Sex Differences in Mate Preferences Across 45 Countries: A Large-Scale Replication
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**S1. Sample Information**

Table S1 lists the total number of participants from each country and the number of women and men in each sample.

Table S1

*Sample Size by Country and Sex*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Sample Size |
| Country | Total | Females | Males |
| Algeria | 614 | 341 | 273 |
| Australia | 508 | 258 | 250 |
| Austria | 197 | 153 | 44 |
| Belgium | 419 | 220 | 199 |
| Brazil | 296 | 156 | 140 |
| Bulgaria | 115 | 72 | 43 |
| Chile | 203 | 113 | 90 |
| China | 396 | 231 | 165 |
| Colombia | 156 | 88 | 68 |
| Costa Rica | 148 | 75 | 73 |
| Croatia | 396 | 207 | 189 |
| Cuba | 260 | 134 | 126 |
| El Salvador | 80 | 50 | 30 |
| Estonia | 221 | 115 | 106 |
| Georgia | 204 | 102 | 102 |
| Germany | 100 | 65 | 35 |
| Greece | 188 | 111 | 77 |
| Hungary | 840 | 420 | 420 |
| India | 378 | 192 | 186 |
| Indonesia | 92 | 45 | 47 |
| Iran | 192 | 98 | 94 |
| Italy | 420 | 285 | 135 |
| Jordan | 188 | 88 | 100 |
| Lithuania | 299 | 149 | 150 |
| Malaysia | 251 | 130 | 121 |
| Mexico | 166 | 96 | 70 |
| Nigeria | 281 | 137 | 144 |
| Norway | 265 | 122 | 143 |
| Pakistan | 594 | 343 | 251 |
| Peru | 223 | 142 | 81 |
| Poland | 520 | 237 | 283 |
| Portugal | 272 | 162 | 110 |
| Romania | 200 | 100 | 100 |
| Russia | 216 | 120 | 96 |
| Slovakia | 457 | 342 | 115 |
| Slovenia | 639 | 326 | 313 |
| South Korea | 214 | 104 | 110 |
| Spain | 395 | 227 | 168 |
| Sweden | 279 | 131 | 148 |
| The Netherlands | 233 | 135 | 98 |
| Turkey | 1061 | 573 | 488 |
| Uganda | 278 | 112 | 166 |
| United States | 230 | 137 | 93 |
| Uruguay | 223 | 135 | 88 |
| Vietnam | 492 | 330 | 162 |

**S2. Funnel Plots**

Due to the challenge of collecting cross-cultural data, sample sizes vary from country to country (ranging from *n* = 80, in El Salvador, to *n* = 1061, in Turkey). If effect sizes vary more widely in smaller samples, this suggests that a substantial portion of the cross-cultural variation in sex differences is due to sampling error. To assess the risk of this, we plotted country-level sex differences (Cohen’s d values) for each preference and age choice, against sample size for each country to create funnel plots (Figure S2). The triangle shape of the graphs illustrate that larger samples have Cohen’s d values closer to the average sex difference while smaller samples are more varied. This indicates that one source of cross-cultural variation is indeed sampling error. Estimated random slope values from the multilevel model account for this error introduced by variability in sample size sample size differences, so Cohen’s d is used instead of *b* to indicate the magnitude of the sex difference in preference for each country. These graphs illustrate the need to account for error due to sample size differences when making cross-cultural comparisons.



**Figure S2**. Cohen’s d values for each country indicating the magnitude of the sex difference in preference for each trait measured as a function of sample size. The black line indicates the average Cohen’s d overall for that trait.

**S3. Mahalanobis *D* Values**

Table S3 lists the overall Mahalanobis *D* values or the overall sex difference in mate preferences for each country with bootstrapped 95% confidence intervals (Overall *D*). It also lists the *D* values and CIs for those traits predicted to be sex differentiated (good financial prospects and physical attractiveness, *D*1) and those not predicted to be sex differentiated (kindness, intelligence, health, *D*2).

