathing pattern as we sit here in meditation **[pause 10 seconds]** Now I will lead us into this exercise again, but after the first round of counting, I would like you to continue the task until I ask you to stop. If you find yourself needing to readjust, or to open your eyes, that is OK. Just pick up with the breathing task when you are ready. Let us begin. Breathe in, 2... 3... 4... and out 2... 3... 4... **[Pause 7 mins]**

We have now expanded the meditative object to encompass the full breath. **[Pause 10s]** Remember you do not want to fall asleep or get too relaxed, you want to balance a state of attention and relaxation. Let us start over together one last time and take a deep breath as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 10 seconds]** Just breathe and relax **[Pause until finish]**

[Ring first bell.] [Pause 10s.] [Ring second bell.] [Pause 10s.] [Ring third bell.]

Any questions for today?

Great, please remember to try to bring what you've learned today into your daily life.

END

Session 3

START

Let's get into meditative posture. Feet flat on the ground and your back straight. When you are comfortable, gently close your eyes and begin meditating by taking a couple of deep breaths until you start feeling a little more relaxed. **[Pause 30s.]**

Allow yourself to become more comfortable. **[Pause 5s.]** And dedicate the next 20 minutes of your life to sitting in meditation. **[Pause 20s.]** And when you are comfortable with it, just breathe normally. Just relax and sit in stillness **[Pause 2 mins]** Just continue taking deep breaths, and relax as we sit here in meditation. **[Pause 2 mins]** We are going to spend the rest of our time today actually meditating without my direction.

[Every 3 minutes or so until the end instruct them to] Just continue to take deep breaths as we sit in meditation. Just relax and sit in the stillness.

[Ring 1st bell.] [Pause 5s.] [Ring 2nd bell.] [Pause 5 s.] [Ring 3rd bell.] [Pause 30s.]

Any questions for today? **[Pause]**

Again, please try to bring what you've learned today into your daily life. You'll receive the final session of meditation training when you visit the lab for your second EEG session.

END

Session 4 (delivered by first author)

START

Note. This meditation was started immediately after EEG recording was established.

Today you are going to meditate for 20 minutes on your own before we begin the laboratory tasks. During this time, I am also going to meditate on my own. So I will not monitor you during this session. Let's start by putting your feet flat on the ground. Straighten your back. Take some deep breaths. Let your body relax. Go ahead and begin meditating.

[Pause 13 min.]

Remember not to drift too far away. Just start your practice over.

[Pause 5.5 min.]

[Ring first bell.] [Pause 5 s.] [Ring 2nd bell.] [Pause 5s.] [Ring 3rd bell.] [Pause 30s.]

Do you have any questions? Did you find meditating on your own easier or more challenging?

END

NOTES

They will say their minds drifted and that it was a lot more difficult without the guidance. Do not dwell too long on fielding questions. Simply acknowledge their experience and move on to the EEG tasks.

Helping Checklist Pilot

Daily helping was measured in the main study with a 12-item yes/no checklist that included the following helping behaviors (Morelli et al., 2012): *gave directions; helped someone with technology; delayed elevator; held open a door; made change; picked up a fallen object for someone; lent or gave money; let someone go ahead of you in line; helped a disabled or elderly person; lent an item of value (tool, clothes, car, etc.); helped someone with schoolwork; and asked someone if they needed help.* Fifteen undergraduate research assistants pilot-tested this checklist, and to conceal the aims of this study, research assistants were asked to report on helping interaction, pleasant (non-helping) interactions, and antagonistic interactions with strangers and acquaintances for fourteen days. These responses were open-ended, allowing research assistants to comment daily on all stranger and acquaintance interactions. Common positive (non-helping) interactions included: *introduced yourself; verbally greeted someone; non-verbally greeted someone (e.g., waved, smiled, made eye contact); and made conversation.* Common antagonistic behaviors included: *ignored or avoided someone; made an aggressive gesture at someone; and disagreed with someone; felt good about someone's misfortune; cut a conversation short.* These additional 9 items were randomized with the 12 original helping checklist items for the main study.

Supplemental Analyses

Table S2.1

Descriptive statistics and bivariate relations among baseline trait predictors and training intervention.

