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**Study 3**

We conducted additional analyses while controlling for religiosity, individualism, socioeconomic diversity, and political diversity at the national level. Further, we tested whether the primary results reported in the main text hold after excluding African countries. We further tested whether country-level ethnic diversity is related to trust, the key variable examined by Putnam (2007).

**Additional Variables** We obtained country-level data on individualism from the Hofstede dataset (Hofstede, 2001; Hofstede, Hofstede & Minkof, 2010); income inequality (Gini index) from the World Bank database (The World Bank, 2012); and religiosity, political party preference, generalized trust, and trust in neighborhood from the World Values Survey (2015). For educational attainment (the key indicator of socioeconomic status used in Studies 1 and 2), there was no data in the World Bank (2012) database on the number of people who obtained a Bachelor’s degree and above for 47 countries (out of 64). Therefore, we measured countries’ socioeconomic status diversity using the Gini index, an index of income inequality.

We computed political diversity using the formula as in Studies 1 and 2. Table S1 reports the means, standard deviations, and correlations among these variables.

**Results**

To maximize sample size, we kept the control variables from the main analyses (per capita gross national income adjusted for purchasing power parity, percentage of population living urban areas, gender diversity, religious diversity), and added each of the additional control variables (individualism, religiosity, socioeconomic status diversity, and political diversity) individually in four separate regressions (see Table S2). The sample size dropped from 128 to 46-58 in these analyses. The magnitude of the effect of racial diversity on self-reported helping was similar across the full sample (*B* = 10.30) and the smaller samples with these additional control variables (*B*’s = 6.16 – 13.32), but no longer statistically significant, which is not surprising given the substantial reduction in sample size and corresponding loss of statistical power. In the fifth model, when non-African countries were excluded, the magnitude of the effect of racial diversity on self-reported helping (*B* = 4.95) was in the same direction as in the full sample, but no longer statistically significant.

We conducted another set of analyses with generalized trust and trust in neighborhood as dependent variables, ethnic diversity as the independent variable, controlling for the same variables as in the Study 3 main analyses (per capita gross national income adjusted for purchasing power parity, percentage of population living urban areas, gender diversity, and religious diversity). We found a negative effect of ethnic diversity on generalized trust, but the relationship was not statistically significant, *B* = -11.46, 95% *CI* [-28.83, 5.93], *t*(46) = -1.33, *p* = .19. We also found a significant negative effect of ethnic diversity on trust in neighborhood, and the relationship was statistically significant, *B* = -.39, 95% *CI* [-0.717, -0.066], *t*(45) = -2.42, *p* = .019 (see Table S3). This finding is consistent with Putnam’s (2007) finding that higher racial diversity is associated with lower trust.

**Study 4**

The religious affiliation dataset (Grammich et al., 2012) that we used to compute the religious diversity measure contained the number of adherents of different religions in each county, along with the total population of the county. Typically, the total number of adherents for all religions in a zip code was equal to or less than the population of the county that the zipcode was located in. However, for zipcode 22030, the total number of adherents of the different religions (27,537) was more than the reported population of the county (22,565). Thus, we used 27,537 as the total population of the county.

**Study 5**

We conducted additional analyses while including all racial minorities and multi-racial people, excluding only five participants who were not living in the US. The sample size for this analysis was 400 participants (145 women, 253 men, 2 unreported; mean age 35.37 years).

After including racial minorities and multi-racial people, a regression found that participants exposed to a racially diverse neighborhood reported greater willingness to help than those exposed to a homogenous all-European American neighborhood, *B* = 0.30, 95% *CI* = [0.02, .58], *t*(398) = 2.09, *p* = .04, *d* = .21. The effect of neighborhood diversity on identification with all humanity was in the same direction as in the primary analyses but not statistically significant, *B* = 0.11, 95% *CI =* [-.05, 0.27], *t*(398) = 1.40, *p* = .16. Another regression found that participants who were more likely to identify with all humanity reported greater willingness to help, *B* = 0.84, 95% *CI* = [0.67, 1.00], *t* (398) = 10.27, *p* < .001. Once identification with all humanity was controlled for, the effect of the diversity condition on helping intentions was no longer statistically significant, *B* = 0.21, 95% *CI* = [-.04, 0.46], *t*(397) = 1.63, *p* = .10, whereas identification with all humanity remained a significant predictor, *B* = 0.83, 95% *CI* = [0.67, 0.99], *t*(397) = 10.15, *p* < .001 (see Table S4). The indirect effect of the diversity manipulation on helping intentions through identification with all humanity was not significant, 95% *CI* = [-.0376, 0.2340].