Table S3

*Mahalanobis D Values and 95% Confidence Intervals*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Country | Overall *D* [95% CIs] | *D*1 [95% CIs]  | *D*2 [95% CIs] |
| Algeria | 0.62 [0.49, 0.81] | 0.62 [0.47, 0.79] | 0.13 [0.06, 0.32] |
| Australia | 0.58 [0.44, 0.78] | 0.50 [0.34, 0.69] | 0.19 [0.09, 0.40] |
| Austria | 0.87 [0.59, 1.35] | 0.82 [0.46, 1.25] | 0.23 [0.11, 0.70] |
| Belgium | 0.74 [0.58, 0.97] | 0.62 [0.43, 0.84] | 0.39 [0.24, 0.60] |
| Brazil | 0.82 [0.64, 1.09] | 0.73 [0.54, 0.96] | 0.23 [0.09, 0.52] |
| Bulgaria | 0.55 [0.36, 1.05] | 0.53 [0.22, 0.94] | 0.21 [0.10, 0.67] |
| Chile | 0.58 [0.39, 0.95] | 0.46 [0.21, 0.78] | 0.34 [0.16, 0.67] |
| China | 0.98 [0.80, 1.24] | 0.87 [0.66, 1.10] | 0.71 [0.53, 0.93] |
| Colombia | 0.76 [0.52, 1.16] | 0.62 [0.34, 0.97] | 0.41 [0.19, 0.80] |
| Costa Rica | 0.48 [0.32, 0.93] | 0.37 [0.12, 0.75] | 0.24 [0.11, 0.65] |
| Croatia | 0.76 [0.60, 0.99] | 0.65 [0.47, 0.87] | 0.33 [0.18, 0.55] |
| Cuba | 0.93 [0.74, 1.25] | 0.85 [0.62, 1.11] | 0.27 [0.12, 0.60] |
| El Salvador | 1.10 [0.74, 1.92] | 0.93 [0.50, 1.55] | 0.51 [0.23, 1.11] |
| Estonia | 0.53 [0.35, 0.89] | 0.50 [0.25, 0.82] | 0.25 [0.11, 0.56] |
| Georgia | 1.42 [1.15, 1.86] | 1.08 [0.77, 1.48] | 0.63 [0.40, 0.94] |
| Germany | 1.09 [0.75, 1.80] | 0.72 [0.36, 1.26] | 0.73 [0.36, 1.31] |
| Greece | 0.70 [0.47, 1.13] | 0.43 [0.17, 0.80] | 0.50 [0.25, 0.84] |
| Hungary | 0.77 [0.65, 0.93] | 0.72 [0.59, 0.87] | 0.31 [0.20, 0.46] |
| India | 0.81 [0.61, 1.10] | 0.78 [0.57, 1.05] | 0.25 [0.11, 0.48] |
| Indonesia | 1.11 [0.82, 1.72] | 0.90 [0.55, 1.39] | 0.25 [0.12, 0.77] |
| Iran | 1.14 [0.91, 1.50] | 0.96 [0.67, 1.32] | 0.67 [0.44, 0.96] |
| Italy | 0.69 [0.52, 0.94] | 0.65 [0.45, 0.88] | 0.05 [0.05, 0.34] |
| Jordan | 0.65 [0.45, 1.04] | 0.62 [0.35, 0.96] | 0.12 [0.08, 0.51] |
| Lithuania | 0.69 [0.52, 0.97] | 0.62 [0.41, 0.87] | 0.17 [0.08, 0.46] |
| Malaysia | 0.51 [0.34, 0.81] | 0.35 [0.15, 0.61] | 0.27 [0.12, 0.56] |
| Mexico | 0.84 [0.65, 1.23] | 0.68 [0.40, 1.02] | 0.45 [0.23, 0.81] |
| Nigeria | 0.30 [0.19, 0.62] | 0.26 [0.08, 0.52] | 0.20 [0.09, 0.46] |
| Norway | 0.75 [0.57, 1.04] | 0.62 [0.40, 0.88] | 0.38 [0.20, 0.66] |
| Pakistan | 0.47 [0.34, 0.68] | 0.40 [0.24, 0.59] | 0.27 [0.14, 0.47] |
| Peru | 0.89 [0.65, 1.25] | 0.75 [0.49, 1.06] | 0.40 [0.19, 0.75] |
| Poland | 0.97 [0.83, 1.17] | 0.91 [0.75, 1.09] | 0.34 [0.21, 0.52] |
| Portugal | 0.50 [0.34, 0.82] | 0.43 [0.20, 0.73] | 0.06 [0.06, 0.40] |
| Romania | 0.35 [0.23, 0.73] | 0.28 [0.08, 0.60] | 0.12 [0.07, 0.48] |
| Russia | 0.84 [0.61, 1.19] | 0.76 [0.50, 1.08] | 0.33 [0.15, 0.65] |
| Slovakia | 0.70 [0.46, 1.15] | 0.55 [0.26, 0.95] | 0.34 [0.17, 0.63] |
| Slovenia | 0.40 [0.29, 0.59] | 0.34 [0.19, 0.51] | 0.24 [0.12, 0.42] |
| South Korea | 0.78 [0.58, 1.12] | 0.52 [0.28, 0.82] | 0.69 [0.47, 1.01] |
| Spain | 0.74 [0.57, 0.98] | 0.60 [0.41, 0.84] | 0.26 [0.13, 0.49] |
| Sweden | 0.38 [0.25, 0.70] | 0.26 [0.08, 0.52] | 0.31 [0.14, 0.61] |
| The Netherlands | 0.59 [0.41, 0.92] | 0.46 [0.23, 0.76] | 0.32 [0.15, 0.64] |
| Turkey | 0.71 [0.60, 0.85] | 0.67 [0.55, 0.80] | 0.28 [0.17, 0.41] |
| Uganda | 0.34 [0.21, 0.70] | 0.32 [0.10, 0.61] | 0.15 [0.07, 0.47] |
| United States | 0.77 [0.57, 1.15] | 0.69 [0.44, 0.98] | 0.48 [0.25, 0.84] |
| Uruguay | 0.72 [0.51, 1.07] | 0.63 [0.38, 0.92] | 0.25 [0.11, 0.59] |
| Vietnam | 0.87 [0.68, 1.13] | 0.85 [0.65, 1.09] | 0.37 [0.21, 0.60] |

*Note*: Overall *D* uses preferences for all 5 traits, while *D*1 uses preferences for good financial prospects and physical attractiveness, and *D*2 uses preferences for kindness, intelligence, and health.

**S4. Mate preferences as a function of pathogen prevalence with controls**

Table S4 list the results of mate preferences as a function of pathogen prevalence, controlling for latitude, gross domestic product per capita, world region, and country religion. Models with controls did not find any relationship between preferences and pathogen prevalence.

Table S4

*Preferences and Age as a Function of Pathogen Prevalence with Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pathogen Index | Preference | *β* | *SE* | *p* |
| Gangestad &  | Good fin. Prosp. | -0.76 | 0.25 | .078 |
| Buss (1993) | Phys. Att. | -0.47 | 0.16 | .067 |
|  | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.44 | .945 |
|  | Intelligence | -0.15 | 0.38 | .726 |
|  | Health | -0.19 | 0.34 | .632 |
|  | Age Difference | 0.07 | 0.08 | .391 |
| YLL | Good fin. Prosp. | 0.06 | 0.05 | .264 |
|  | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.05 | .382 |
|  | Kindness | -0.004 | 0.04 | .933 |
|  | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.05 | .688 |
|  | Health | -0.03 | 0.04 | .483 |
|  | Age Difference | 0.03 | 0.03 | .349 |
| Comp | Good fin. Prosp. | 0.06 | 0.05 | .198 |
|  | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.05 | .308 |
|  | Kindness | -0.003 | 0.04 | .943 |
|  | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.05 | .530 |
|  | Health | -0.009 | 0.04 | .821 |
|  | Age Difference | 0.02 | 0.03 | .418 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001

**S5. Sex differences in mate preferences as a function of gender equality with controls**

Table S5 list the results of sex differences in mate preferences as a function of gender equality, controlling for latitude, gross domestic product per capita, world region, and country religion. Age difference models failed to converge with all of the controls. Therefore, country religion was dropped from the analysis for age models. Adding controls did not change the pattern of results.