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. MAAS	–							
2. NEO-A	0.48**	–						
3. MRS	0.10	–0.10	–					
4. SDO	0.14	–0.13	0.36**	–				
5. IRI-F	–0.15	0.12	–0.24*	–0.25*	–			
6. IRI-P	0.28*	0.33**	–0.12	–0.07	0.29**	–		
7. IRI-E	0.16	0.29**	–0.26*	–0.33**	0.51**	0.53**	–	
8. IRI-D	–0.21	0.03	–0.13	–0.20	0.19	–0.08	0.14	–
9. Training	0.02	–0.01	0.25*	–0.01	–0.12	–0.19	–0.24*	0.01
α	0.82	0.61	0.74	0.91	0.80	0.68	0.83	0.80
M	3.54	3.97	1.95	1.73	24.30	25.99	26.52	18.44
SD	0.66	0.52	0.30	0.71	5.60	3.89	3.77	4.99

Notes. Training = (intervention; 0 = Sham Mediation training., 1 = mindfulness training); MAAS = Mindful

Attention Awareness Scale; NEO-A = Agreeableness subscale of the NEO-FFI; MRS = Modern Racism Scale; SDO

= Social Dominance Orientation Scale; IRI- = Interpersonal Reactivity Index; F = Fantasy, P = Perspective Taking,

E = Empathic Concern; D = Personal Distress.; Significant training relations highlighted in bold. * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p <$

.01

Distributional assumptions of Poisson and zero-inflated Poisson models for post-intervention daily interactions with strangers and acquaintances. There were excess zero counts for helping behavior (86.2%), positive interactions (49.7%), and antagonistic interactions (97.5%). Thus, we considered multilevel zero-inflated Poisson and zero-inflated negative binomial distributions (Lambert, 1992)—the latter to account for overdispersion. The zero-inflated distribution partitions zero-counts into two different processes. The zero-inflated process assumes that participants score zero on stranger interactions because they never interact with strangers (Hu et al., 2011). The count process assumes that a person interacts with strangers but did not that day. Examining the distributions revealed a low percentage of participants who never engaged in helping behavior (16.5%) or positive interaction (0%). Although most participants never engaged in antagonistic interactions (54%) with strangers, preliminary tests of the zero-inflated portions of the models returned unrealistically inflated effect sizes and standard error estimates, an indicator of complete or quasi-complete separation (Albert & Anderson, 1984).

Table S2.2*Post-intervention scenario helping behavior toward racial outgroup members*

		Main Effects	Trait x Training Interaction	Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates
Fixed Effects b (SE(b)) [Δodds]				
Level 1	Intercept	-.83** (.27)	-.90** (.27)	-.90** (.27)
	Training	1.10* (.53) [3.01]	1.24* (.54) [3.45]	1.30* (.57) [3.66]
	Pre-Help	-.03 (.52)	.10 (.57)	.07 (.58)
	Order	-.70 (.52)	-.72 (.54)	-.71 (.54)
	MAAS		-.45 (.42)	-.47 (.54)
	Training x MAAS		-.56 (.86)	-.55 (.87)
	IRI-E			.03 (.08)
	MRS			.00 (.99)
Model Fit				
	-2 * Log Likelihood	$\Delta\chi^2(3) = 7.66$	$\Delta\chi^2(2) = .125$	$\Delta\chi^2(2) = .136$

Note. Training = training condition (Mindfulness = .5, Sham Meditation = -.5); Scenario Order = pre- post-intervention scenario order (Crutches First = -.5, Paper Drop First = .5); Pre-Help = pre-intervention helping behavior (No help = -.5, Help = .5). MAAS = Mindful Attention Awareness Scale; IRI-E = Empathic Concern subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index; MRS = Modern Racism Scale. b = log odds ratio; % Δ odds = e^b ; this statistic represents the change in odds for every one-point increase in the predictor and is interpreted as a decrease in odds for negative b values. There were six intervention cohorts (ns range 7 – 19). Cohort intercepts did not vary significantly ($\mu_{0j} = .43$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .37$, $p = .242$, $ICC = .12$, $-2LL(2) = 93.87$). The binary logistic regression model without nesting provided the best fit of the data ($-2LL(1) = 95.55$). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table S2.3

Binary outcome multilevel models predicting post-intervention daily helping behaviors toward strangers and acquaintances

