

Supplemental Methods

The PDG was presented to participants as a series of ten trials where they could decide to either cooperate or defect. Participants were told the amount of money they could earn would depend on their decision as well as the decisions of previous participants who they would be randomly paired with for each trial. If the participant chose to cooperate for a given trial, they would receive either nothing or 75 cents, but if they defected they could earn either 25 cents or 1.25 dollars. Likewise, participants were told that the decisions they made would in turn affect the possible amount of money that future participants could earn from this task. Therefore, if the participants cooperated, they would receive an equal amount of money as the future participants, but if they defected they could receive more money at the cost of other future participants receiving less money. Participants were able to see how much money they earned before continuing. Although participants were told their responses would be randomly paired with previous and future participants, they were actually paired with a preprogrammed simulator that followed the tit-for-tat schema (Imhof, Fudenberg, & Nowak, 2007). This deception was necessary so all participants would be tested in the same paradigm that could reliably measure their level of cooperation (Kuhlman & Marshello, 1975; Zheng et al., 2017). Participants' cooperation scores were based on the number of trials they chose to cooperate, which was then divided by two, so the scores ranged from 0 to 5.

In the DG, participants were given \$5.00 and asked to decide how much of that money they would like to keep and how much they would like to donate to a charity (i.e., Red Cross). As performed in previous studies (Eckel & Grossman, 1996), participants were informed that the Red Cross supports people that have been affected by natural disasters and emergency situations. Participants kept their chosen amount of money and donations were given to the Red Cross.

Participants' charity scores were determined by the number of dollars (0 to 5) they donated; values were calculated to the quarter dollar.

Supplemental Tables

Table S1. Bivariate analyses of individual covariates predicting prosocial measures from both studies.

Predictor	Study 1	Study 1	Study 2
	DG: Charitability	PDG: Cooperation	HAS: Helping Attitude
Age	$\beta(67) = 0.14$	$\beta(67) = 0.22^{\sim}$	$\beta(497) = 0.30^{***}$
PSS: Current Life Stress	$\beta(67) = -0.10$	$\beta(67) = -0.13$	-
ACE: ELS Summary Score	$\beta(65) = -0.14$	$\beta(65) = -0.05$	$\beta(430) = -0.09^{\sim}$
ACE: Physical Abuse	$\beta(65) = -0.19$	$\beta(65) = -0.04$	$\beta(486) = -0.04$
ACE: Emotional Abuse	$\beta(65) = -0.09$	$\beta(65) = 0.05$	$\beta(488) = -0.07$
ACE: Sexual Abuse	$\beta(65) = 0.13$	$\beta(65) = -0.05$	$\beta(479) = 0.02$
ACE: Family Drug Abuse	$\beta(67) = -0.06$	$\beta(67) = -0.08$	$\beta(487) = 0.00$
ACE: Family Incarceration	$\beta(67) = -0.24^*$	$\beta(67) = 0.07$	$\beta(486) = -0.04$
ACE: Family Mental Illness	$\beta(67) = -0.05$	$\beta(67) = -0.16$	$\beta(487) = -0.02$
ACE: Family Violence	$\beta(66) = -0.08$	$\beta(66) = 0.10$	$\beta(493) = -0.07$
ACE: Parent Separation/Death	$\beta(67) = 0.06$	$\beta(67) = 0.22^{\sim}$	$\beta(488) = -0.03$
ACE: Emotional Neglect	$\beta(65) = -0.19$	$\beta(65) = -0.12$	$\beta(496) = -0.14^{***}$
ACE: Physical Neglect	$\beta(66) = -0.04$	$\beta(66) = 0.03$	$\beta(483) = -0.02$
ACE: Bullying	$\beta(66) = -0.06$	$\beta(66) = -0.04$	$\beta(488) = -0.00$
ACE: Community Violence	$\beta(66) = -0.20$	$\beta(66) = -0.10$	$\beta(485) = -0.00$
ACE: Collective Violence	$\beta(66) = -0.13$	$\beta(66) = -0.22^{\sim}$	$\beta(481) = -0.00$

Notes: Bivariate analyses of age, sex, current life stress, early life stress, and all 13 specific stressors are separately analyzed with prosocial behaviors. β (standardized regression coefficient) and degrees of freedom are presented for each linear regression. Asterisks are used to represent p-values: ($p \leq 0.10$) $^{\sim}$, ($p \leq 0.05$) * , ($p \leq 0.01$) ** , ($p \leq 0.005$) ***

Table S2. Multivariate analysis including all covariates to predict prosocial measures from both studies.

Predictor	Study 1	Study 1	Study 2
	DG: Charitability	PDG: Cooperation	HAS: Helping Attitude
Age	$\beta(51) = 0.20$	$\beta(51) = 0.32^*$	$\beta(414) = 0.29^{***}$
Sex	$\beta(51) = 0.25^{\sim}$	$\beta(51) = -0.01$	$\beta(414) = 0.11^*$
ACE: Physical Abuse	$\beta(51) = -0.23$	$\beta(51) = 0.00$	$\beta(414) = -0.05$
ACE: Emotional Abuse	$\beta(51) = -0.16$	$\beta(51) = 0.06$	$\beta(414) = 0.04$
ACE: Sexual Abuse	$\beta(51) = 0.17$	$\beta(51) = -0.11$	$\beta(414) = 0.06$
ACE: Family Drug Abuse	$\beta(51) = 0.02$	$\beta(51) = -0.20$	$\beta(414) = 0.02$
ACE: Family Incarceration	$\beta(51) = -0.15$	$\beta(51) = 0.18$	$\beta(414) = -0.05$
ACE: Family Mental Illness	$\beta(51) = 0.00$	$\beta(51) = -0.07$	$\beta(414) = -0.01$
ACE: Family Violence	$\beta(51) = 0.15$	$\beta(51) = 0.07$	$\beta(414) = -0.10$
ACE: Parent Separation/Death	$\beta(51) = 0.14$	$\beta(51) = 0.21$	$\beta(414) = 0.03$
ACE: Emotional Neglect	$\beta(51) = -0.20$	$\beta(51) = -0.35^*$	$\beta(414) = -0.16^{***}$
ACE: Physical Neglect	$\beta(51) = -0.03$	$\beta(51) = 0.08$	$\beta(414) = 0.08$
ACE: Bullying	$\beta(51) = 0.16$	$\beta(51) = 0.02$	$\beta(414) = 0.00$
ACE: Community Violence	$\beta(51) = -0.09$	$\beta(51) = -0.03$	$\beta(414) = 0.02$
ACE: Collective Violence	$\beta(51) = -0.20$	$\beta(51) = -0.31^*$	$\beta(414) = 0.05$

Notes: Multivariate analyses of age, sex, and all 13 specific stressors predicting prosocial behaviors. β (standardized regression coefficient) and degrees of freedom are presented for each covariate within a given linear model. Asterisks are used to represent p-values: ($p \leq 0.10$) $^{\sim}$, ($p \leq 0.05$) * , ($p \leq 0.01$) ** , ($p \leq 0.005$) ***