Table S5

*Sex differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality with Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.02 | 0.03 | .419 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .189 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .398 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.03 | .610 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .399 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.20 | 0.05 | .0001\*\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .211 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .339 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .120 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.03 | .508 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.05 | 0.03 | .131 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.16 | 0.06 | .007\*\* |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.03 | 0.03 | .291 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .268 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.02 | .698 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.004 | 0.02 | .878 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .348 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.14 | 0.04 | .0009\*\*\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.03 | .036\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .359 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .137 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.02 | .211 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .511 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.06 | .026\* |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .388 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .139 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .368 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.02 | 0.03 | .469 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.01 | 0.03 | .814 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.18 | 0.06 | .003\*\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .107 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | 0.003 | 0.03 | .925 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.02 | .291 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.003 | 0.03 | .897 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.005 | 0.03 | .868 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.05 | .007\*\* |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

**S6. Analyses with all reported mate ages.**

When we include all reported mate ages the pattern of results is unchanged from the main text. Men reported having partners younger than themselves, while women reported having partners older than themselves, on average, *b* = -0.69, *SE* = 0.04, *p* < .001. Women reported partners, *M* = 1.51, 95% CI [1.33, 1.69], older than themselves, and men reported partners *M* = -3.07, 95% CI [-3.26, -2.88], younger than themselves. The sex difference ranged from *b* = - 1.20 in Algeria, to *b* = -0.27 in Belgium. Overall, as in the main text, as men’s age increased they reported increasingly younger partners on average, while as women’s age increased their reported partner age remained consistently a few years older than them themselves on average (Figure S6).



**Figure S6**. Difference between participant and their reported partner age, across participant ages. Data is jittered to reduce overplotting. Trend lines were generated by loess smoothing to illustrate the pattern of the data. Shaded areas indicate 95% confidence intervals.

Also, as in the main text, gender equality predicted the sex difference in age of long term partners for every measure of gender equality, with and without controls (Tables S6a and S6b). Finally, as in the main text, age choice was unrelated to pathogen prevalence, with and without controls (Tables S6c and S6d).

Table S6a

*Sex Difference in Age Difference and Gender Equality, No Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.04 | .0006\*\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.11 | 0.04 | .018\* |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.04 | .004\*\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.10 | 0.04 | .025\* |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.12 | 0.03 | .002\*\* |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.04 | .004\*\* |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S6b

*Sex Difference in Age Difference and Gender Equality, with Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.04 | .0007\*\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.11 | 0.04 | .020\* |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.04 | .004\*\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.04 | .027\* |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.11 | 0.03 | .002\*\* |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.04 | .005\*\* |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S6c

*Age Difference and Pathogen Prevalence, No Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pathogen Index | Preference | *β* | *SE* | *p* |
| G&B (1993) | Age Difference | 0.002 | 0.02 | .929 |
| YLL | Age Difference | 0.0005 | 0.05 | .992 |
| Composite | Age Difference | -0.002 | 0.04 | .967 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. G&B (1993) refers to the pathogen index listed in Gangestad and Buss (1993), YLL refers to the years of life lost to communicable disease, and Composite refers to the average of years of life lost to infectious and parasitic diseases and estimated deaths due to infection and parasitic diseases.

Table S6d

*Age Difference and Pathogen Prevalence, with Controls*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pathogen Index | Preference | *β* | *SE* | *p* |
| G&B (1993) | Age Difference | -0.05 | 0.22 | .841 |
| YLL | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.07 | .179 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.08 | 0.06 | .206 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. G&B (1993) refers to the pathogen index listed in Gangestad and Buss (1993), YLL refers to the years of life lost to communicable disease, and Composite refers to the average of years of life lost to infectious and parasitic diseases and estimated deaths due to infection and parasitic diseases.

**S7. Comparing Importance and Ideals in Preferences**

Participants in our study reported their mate preferences as the trait value preferred in an ideal long-term, romantic partner (as in, “How kind should your ideal partner be?”). This differs slightly from the item format used in Buss (1989), where participants reported how important it was that their partner possessed a variety of positive characteristics (as in, “How important is it that your mate is kind?”). We opted for this item format to attempt to improve on a number of limitations of the original item format. But it is possible that this difference in question format could explain some of the differences in results between our study and some of the prior literature.

 Although we cannot rule out this possibility entirely, results from two smaller samples suggest that preferences in terms of ideals and importance are likely strongly correlated with one another. The first sample was *n* = 382 to participants who were members of 191 committed, romantic relationships. Participants in this sample were *M* = 49.86 years old on average (*SD* = 14.48) and were in their relationships for *Mdn* = 156 months. These participants reported their ideal mate preferences on 20 dimensions, including the 5 dimensions measured in the cross-cultural sample. The instructions and question formats were the same for these participants as for the cross-cultural sample. Participants additionally rated how important each preference dimension was to them when considering a long-term mate on a 0 (irrelevant) to 10 (indispensable) scale (as in “How important is physical attractiveness?”), very parallel to the original Buss (1989) scale. These two ratings tended to be moderately strongly correlated, ranging from *r* = .46 for health to *r* = .57 for physical attractiveness and averaging *r* = .51 overall.