		Main Effects	Trait x Training Interaction	Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates
Fixed Effects γ (SE(γ)) [Δodds]				
Level 1	Intercept	-2.26*** (.31)	-2.27*** (.15)	-2.27*** (.15)
	Sine Cycle	.32** (.12) [1.38]	.32* (.12) [1.37]	.32* (.12) [1.38]
	Cosine Cycle	.06 (.12)	.	.
	Pre-Intervention Help	.48*** (.14) [1.61]	.49** (.14) [1.63]	.48** (.14) [1.62]
	Race	-.35* (.17) [1.43]	-.41* (.17) [1.51]	-.41* (.17) [1.51]
	Training x Race		-.13 (.33)	-.13 (.33)
	MAAS x Race		.39 (.25)	.39 (.25)
	Training x Race x MAAS		-.89 (.49)	-.90 (.49)
Level 2	Training	.30 (.29)	.34 (.28)	.37 (.28)
	MAAS		.22 (.20)	.24 (.21)
	Training x MAAS		-.86* (.41) [2.36]	-.95* (.44) [2.59]
	IRI-E			-.016 (.040)
	MRS			-.47 (.41)
Random Effects residual SE(residual)				
	μ_{0j} [Person Level ICC]	1.02** (.31) [.10]	.95** (.28) [.16]	.93** (.29) [.17]
Model Fit				
	-2 * Log Likelihood	$\Delta\chi^2(5) = 54.80^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(9) = 167.26^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(2) = .83$

Note. Sine Cycle = $\sin(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Cosine Cycle = $\cos(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Pre-Intervention Help = pre-intervention helping behavior; Race = race of the primary interaction partner (Same = -.5, Other = .5).

Training = training condition (Mindfulness = .5, Sham Meditation = -.5). MAAS = Mindful Attention Awareness Scale; IRI-E = Empathic Concern subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index; MRS = Modern Racism Scale. Δ odds = e^γ ; this statistic represents the change in odds for every one-point increase in the predictor and is interpreted as a decrease in odds for negative γ values. Trait x Training Interaction model fit is compared to the unconditional model. Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates model fit is compared to the Trait x Training Interaction Model. Cohort intercepts did not vary significantly ($\mu_{0j} = .16$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .14$, $p = .254$, ICC = .05, $-2LL(2) = 1539.81$). Intercepts significantly varied between subjects ($\mu_{0j} = 1.13$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .32$, $p < .001$, ICC = .26, $-2LL(2) = 1429.65$). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

MAAS relation with helping by condition. We examined the simple slopes of MAAS within each training condition. The MAAS slope was not significant for the sham meditation condition ($b = .48, SE(b) = .40, p = .239, OR = 1.62$) or the mindfulness meditation condition ($b = -.19, SE(b) = .20, p = .349, OR = .83$).

Decomposing training x MAAS x race interaction trend. We explored the nature of the training x race x MAAS three-way interaction trend ($p = .070$). Among people scoring below the median of trait mindfulness, sham meditation trainees reported less frequent helping behavior toward racial outgroup strangers and acquaintances, relative to ingroup helping ($b = -1.105, SE(b) = .33, p = .001, OR = .331$). For mindfulness trainees, helping behavior given to racial ingroup and outgroup members was not statistically different ($b = -.63, SE(b) = .35, p = .077, OR = .53$), but this effect size was not lower than that reported for sham mindfulness meditation trainees ($z = .98, p = .327$). Among people scoring higher than the median on trait mindfulness, neither sham meditation trainees ($b = .23, SE(b) = .17, p = .191, OR = 1.25$) nor mindfulness meditation trainees ($b = -.21, SE(b) = .31, p = .506, OR = .81$) showed a significant difference between helping same- and other-race strangers and acquaintances, and these slopes were not statistically different, $z = 1.24, p = .214$.

Table S2.4

Binary outcome multilevel models predicting daily post-intervention positive interactions with strangers and acquaintances