**Suspicion Check**

Upon excluding the eight participants who might be suspicious of the relationship between the manipulation and the dependent measure, the effect of the diversity manipulation on helping intentions remained marginally significant (*B* = 0.30, 95% *CI* = [-0.0273, .6267], *t*(292) = 1.80, *p* = .07, *d* = .21), whereas diversity significantly predicted identification with all humanity (*B* = 0.18, 95% *CI* = [.0058, .3559], *t*(292) = 2.03, *p* = .04, *d* = .24), and identification with all humanity significantly predicted helping (*B* = 0.91, 95% *CI* = [.7183, 1.0939], *t*(292) = 9.50, *p* < .001). Once identification with all humanity was controlled for, the effect of the diversity condition on helping intentions was reduced, *B* = 0.14, 95% *CI* = [-0.15, 0.43], *t*(291) = 0.94, *p* = .35, whereas identification with all humanity remained a significant predictor, *B* = 0.90, 95% *CI* = [0.71, 1.08], *t*(291) = 9.32, *p* < .001. Further, the indirect effect of the diversity manipulation on helping intentions through identification with all humanity remained significant, indirect effect = 0.16, *SE* = 0.09, 95% *CI* = [0.0070, 0.3426].
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**Table S1.** Means, standard deviation and correlations of variables (Study 3).

|  |
| --- |
|  |
|   | Mean | S.D. | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) | (8) | (9) | (10) | (11) |
| 1. Helping | 45.53 | 13.40 | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Generalized trust | 23.37 | 15.73 | 0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (58) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Trust in neighborhood | 2.86 | 0.26 | -0.10 | 0.27\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (57) | (57) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Gross national income per capita purchasing power parity | 16937 | 18031 | 0.12 | 0.39\*\* | -0.01 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (141) | (56) | (55) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Urban population percentage | 0.59 | 0.23 | 0.01 | 0.28\* | -0.25† | 0.69\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (143) | (57) | (56) | (140) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6. Individualism | 42.92 | 24.15 | 0.31\* | 0.57\*\* | 0.25 | 0.58\*\* | 0.39\*\* |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (66) | (34) | (33) | (64) | (65) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7. Religiosity | 65.92 | 23.08 | 0.02 | -0.60\*\* | 0.08 | -0.31\* | -0.43\* | -0.19 |  |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (57) | (56) | (55) | (55) | (56) | (34) |  |  |  |  |  |
| 8. Income inequality | 36.96 | 8.33 | 0.17 | -0.52\*\* | -0.48\* | -0.42\*\* | -0.00 | -0.70\*\* | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (67) | (26) | (26) | (65) | (66) | (41) | (27) |  |  |  |  |
| 9. Gender diversity | 0.97 | 0.07 | -0.10 | -0.06 | -0.15 | -0.54\*\* | -0.25\*\* | -0.09 | -0.12 | 0.27\* |  |  |  |
|   |  |  | (143) | (57) | (56) | (140) | (143) | (65) | (56) | (66) |  |  |  |
| 10. Religious diversity | 0.31 | 0.21 | -0.10 | 0.44\*\* | 0.04 | 0.11 | -0.06 | 0.12 | -0.49\*\* | -0.40\*\* | -0.01 |  |  |
|   |  |  | (145) | (58) | (57) | (141) | (143) | (66) | (57) | (67) | (143) |  |  |
| 11. Political diversity | 0.72 | 0.13 | 0.26† | 0.12 | -0.19 | 0.07 | 0.17 | 0.15 | 0.01 | -0.05 | -0.09 | -0.16 |  |
|   |  |  | (52) | (51) | (50) | (50) | (51) | (32) | (51) | (25) | (51) | (52) |  |
| 12. Racial diversity | 0.38 | 0.26 | 0.17\* | -0.17 | -0.14 | -0.05 | -0.18\* | -0.07 | 0.36\*\* | 0.08 | -0.10 | 0.14 | -0.02 |
|   |  |  | (134) | (54) | (53) | (129) | (131) | (60) | (53) | (61) | (131) | (133) | (48) |
| Note. † indicates *p* < .10, \* indicates *p* < .05, and \*\* indicates *p* < .01 (two-tailed). *N*’s are in parentheses. |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Table S2.** Results of regression with proportion of people who helped a stranger in the past month as the dependent variable (Study 3).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | Variables | Model 1 (N=58) | Model 2 (N=51) | Model 3 (N=58) | Model 4 (N=46) | Model 5 (N=91) |
| Constant | 39.97\* (3.34) | 38.14 (3.95) | 36.44 (2.87) | 38.24\*\* (3.62) | 40.27\*\* (2.65) |
| Control Variables |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Gross national income per capita purchasing power parity | .000054 (.00016) | .000032† (.00016) | .00029† (.00016) | .000016 (.00018) | .00030\*\* (.00011) |
|  | Urban Population Percentage | -4.79 (10.79) | .85 (12.52) | -18.46† (10.52) | 11.55 (13.75) | -5.23 (8.30) |
|  | Gender Diversity | .241.95 (82.86)\*\* | 44.69 (41.91) | 121.22† (66.90) | 269.31\* (101.39) | 17.11 (21.34) |
|  | Religious Diversity | -7.02 (8.62) | -9.45 (10.58) | -8.57 (7.90) | 4.43 (10.68) | -18.89\*\* (6.66) |
|  | Individualism | .20\* (.08) |  |  |  |  |
|  | Religiosity |  | .04 (.11) |  |  |  |
|  | Income Inequality |  |  | .32 (.22) |  |  |
|  | Political Diversity |  |  |  | 26.50† (13.73) |  |
| Predictor Variable |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Ethnic diversity | 6.16 (7.15) | 12.65 (9.42) | 13.32† (6.88) | 6.94 (8.20) | 4.95 (5.98) |