 These correlations are made more striking by the fact that the second sample suggests that these correlations are near the test-retest reliability of the individual items themselves. The complete sample for the second study was *n* = 274 participants from 137 committed romantic relationships. Participants were *M* = 48.52 years old on average (*SD* = 12.68) and were in their relationships for *Mdn* = 209 months. Participants reported their ideal mate preferences, as a preferred trait value, in wave 1 of this study and were invited to complete the same survey again one month later in wave 2. From the total initial sample, 40 dyads, or *n* = 80 participants provided us usable data. We estimated the test-retest reliability of the preference ratings by calculating the correlation between Wave 1 and Wave 2 preferences for participants who completed both waves of this study. These reliabilities ranged from *r* = .57 for kindness to *r* = .64 for intelligence.

 If we assume that ideal and importance preferences have the same reliabilities, we can use these test-retest reliabilities to correct the ideal-importance correlations for attenuation. The corrected correlations range from *r* = .79 for health to *r* = .96 for good financial prospects and average *r* = .86 overall. This suggests that, despite the distinct wording, the ideal preferences we asked participants to report in the cross-cultural sample are likely to tap into the same or nearly the same construct as the importance items used in Buss (1989).

**S8. Pathogen Prevalence and Gender Equality as Simultaneous Predictors**

To more closely approximate the analyses reported by Gangestad et al. (2006), we ran an additional series of analyses in which pathogen prevalence and gender equality acted as competing predictors of mate preferences. Replicating these analyses required three separate series of multilevel models: one competing an interaction between gender equality and sex with an interaction between pathogen prevalence and sex; another competing main effects of gender equality and pathogen prevalence; and a third competing an interaction between sex and gender equality with a main effect of pathogen prevalence.

For the sake of thoroughness, we report the results of all of these analyses. However, these results should be interpreted cautiously. These analyses were not preregistered. Additionally, in contrast to Gangestad et al. (2006), the theoretical justification for competing pathogen prevalence and gender equality in our sample is less clear given the absence of an effect of either variable on mate preferences in isolation. Furthermore, given that the entire series of analyses requires 648 focal significance tests, one would expect at least 32 significant effects on average due to just Type I errors alone. For this reason, we focused attention not on individual significant effects, but significant patterns that were robust across different measures of gender equality or pathogen prevalence. With this in mind, few robust patterns appear. Controlling for an interaction between pathogen prevalence and sex sometimes caused the effect of gender equality on age difference to be marginal rather than significant. However, the effect of pathogen prevalence itself was only significant in 4 out of 18 of these analyses—very close to the Type I error rate. Beyond this, the only robust pattern of results was that gender equality continued to interact with sex in predicting age choices—the same result reported in the primary text. Overall, treating pathogen prevalence and gender equality as competing predictors did not change any of the conclusions from the primary analyses.

For all of the following analyses, controls (GDP per capita, latitude, world region, and country religion) were included in models. However, some models had convergence and/or rank issues due to missing data. If a model failed to converge, country religion was dropped from the model. If a model still failed to converge, world region was subsequently dropped.

**Sex by Gender Equality Interaction and Sex by Pathogen Prevalence Interaction.** The following analyses predict mate preferences and age choice from competing interactions between sex and gender equality and pathogen prevalence. These models treat pathogen prevalence and gender equality as competing predictors of sex differences.

Table S8aa

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls (index from Gangestad & Buss, 1993)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Sex\*Path. Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.15 | 0.07 | .069 | 0.10 | 0.07 | .150 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.13 | 0.09 | .179 | 0.08 | 0.09 | .388 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.05 | .591 | -0.03 | 0.04 | .529 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.08 | .762 | -0.005 | 0.07 | .946 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | -0.03 | 0.08 | .752 | -0.09 | 0.07 | .271 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | -0.04 | 0.12 | .713 | -0.20 | 0.11 | .090 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.09 | 0.07 | .270 | 0.07 | 0.08 | .415 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.09 | 0.10 | .385 | -0.10 | 0.10 | .361 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.04 | .721 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .766 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.05 | 0.08 | .523 | 0.01 | 0.08 | .879 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | -0.02 | 0.08 | .817 | -0.08 | 0.08 | .347 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.04 | 0.12 | .721 | -0.13 | 0.12 | .292 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.06 | 0.06 | .365 | 0.04 | 0.07 | .636 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.06 | .279 | -0.005 | 0.08 | .946 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.04 | .643 | -0.001 | 0.04 | .976 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.06 | .787 | -0.05 | 0.08 | .546 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.10 | 0.06 | .104 | -0.14 | 0.07 | .060 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | 0.01 | 0.07 | .933 | -0.07 | 0.09 | .482 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.10 | 0.07 | .171 | 0.07 | 0.07 | .313 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | -0.07 | 0.09 | .435 | -0.07 | 0.08 | .424 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.09 | 0.05 | .046\* | -0.08 | 0.04 | .068 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.14 | 0.06 | .047\* | 0.09 | 0.06 | .173 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | -0.07 | 0.07 | .320 | -0.11 | 0.03 | .130 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | -0.01 | 0.11 | .960 | -.15 | 0.11 | .169 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.03 | 0.06 | .671 | 0.01 | 0.05 | .872 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.08 | .551 | 0.002 | 0.06 | .967 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.0004 | 0.04 | .991 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .734 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | 0.001 | 0.06 | .991 | -0.01 | 0.05 | .785 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | -0.04 | 0.06 | .503 | -0.07 | 0.05 | .185 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.01 | 0.10 | .905 | -0.15 | 0.08 | .079 |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.09 | 0.07 | .262 | 0.05 | 0.08 | .492 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.05 | 0.08 | .523 | 0.02 | 0.08 | .854 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.05 | .609 | -0.03 | 0.05 | .490 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.07 | .565 | -0.0003 | 0.08 | .997 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.10 | 0.07 | .177 | -0.14 | 0.07 | .086 |
| Composite | Age Difference | -0.02 | 0.09 | .858 | -0.07 | 0.09 | .463 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8ab