		Main Effects	Trait x Training Interaction	Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates
Fixed Effects γ (SE(γ)) [Δodds]				
Level 1	Intercept	-.01 (.11)	-.01 (.11)	-.01 (.11)
	Sine Cycle	.19** (.08) [1.20]	.18* (.08) [1.20]	.18* (.08) [1.20]
	Cosine Cycle	.118 (.07)		
	Pre-Intervention Positive Interactions	.39*** (.12) [1.48]	.40** (.12) [1.49]	.39** (.12) [1.49]
	Race	-.72*** (.13) [2.06]	-.73*** (.13) [2.07]	-.73*** (.13) [2.07]
	Training x Race		.13 (.25)	.13 (.25)
	MAAS x Race		.22(.21)	.21 (.21)
	Training x Race x MAAS		-.27 (.41)	-.26 (.42)
	Level 2	Training	-.15 (.23)	-.16 (.23)
	MAAS		-.04 (.17)	-.02 (.17)
	Training x MAAS		-.26 (.33)	-.35 (.33)
	IRI-E			.02 (.03)
	MRS			-.75 (.33) [2.12]
Random Effects residual SE(residual)				
	μ_{0j} [Person Level ICC]	.75** (.15) [.04]	.76*** (.15) [.03]	.72*** (.16) [.09]
Model Fit				
	-2 * Log Likelihood	$\Delta\chi^2(5) = 165.91^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(9) = 167.26^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(2) = 3.89$

Note. Sine Cycle = $\sin(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Cosine Cycle = $\cos(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Pre-Intervention Positive Interactions = pre-intervention positive interactions with strangers and acquaintances. ; Race = race of the primary interaction partner (Same = -.5, Other = .5). Training = training condition (Mindfulness = .5, Sham Meditation = -.5). MAAS = Mindful Attention Awareness Scale; IRI-E = Empathic Concern subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index; MRS = Modern Racism Scale. Δ odds = e^γ ; this statistic represents the change in odds for every one-point increase in the predictor and is interpreted as a decrease in odds for negative γ values. Trait x Training Interaction model fit is compared to the unconditional model. Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates model fit is compared to the Trait x Training Interaction Model. Cohort intercepts varied significantly, but explained only 3% of the variance ($\mu_{0j} = .09$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .03$, $p < .001$, ICC = .03, $-2LL(2) = 1539.81$). Intercepts significantly varied between subjects ($\mu_{0j} = .79$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .14$, $p < .001$, ICC = .19, $-2LL(2) = 2687.83$). * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table S2.5

Binary outcome multilevel models predicting daily post-intervention antagonistic interactions with strangers and acquaintances

	Main Effects	Trait x Training Interaction	Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates
Fixed Effects γ (SE(γ)) [Δodds]			
Level 1	Intercept	-4.23*** (.27)	-4.30*** (.28)
	Sine Cycle	.43** (.18) [1.53]	.43* (.18) [1.54]
	Cosine Cycle	-.04 (.19)	
	Pre-Intervention Antagonistic Interactions	.68 (.45)	.71 (.45)
	Race	-1.00** (.31) [2.71]	-1.05*** (.311) [2.86]
	Training x Race		-.48 (.63)
	MAAS x Race		-.53 (.47)
	Training x Race * MAAS		-1.50 (.93)
	Training	.38 (.39)	.24 (.42)
	MAAS		-.08 (.28)
Level 2	Training x MAAS		-1.00 (.56)
	IRI-E		.00 (.05)
	MRS		-.72 (.72)
Random Effects residual SE(residual)			
μ_{0j} [Person Level ICC]	.85* (.42) [.00]	.90* (.44) [.00]	.85* (.44) [.00]
Model Fit			
-2 * Log Likelihood	$\Delta\chi^2(5) = 58.34^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(9) = 67.03^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(2) = .99$

Note. Sine Cycle = $\sin(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Cosine Cycle = $\cos(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Pre-Intervention antagonistic Interactions = pre-intervention antagonistic interactions with strangers and acquaintances; Race = race of the primary interaction partner (Same = -.5, Other = .5). Training = training condition (Mindfulness = .5, Sham Mediation = -.5). MAAS = Mindful Attention Awareness Scale; IRI-E = Empathic Concern subscale of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index; MRS = Modern Racism Scale. Δ odds = e^γ ; this statistic represents the change in odds for every one-point increase in the predictor and is interpreted as a decrease in odds for negative γ values. Trait x Training Interaction model fit is compared to the unconditional model. Trait x Training Interaction with Covariates model fit is compared to the Trait x Training Interaction Model. Cohort intercepts did not vary significantly ($\mu_{0j} = .00$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .00$, $p = .511$, ICC = .00, $-2LL(2) = 479.96$). Intercepts significantly varied between subjects ($\mu_{0j} = .78$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .33$, $p = .017$, ICC = .19, $-2LL(2) = 472.66$).

