

Supplement to:

Vernarelli, Michael J. 2016. "Predicting Altruistic Behavior and Assessing Homophily: Evidence from the Sisterhood." *Sociological Science* 3: 889-909.

## Appendix A

The three categories for relationship with other sorority sisters participating in the experiment were designed to reflect increasing levels of social closeness. A Category 1 Sister is defined as someone with whom one has the least amount of intimacy. Interactions occur at formal events such as chapter meetings or philanthropic events. A Category 2 Sister is defined as someone with whom one has a casual friendship and interactions beyond formal events. A Category 3 Sister is defined as someone with whom one is most intimate and spends time in personal living space and shares day-to-day concerns and experiences. The actual descriptions of these categories that were distributed to the participants before rating the others are given below.

Category 1 Sister: Attends meetings, PEARLs (mandatory scholarship presentations), and all other events with this sister.

Category 2 Sister: In addition to Category 1 activities hangs out at the house and/or shares meals on campus. Hangs out (sits) with this sister at events. Knows a little about her academics (major).

Category 3 Sister: In addition to Category 2 activities hangs out on weekends with this sister. Is very comfortable with her; knows her really well. Walks into her room unannounced to socialize.

## Appendix B

The research team distributed the money contributed in the envelopes to the anonymous students by setting up a table outside on the university grounds and inviting student passer-bys to receive "free money." After some initial skepticism students who were not part of the experiment and completely anonymous to the research team stopped at the table, randomly selected an envelope and were given the money inside. All 29 envelopes were distributed in 10-15 minutes.

## Appendix C

Warner et al. (1979) indicated that in small group samples where every group member interacts with every other group member a consistent pattern of behavior manifested by individuals in dyadic interactions results in nonindependence of observations. They defined two roles in the dyad, actor and partner. In the current study an actor (judge) predicted the behavior of the partner (target) in the dyad. An individual judge is assumed to have consistent behavior across her predictions. Likewise, a target is assumed to receive a consistent set of predictions concerning her behavior across all predictions. Warner et al. proposed an equation to disentangle these two effects, so that the underlying dyadic interaction between

actor and partner could be identified. Its application to the analysis of predictive ability is given below.

$$P_{ij} = m + a_i + b_j + c_{ij}$$

where:

$P_{ij}$  is prediction by judge  $i$  of dictator contributions made by target  $j$

$m$  is the mean of all predictions made

$a_i$  is the actor effect of judge  $i$  in her predictions

$b_j$  is the partner effect of target  $j$  in predictions received by her

$c_{ij}$  is the interaction effect between judge  $i$  and target  $j$  in dyad  $ij$

The actor effect is calculated as:

$$a_i = [(n-1)^2/n(n-2)]m_{i*} + [n-1/n(n-2)]m_{*i} - [n-1/n-2]m$$

where:

$n$  is number of participants in the study

$m_{i*}$  is mean of predictions made by participant  $i$  as judge

$m_{*i}$  is mean of predictions received by participant  $i$  as target

The partner effect is calculated as:

$$b_j = [(n-1)^2/n(n-2)]m_{*j} + [n-1/n(n-2)]m_{j*} - [n-1/n-2]m$$

For analysis of the average prediction of the judges and the contribution of a target, the correlation between the partner effect and contribution of the participant was calculated. For analysis of predictive ability of individual judges at the dyad level, the correlation between the interaction effect and the contribution of individual participants was calculated. The interaction effect was calculated as:

$$c_{ij} = P_{ij} - m - a_i - b_j$$