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls (years of life lost to communicable diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Sex\*Path. Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.04 | .191 | 0.04 | 0.04 | .300 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.02 | 0.05 | .711 | -0.08 | 0.04 | .063 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .471 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .858 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.01 | 0.04 | .709 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .319 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.02 | 0.04 | .527 | 0.002 | 0.04 | .949 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.10 | 0.08 | .222 | -0.11 | 0.07 | .108 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.04 | .211 | 0.01 | 0.03 | .736 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.005 | 0.04 | .903 | -0.08 | 0.04 | .031\* |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.05 | 0.03 | .036\* | -0.04 | 0.02 | .130 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.03 | .328 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .389 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.04 | 0.04 | .266 | -0.02 | 0.03 | .615 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.11 | 0.06 | .078 | -0.10 | 0.05 | .083 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.06 | 0.04 | .130 | 0.07 | 0.06 | .270 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.04 | .0496\* | -0.11 | 0.06 | .082 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .527 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .162 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | -0.04 | 0.03 | .240 | 0.11 | 0.05 | .051 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.04 | 0.03 | .253 | -0.04 | 0.06 | .478 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.08 | 0.06 | .227 | -0.14 | 0.10 | .161 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.07 | 0.03 | .022\* | 0.03 | 0.03 | .320 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.01 | 0.03 | .824 | -0.06 | 0.03 | .049\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.03 | .189 | 0.004 | 0.02 | .858 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.03 | .081 | 0.04 | 0.02 | .101 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .597 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .781 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.07 | 0.05 | .191 | -0.14 | 0.05 | .003\*\* |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .231 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .402 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.01 | 0.04 | .750 | -0.06 | 0.03 | .108 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .535 | 0.01 | 0.03 | .853 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.004 | 0.03 | .894 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .430 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | -0.002 | 0.03 | .952 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .668 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.07 | .215 | -0.13 | 0.05 | .025\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.09 | 0.04 | .026 | 0.10 | 0.06 | .117 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.01 | 0.04 | .722 | -0.04 | 0.07 | .502 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.03 | .803 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .402 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.05 | 0.03 | .126 | 0.12 | 0.05 | .027\* |
| Composite  | Health | -0.01 | 0.04 | .870 | -0.004 | 0.06 | .949 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.07 | .186 | -0.13 | 0.10 | .201 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8ac

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls (average of years of life lost and estimated deaths due to parasitic and infectious diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Sex\*Path. Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.04 | .193 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .290 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.003 | 0.04 | .951 | -0.06 | 0.04 | .084 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .543 | 0.002 | 0.03 | .942 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.01 | 0.03 | .785 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .327 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.03 | 0.04 | .472 | 0.004 | 0.03 | .900 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.07 | .086 | -0.08 | 0.06 | .164 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.04 | .188 | 0.01 | 0.03 | .647 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.01 | 0.04 | .879 | -0.07 | 0.03 | .043\* |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.05 | 0.02 | .057 | -0.03 | 0.02 | .218 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.03 | .391 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .485 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.04 | 0.03 | .234 | -0.02 | 0.03 | .583 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.06 | .042\* | -0.08 | 0.05 | .112 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.05 | 0.03 | .098 | 0.09 | 0.06 | .158 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .137 | -0.07 | 0.06 | .297 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .543 | 0.09 | 0.05 | .091 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | -0.03 | 0.03 | .329 | 0.11 | 0.05 | .046\* |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.03 | 0.03 | .344 | -0.02 | 0.06 | .754 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.11 | 0.10 | .081 | -0.11 | 0.10 | .297 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.07 | 0.03 | .025\* | 0.02 | 0.03 | .342 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.02 | 0.03 | .636 | -0.05 | 0.03 | .058 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.02 | .184 | 0.01 | 0.02 | .680 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.03 | .122 | 0.03 | 0.02 | .156 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .568 | -0.01 | 0.02 | .783 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.05 | .090 | -0.13 | 0.04 | .005\*\* |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .237 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .380 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.02 | 0.04 | .521 | -0.05 | 0.03 | .125 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .534 | 0.01 | 0.03 | .709 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.03 | .787 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .416 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.001 | 0.03 | .963 | -0.01 | 0.03 | .733 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.11 | 0.06 | .083 | -0.11 | 0.05 | .034\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.07 | 0.03 | .034\* | 0.09 | 0.06 | .133 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.001 | 0.04 | .989 | -0.01 | 0.06 | .842 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.03 | .750 | 0.07 | 0.05 | .196 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.03 | .270 | 0.11 | 0.05 | .038\* |
| Composite  | Health | -0.002 | 0.03 | .957 | 0.01 | 0.06 | .837 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.11 | 0.06 | .066 | -0.12 | 0.10 | .242 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

**Preferences predicted by gender equality and pathogen prevalence with controls.** The following analyses predict preferences and age choice from competing main effects of pathogen prevalence and gender equality. These models treat gender equality and pathogen prevalence as competing predictors of absolute preferences.