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

Table S26

Pre-intervention daily interactions with strangers as predicted by psychological traits (including all trait x race interaction terms)

Outcome		Helping Behavior	Positive Interactions	Antagonistic Interactions
Fixed Effects γ (SE(γ)) [Δodds]				
Level 1	Intercept	-2.00*** (.12)	-.03 (.10)	-3.76*** (.23)
	Sine Cycle	.53*** (.09) [1.71]	.15* (.07) [1.16]	.27 (.19)
	Race	-.26 (.14)	-.49*** (.11) [1.63]	-.23 (.30)
	MAAS x Race	.03 (.28)	.31 (.23)	-.14 (.43)
	NEO-A x Race	-.13 (.30)	-.81* (.31) [2.26]	.29 (.44)
	MRS x Race	-.48 (.40)	-.51 (.33)	.06 (.61)
	SDO x Race	-.30 (.20)	-.13 (.16)	-.17 (.38)
	IRI-F x Race	.06* (.03) [1.06]	.06* (.02) [1.06]	-.11 (.06)
	IRI-P x Race	.03 (.04)	.01 (.03)	.05 (.08)
	IRI-E x Race	-.03 (.05)	.02 (.04)	.06 (.09)
	IRI-D x Race	-.02 (.03)	.02 (.02)	.06 (.06)
	Level 2	MAAS	.62** (.20) [1.86]	.24 (.16)
NEO-A		.07 (.25)	.17 (.20)	-.67 (.36)
MRS		.06 (.30)	-.56 (.31)	.39 (.64)
SDO		-.27 (.18)	-.11 (.18)	-.18 (.27)
IRI-F		.03 (.03)	-.02 (.02)	.05 (.04)
IRI-P		-.07* (.04) [1.07]	-.08** (.03) [1.08]	-.06 (.05)
IRI-E		-.06 (.05)	.04 (.03)	.03 (.06)
IRI-D		.01 (.03)	.02 (.02)	-.01 (.04)
Random Effects residual SE(residual)				
μ_{0j} [Person Level ICC]		.57*** (.16) [.23]	.53*** (.14) [.16]	1.07** (.37) [.09]
Model Fit				
$\Delta-2 * \text{Log Likelihood}$		$\Delta\chi^2(18) = 66.12^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(18) = 73.29^{***}$	$\Delta\chi^2(18) = 18.28$

Note. Sine Cycle = $\sin(2 \times \pi \times \text{Day} / 7)$; Pre-Int = pre-intervention behavior that corresponds with the outcome;

Race = race of the primary interaction partner (Same = -.5, Other = .5); MAAS = Mindful Attention Awareness

Scale; NEO-A = Agreeableness subscale of the NEO-FFI; MRS = Modern Racism Scale; SDO = Social Dominance

Orientation Scale; IRI- = Interpersonal Reactivity Index; F = Fantasy, P = Perspective Taking, E = Empathic

Concern; D = Personal Distress. Δ odds = e^{γ} ; this statistic represents the change in odds for every one-point increase

in the predictor and is interpreted as a decrease in odds for negative γ values. Intercepts varied between subjects for

helping behavior ($\mu_{0j} = .73$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .18$, $p < .001$, ICC = .18, $-2LL(2) = 1741.21$), positive interactions ($\mu_{0j} = .63$,

$SE(\mu_{0j}) = .15$, $p < .001$, ICC = .16, $-2LL(2) = 2775.96$), and antagonistic interactions ($\mu_{0j} = 1.18$, $SE(\mu_{0j}) = .34$, p

$= .001$, ICC = .26, $-2LL(2) = 686.01$). $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

References

- Albert, A., & Anderson, J. A. (1984). On the existence of maximum likelihood estimates in logistic regression models. *Biometrika*, *71*(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.1093/biomet/71.1.1>
- Hu, M. C., Pavlicova, M., & Nunes, E. V. (2011). Zero-inflated and hurdle models of count data with extra zeros: examples from an HIV-risk reduction intervention trial. *The American Journal of Drug and Alcohol Abuse*, *37*(5), 367-375. <https://doi.org/10.3109/00952990.2011.597280>
- Lambert, D. (1992). Zero-inflated Poisson regression, with an application to defects in manufacturing. *Technometrics*, *34*(1), 1-14. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/1269547>
- Morelli, S. A., Rameson, L. T., & Lieberman, M. D. (2012). The neural components of empathy: predicting daily prosocial behavior. *Social Cognitive and Affective Neuroscience*, *9*(1), 39-47. <https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nss088>