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported; standard errors are in parentheses. Control variables are mean-centered. † indicates *p* < .10, \* indicates *p* < .05, and \*\* indicates *p* < .01 (two-tailed). Model 5 excludes African countries.

**Table S3.** Results of regression with generalized trust and trust in neighborhood as the dependent variables (Study 3).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   | Generalized Trust | Trust in Neighborhood |
|   |  | Model 1 (N=52) | Model 2 (N=51) |
| Constant | 24.74\*\* (3.76) | 2.96\*\* (.09) |
| Control Variables |  |  |
|  | Gross national income per capita purchasing power parity | .00024 (.00015) | -5.55E-07 (2.74E-06) |
|  | Urban Population Percentage | 5.55 (11.52) | -.55\* (.21) |
|  | Gender Diversity | 24.43 (35.74) | -1.47\* (.66) |
|  | Religious Diversity | 26.89\*\* (9.32) | .17 (.17) |
|  |  |  |  |
| Predictor Variable |  |  |
|   | Ethnic diversity | -11.46 (8.64) | -.39\* (.16) |

Note. Unstandardized coefficients are reported; standard errors are in parentheses. Control variables are mean-centered. † indicates *p* < .10, \* indicates *p* < .05, and \*\* indicates *p* < .01 (two-tailed).

**Table S4.** Results with all participants, including non-European Americans and multi-racials (Study 5).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   |   |  |  |  Dependent variable: Helping a stranger |  |
|   | Independent Variables | Model 1 | Model 2 | Model 3 |
|  |  | B (SE) | *β* | 95% CI | B (SE) | *β* | 95% CI | B (SE) | *β* | 95% CI |
|  | Constant | 5.00 (.10) |  | [4.81, 5.20] | 2.56 (.26) |  | [2.05, 3.07] | 2.49 (.26) |  | [1.97, 3.01] |
| Mediating Variable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | IWAH |  |  |  | .84\*\* (.08) | 0.46\*\* | [.68, 1.00] | .83\*\* (.08) | 0.45\*\* | [.67, .99] |
| Predictor Variable |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|   | Diversity condition | .30\* (.14) | .10\* | [.02, .58] |  |  |  | .21 (.13) | 0.07 | [-.04, .46] |

Note. Standard errors are in parentheses. Note. † indicates *p* < .10, \* indicates *p* < .05, and \*\* indicates *p* < .01 (all two-tailed) (*N* = 400).