Table S8ba

*Preferences and Age Choice Predicted by Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls (index from Gangestad & Buss, 1993)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.08 | 0.19 | .689 | -0.24 | 0.12 | .077 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.09 | 0.14 | .544 | -0.17 | 0.09 | .093 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | 0.17 | 0.18 | .374 | -0.04 | 0.11 | .717 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.12 | 0.07 | .135 | -0.06 | 0.09 | .498 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.36 | 0.20 | .107 | 0.08 | 0.12 | .518 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.06 | 0.08 | .464 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .451 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.12 | 0.08 | .180 | -0.19 | 0.11 | .125 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.12 | 0.07 | .112 | -0.08 | 0.09 | .347 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.10 | .903 | 0 | 0.14 | .986 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | -0.10 | 0.10 | .330 | -0.21 | 0.13 | .132 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | -0.04 | 0.12 | .740 | 0.07 | 0.15 | .674 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | -0.002 | 0.04 | .966 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .376 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.10 | 0.10 | .338 | -0.28 | 0.12 | .041\* |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.08 | .378 | -0.15 | 0.10 | .148 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.001 | 0.11 | .995 | -0.02 | 0.13 | .870 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.11 | 0.10 | .298 | -0.16 | 0.13 | .220 |
| GII (2015) | Health | -0.19 | 0.11 | .120 | -0.01 | 0.13 | .967 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | 0.04 | 0.05 | .361 | 0.07 | 0.05 | .361 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.16 | 0.07 | .049\* | -0.13 | 0.10 | .210 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | -0.07 | 0.07 | .330 | -0.23 | 0.10 | .039\* |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.09 | .779 | -0.04 | 0.13 | .769 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | -0.09 | 0.09 | .348 | -0.24 | 0.13 | .084 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | -0.24 | 0.08 | .010\* | -0.11 | 0.11 | .332 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | -0.01 | 0.04 | .723 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .455 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.12 | 0.09 | .245 | -0.21 | 0.11 | .075 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | -0.05 | 0.08 | .534 | -0.2 | 0.09 | .054 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.11 | .908 | -0.02 | 0.12 | .854 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.05 | 0.11 | .637 | -0.22 | 0.12 | .105 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.08 | 0.11 | .517 | 0.07 | 0.13 | .601 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | -0.04 | 0.05 | .348 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .334 |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.20 | 0.09 | .057 | -0.22 | 0.09 | .046\* |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.15 | 0.08 | .101 | -0.2 | 0.09 | .043\* |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.12 | .880 | -0.02 | 0.12 | .849 |
| Composite | Intelligence | -0.12 | 0.11 | .331 | -0.22 | 0.12 | .088 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.05 | 0.13 | .715 | 0.04 | 0.13 | .759 |
| Composite | Age Difference | -0.05 | 0.05 | .332 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .320 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8bb

*Preferences and Age Choice Predicted by Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls (years of life lost to communicable diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.21 | 0.13 | .109 | 0.09 | 0.05 | .110 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.10 | 0.12 | .396 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .247 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | 0.03 | 0.11 | .776 | -0.01 | 0.05 | .885 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.16 | 0.08 | .043\* | 0.06 | 0.04 | .097 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.26 | 0.09 | .008\*\* | 0.01 | 0.04 | .737 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.08 | 0.04 | .044\* | 0.05 | 0.02 | .005\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.03 | 0.12 | .772 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .413 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.16 | 0.12 | .229 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .225 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | 0.19 | 0.11 | .113 | -0.004 | 0.05 | .939 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | -0.11 | 0.12 | .354 | 0.01 | 0.05 | .842 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | -0.06 | 0.11 | .612 | -0.04 | 0.04 | .334 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.02 | 0.03 | .568 | 0.03 | 0.02 | .091 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.15 | 0.11 | .209 | -0.03 | 0.10 | .788 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.13 | .724 | -0.03 | 0.12 | .773 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.06 | 0.11 | .577 | -0.004 | 0.10 | .971 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.15 | 0.12 | .228 | -0.09 | 0.11 | .406 |
| GII (2015) | Health | -0.08 | 0.10 | .457 | -0.13 | 0.09 | .179 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | 0.005 | 0.03 | .852 | 0.01 | 0.03 | .706 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.14 | 0.09 | .135 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .205 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.01 | 0.10 | .902 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .277 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.001 | 0.08 | .989 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .848 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | -0.04 | 0.09 | .663 | 0.02 | 0.05 | .662 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.07 | 0.08 | .412 | -0.03 | 0.04 | .456 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | -0.003 | 0.02 | .862 | 0.03 | 0.02 | .075 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.15 | 0.08 | .068 | 0.09 | 0.05 | .100 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.08 | .656 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .159 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.07 | .932 | -0.01 | 0.05 | .878 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | 0.06 | 0.08 | .436 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .394 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.1 | 0.07 | .145 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .743 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.01 | 0.20 | .628 | 0.04 | 0.02 | .032\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.21 | 0.12 | .099 | 0.02 | 0.11 | .843 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.06 | 0.13 | .674 | -0.04 | 0.12 | .774 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.12 | .867 | 0.01 | 0.11 | .903 |
| Composite | Intelligence | -0.14 | 0.13 | .296 | -0.11 | 0.12 | .351 |
| Composite  | Health | 0.09 | 0.11 | .428 | -0.11 | 0.10 | .257 |
| Composite | Age Difference | -0.001 | 0.02 | .979 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .437 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8bc

*Preferences and Age Choice Predicted by Gender Equality and Pathogen Prevalence with Controls* *(average of years of life lost and estimated deaths due to parasitic and infectious diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.18 | 0.12 | .146 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .112 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.08 | 0.11 | .467 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .253 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | 0.04 | 0.11 | .749 | -0.005 | 0.04 | .914 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.14 | 0.07 | .068 | 0.05 | 0.03 | .132 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.26 | 0.08 | .005\*\* | 0.02 | 0.03 | .565 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.05 | 0.04 | .135 | 0.04 | 0.01 | .009\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.12 | .762 | 0.04 | 0.04 | .354 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.15 | 0.12 | .232 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .242 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | 0.19 | 0.11 | .112 | -0.003 | 0.04 | .951 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | -0.11 | 0.12 | .351 | 0.02 | 0.05 | .705 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | -0.07 | 0.11 | .564 | -0.02 | 0.04 | .631 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.01 | 0.03 | .610 | 0.03 | 0.02 | .062 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.16 | 0.11 | .188 | -0.02 | 0.12 | .884 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.13 | .747 | -0.03 | 0.14 | .811 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.05 | 0.11 | .653 | 0.03 | 0.12 | .831 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.12 | 0.12 | .360 | -0.03 | 0.13 | .822 |
| GII (2015) | Health | -0.13 | 0.10 | .220 | -0.05 | 0.11 | .643 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | 0.01 | 0.02 | .837 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .626 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.13 | 0.09 | .162 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .170 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.003 | 0.09 | .978 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .223 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | 0.004 | 0.08 | .996 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .888 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | -0.05 | 0.09 | .601 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .453 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.07 | 0.08 | .375 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .794 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | -0.01 | 0.02 | .749 | 0.03 | 0.02 | .054 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.12 | 0.07 | .113 | 0.07 | 0.05 | .118 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.02 | 0.08 | .843 | 0.07 | 0.05 | .143 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.004 | 0.07 | .956 | -0.004 | 0.04 | .927 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | 0.05 | 0.08 | .502 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .321 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.11 | 0.06 | .115 | -0.002 | 0.04 | .954 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.001 | 0.02 | .948 | 0.03 | 0.01 | .029\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.19 | 0.11 | .096 | -0.02 | 0.11 | .833 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.05 | 0.12 | .706 | -0.03 | 0.13 | .821 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.11 | .891 | 0.05 | 0.11 | .695 |
| Composite | Intelligence | -0.06 | 0.12 | .641 | 0.001 | 0.13 | .995 |
| Composite  | Health | 0.14 | 0.10 | .174 | -0.06 | 0.10 | .542 |
| Composite | Age Difference | -0.005 | 0.02 | .831 | 0.03 | 0.03 | .386 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

**Sex differences in preferences and age choice as a function of gender equality with controls including pathogen prevalence.** The following models predict preferences and age choice from an interaction of gender equality and sex and a main effect of pathogen prevalence. These models treat gender equality as a moderator of sex differences and pathogen prevalence as a predictor of absolute preferences—in line with the originally predicted roles of these variables (Gangestad & Buss, 1993; Eagly & Wood, 1999).

Table S8ca

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality with Controls Including Pathogen Prevalence (index from Gangestad & Buss, 1993)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.05 | .257 | -0.24 | 0.12 | .081 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.06 | .265 | -0.17 | 0.09 | .099 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.002 | 0.03 | .949 | -0.05 | 0.11 | .664 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.05 | .552 | -0.15 | 0.09 | .146 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.05 | 0.05 | .368 | 0.08 | 0.12 | .530 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.08 | .144 | 0.03 | 0.04 | .509 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.05 | .437 | -0.18 | 0.11 | .135 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.01 | 0.06 | .814 | -0.13 | 0.08 | .144 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.03 | .843 | -0.01 | 0.14 | .95 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.04 | .382 | -0.2 | 0.13 | .152 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.04 | 0.05 | .383 | 0.06 | 0.15 | .703 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.07 | .059 | 0.03 | 0.04 | .500 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.04 | 0.04 | .411 | -0.27 | 0.12 | .046\* |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.04 | .150 | -0.16 | 0.10 | .127 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .510 | -0.04 | 0.13 | .746 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.04 | .838 | -0.16 | 0.13 | .251 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.02 | 0.05 | .663 | -0.01 | 0.13 | .951 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.03 | 0.05 | .560 | 0.08 | 0.06 | .177 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .346 | -0.13 | 0.10 | .227 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | -0.01 | 0.06 | .799 | -0.23 | 0.10 | .042 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.03 | .372 | -0.07 | 0.13 | .622 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.07 | 0.04 | .133 | -0.24 | 0.13 | .085 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.05 | .742 | -0.11 | 0.11 | .322 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.07 | .109 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .415 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.02 | 0.05 | .686 | -0.21 | 0.11 | .079 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.06 | .486 | -0.19 | 0.09 | .057 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.03 | .829 | -0.04 | 0.12 | .736 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | 0.01 | 0.05 | .858 | -0.21 | 0.12 | .123 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.002 | 0.05 | .967 | 0.07 | 0.13 | .616 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.10 | 0.09 | .266 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .311 |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.05 | .353 | -0.22 | 0.10 | .047\* |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.06 | 0.05 | .268 | -0.2 | 0.09 | .044\* |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.0004 | 0.03 | .989 | -0.05 | 0.12 | .721 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.05 | .396 | -0.21 | 0.12 | .102 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.008 | 0.05 | .879 | 0.04 | 0.13 | .772 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.04 | 0.06 | .580 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .300 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8cb

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality with Controls Including Pathogen Prevalence (years of life lost to communicable diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.02 | 0.03 | .412 | 0.09 | 0.05 | .121 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .198 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .273 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .401 | -0.01 | 0.05 | .766 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.03 | .643 | 0.07 | 0.04 | .082 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .401 | 0.01 | 0.04 | .801 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.19 | 0.06 | .002\*\* | 0.05 | 0.02 | .004\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .210 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .418 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .341 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .267 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .120 | -0.001 | 0.05 | .987 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.03 | .513 | 0.01 | 0.05 | .870 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.05 | 0.03 | .129 | -0.05 | 0.04 | .320 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.17 | 0.06 | .006\*\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | .093 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.03 | 0.03 | .292 | -0.02 | 0.10 | .874 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .268 | -0.03 | 0.12 | .773 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.02 | .697 | -0.01 | 0.10 | .900 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.004 | 0.02 | .879 | -0.09 | 0.11 | .412 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .369 | -0.13 | 0.09 | .167 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.14 | 0.05 | .007\*\* | 0.01 | 0.03 | .806 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.03 | .036\* | 0.06 | 0.05 | .204 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .356 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .304 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .137 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .765 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.02 | .212 | 0.02 | 0.05 | .669 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .503 | -0.03 | 0.04 | .422 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.06 | .025\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | .078 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .377 | 0.09 | 0.05 | .098 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .139 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .174 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .368 | -0.01 | 0.05 | .809 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.02 | 0.03 | .465 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .391 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.01 | 0.03 | .812 | -0.02 | 0.04 | .698 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.18 | 0.06 | .003\*\* | 0.04 | 0.02 | .029\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .109 | 0.03 | 0.11 | .761 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | 0.003 | 0.03 | .925 | -0.03 | 0.12 | .802 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.02 | .291 | 0.01 | 0.11 | .958 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.003 | 0.03 | .914 | -0.09 | 0.12 | .460 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.004 | 0.03 | .874 | -0.12 | 0.10 | .246 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.05 | .007\*\* | 0.002 | 0.02 | .943 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Table S8cc

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality with Controls Including Pathogen Prevalence (average of years of life lost and estimated deaths due to parasitic and infectious diseases)*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Sex\*Gender Equality | Pathogen Prevalence |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.02 | 0.03 | .410 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .118 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .197 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .277 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .401 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .812 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.03 | .661 | 0.06 | 0.03 | .102 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .402 | 0.02 | 0.03 | .603 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.19 | 0.06 | .001\*\* | 0.04 | 0.01 | .007\*\* |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.03 | .209 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .356 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .340 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .293 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .120 | 0 | 0.04 | .995 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.02 | 0.03 | .518 | 0.02 | 0.05 | .728 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.05 | 0.03 | .131 | -0.02 | 0.04 | .630 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.17 | 0.06 | .006\*\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | .057 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.03 | 0.03 | .291 | 0.003 | 0.12 | .983 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .267 | -0.03 | 0.14 | .817 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.02 | .699 | 0.02 | 0.12 | .868 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | 0.004 | 0.02 | .877 | -0.02 | 0.13 | .875 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .352 | -0.05 | 0.11 | .658 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.14 | 0.05 | .007\*\* | 0.01 | 0.03 | .660 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.03 | .036\* | 0.06 | 0.05 | .172 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .354 | 0.06 | 0.05 | .248 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.04 | 0.02 | .137 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .824 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.02 | .215 | 0.04 | 0.05 | .454 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.02 | 0.03 | .509 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .768 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.13 | 0.06 | .024\* | 0.03 | 0.02 | .050 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.03 | 0.03 | .375 | 0.08 | 0.05 | .115 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .138 | 0.07 | 0.05 | .157 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.02 | .368 | -0.01 | 0.04 | .869 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | -0.02 | 0.03 | .465 | 0.05 | 0.05 | .313 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.01 | 0.03 | .814 | -0.004 | 0.04 | .916 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.18 | 0.06 | .003\*\* | 0.04 | 0.01 | .025\* |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.03 | .107 | -0.01 | 0.12 | .926 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | 0.003 | 0.03 | .926 | -0.02 | 0.13 | .849 |
| Composite | Kindness | -0.03 | 0.02 | .291 | 0.04 | 0.11 | .715 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.004 | 0.03 | .890 | 0.02 | 0.13 | .864 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.005 | 0.03 | .868 | -0.06 | 0.1 | .549 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.05 | .007\*\* | -0.0002 | 0.02 | .994 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.

Controlling for pathogen prevalence using the Gangestad and Buss (1993) index appears to change the pattern of results for gender equality and age choice. However, further inspection reveals that this difference was not due to pathogen prevalence, but rather to the limited number of countries with the pathogen index from Gangestad and Buss (1993) (N= 18) (Table S8cd). Running the gender equality analyses with just this small sample of countries resulted in no significant effects of gender equality on sex difference in preferences. Therefore, controlling for pathogen prevalence did not change the pattern of results.

Table S8cd

*Sex Differences in Preferences and Age as a Function of Gender Equality Using Countries (n = 18) with Pathogen Index from Gangestad and Buss (1993) (total n = 4946 for preferences, n = 3019 for age choice analyses)*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Gend. Eq. Index | Preference | *b* | *SE* | *p* |
| GDI (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.06 | 0.05 | .243 |
| GDI (1995) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.06 | .267 |
| GDI (1995) | Kindness | -0.001 | 0.03 | .966 |
| GDI (1995) | Intelligence | 0.03 | 0.05 | .601 |
| GDI (1995) | Health | 0.05 | 0.05 | .362 |
| GDI (1995) | Age Difference | 0.12 | 0.08 | .151 |
| GEM (1995) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.05 | .463 |
| GEM (1995) | Phys. Att. | -0.01 | 0.06 | .823 |
| GEM (1995) | Kindness | -0.01 | 0.03 | .849 |
| GEM (1995) | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.05 | .382 |
| GEM (1995) | Health | 0.04 | 0.05 | .378 |
| GEM (1995) | Age Difference | 0.15 | 0.07 | .054 |
| GII (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | -0.04 | 0.04 | .424 |
| GII (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.07 | 0.05 | .148 |
| GII (2015) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .489 |
| GII (2015) | Intelligence | -0.01 | 0.05 | .819 |
| GII (2015) | Health | 0.02 | 0.05 | .705 |
| GII (2015) | Age Difference | -0.03 | 0.05 | .608 |
| GGGI (2016) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.04 | 0.04 | .389 |
| GGGI (2016) | Phys. Att. | -0.01 | 0.05 | .806 |
| GGGI (2016) | Kindness | -0.02 | 0.03 | .373 |
| GGGI (2016) | Intelligence | 0.06 | 0.04 | .145 |
| GGGI (2016) | Health | 0.01 | 0.04 | .744 |
| GGGI (2016) | Age Difference | 0.10 | 0.06 | .113 |
| GDI (2015) | Good fin. prosp. | 0.02 | 0.05 | .713 |
| GDI (2015) | Phys. Att. | 0.04 | 0.06 | .503 |
| GDI (2015) | Kindness | 0.01 | 0.03 | .810 |
| GDI (2015) | Intelligence | 0.01 | 0.05 | .896 |
| GDI (2015) | Health | 0.002 | 0.05 | .970 |
| GDI (2015) | Age Difference | 0.09 | 0.07 | .275 |
| Composite | Good fin. prosp. | 0.05 | 0.05 | .369 |
| Composite | Phys. Att. | -0.06 | 0.06 | .280 |
| Composite | Kindness | 0.001 | 0.03 | .984 |
| Composite | Intelligence | 0.04 | 0.05 | .404 |
| Composite  | Health | -0.008 | 0.05 | .878 |
| Composite | Age Difference | 0.03 | 0.06 | .600 |

*Note*: \* = p < .05; \*\* = p < .01; \*\*\* = p < .001. GII (2015) is reverse scored.