

Supplemental Material

Experiment 1: Supplemental Analyses

Here, we tested whether the effect of target religion might be qualified by target sex or participant sex, reporting a 2 (Participant Sex) \times 2 (Target Sex) \times 2 (Target Religion) ANOVA for each outcome variable. All significant main and interaction effects are reported, and cell means are reported in Table S1. All main effects are religious vs. nonreligious target, male vs. female target, and men vs. women (perceivers).

Table S1: Mean (SD) Ratings by Participant Sex, Target Sex, and Target Religion in Experiment 1.

Outcome	Male Perceivers				Female Perceivers			
	Male Target		Female Target		Male Target		Female Target	
	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious
Committed Reproductive Strategy	4.96 (1.20)	3.87 (.99)	5.41 (.93)	4.37 (.78)	5.65 (.85)	4.31 (.89)	5.64 (.96)	4.58 (.93)
(Non)Aggression	4.97 (1.17)	4.88 (1.18)	5.46 (1.08)	4.95 (1.28)	5.74 (1.09)	5.21 (1.10)	6.04 (1.01)	5.44 (1.17)
(Non)Impulsivity	4.54 (1.02)	4.01 (1.11)	5.01 (.86)	4.26 (.97)	4.98 (1.07)	4.37 (1.03)	5.13 (1.17)	4.26 (1.11)
Education	4.98 (.98)	4.70 (1.62)	5.43 (1.08)	5.04 (1.00)	5.64 (.83)	4.99 (1.20)	5.40 (1.05)	5.27 (1.00)
Ecology	5.23 (1.29)	5.27 (1.36)	5.73 (1.17)	5.10 (1.35)	5.79 (1.07)	5.21 (1.34)	6.00 (1.25)	5.71 (1.22)
Mate Value	4.42 (1.33)	4.51 (1.16)	4.78 (1.40)	4.69 (1.40)	4.58 (1.26)	4.68 (1.39)	4.76 (1.44)	4.48 (1.34)
Children	4.46 (1.09)	3.50 (1.31)	4.68 (1.00)	3.73 (1.21)	4.25 (1.23)	3.45 (1.07)	4.33 (1.32)	3.23 (1.12)
Trust	5.00 (1.03)	4.50 (1.46)	5.35 (1.02)	4.59 (1.09)	5.54 (1.05)	4.55 (1.01)	5.26 (1.02)	5.00 (.85)

Committed Reproductive Strategy. Religious targets were rated more committed than nonreligious targets, $F(328) = 117.33, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .263$. Female targets were rated more likely to be committed strategists, $F(328) = 8.41, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .025$. Women rated targets as more committed, $F(328) = 14.11, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .041$.

(Non)Aggression. Religious targets were rated less aggressive, $F(328) = 12.01, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .035$. Female targets were rated less aggressive, $F(328) = 4.77, p < .030, \eta_p^2 = .014$. Women provided lower aggression ratings overall, $F(328) = 18.65, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .054$.

(Non)Impulsivity. Religious targets were rated less impulsive, $F(328) = 35.14, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .097$. Target sex did not significantly affect ratings, $F(328) = 2.62, p = .107, \eta_p^2 = .008$.

Women rated targets as marginally less impulsive than men, $F(328) = 3.80, p = .052, \eta_p^2 = .011$.

Education. Religious targets were viewed as more educated, $F(328) = 8.99, p = .003, \eta_p^2 = .027$. Female targets were rated as marginally more educated, $F(328) = 2.94, p = .087, \eta_p^2 = .009$. Women rated targets as more educated, $F(328) = 5.54, p = .019, \eta_p^2 = .017$.

Ecology. Religious targets were judged to come from more hopeful ecologies, $F(328) = 6.94, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = .021$. Female targets were judged to be from more hopeful ecologies, $F(328) = 3.54, p = .061, \eta_p^2 = .011$. Women judged targets as being from more hopeful ecologies, $F(328) = 6.16, p = .014, \eta_p^2 = .018$.

Mate Value. There were no significant main effects or interactions between factors on mate value ($F_s < 1$).

Children. Religious targets were rated as more likely to want several children, $F(328) = 53.85, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .141$. Target sex did not significantly affect perceptions of target's desire to have children ($p > .250$), but, compared to female participants, male participants rated targets as more likely to want several children, $F(328) = 4.43, p = .036, \eta_p^2 = .013$.

Trust. Religious targets were rated more trustworthy, $F(1, 328) = 28.74, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .081$. Women tended to rate targets as marginally more trustworthy than men did, $F(1, 328) = 3.75, p = .054, \eta_p^2 = .011$. These effects were qualified by a significant three-way (Participant Sex \times Target Sex \times Target Religion) interaction, $F(1, 328) = 4.49, p = .035, \eta_p^2 = .014$, such that, although religious targets were trusted in every comparison, this difference was especially large for women viewing male targets.

In light of this three-way interaction, we used Model 10 of PROCESS (Hayes, 2012) to test whether the mediation reported in the main manuscript would hold across all constellations of participant sex and target sex. Consistent with the mediation reported in the main text, for each combination of target and participant sex, the 95% bootstrapped CI for ecology, aggression, and impulsivity straddled zero, indicating that these are not significant mediators.

More importantly, perceived reproductive strategy *was* a significant mediator for each combination: women viewing female targets, $b = .36$, $SE = .10$, 95% CI = [.19, .58]; men viewing female targets, $b = .31$, $SE = .09$, 95% CI = [.16, .53]; women viewing male targets, $b = .41$, $SE = .11$, 95% CI = [.22, .65]; and men viewing male targets, $b = .37$, $SE = .11$, 95% CI = [.18, .64]. Descriptively, the indirect effect was strongest among women viewing male targets. However, this seems to imply that participant sex, target sex, or the combination did not play a major role in influencing results.

The pattern was only different in perceived education; the indirect path (via education) was not significant for female targets, whether viewed by men, $b = .06$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI = [-.04, .20], or by women, $b = .07$, $SE = .06$, 95% CI = [-.02, .21]. The effect was significant, however, for male targets, whether viewed by men, $b = .12$, $SE = .08$, 95% CI = [.009, .33], or by women, $b = .13$, $SE = .07$, 95% CI = [.03, .32].

PROCESS also provides an index of partial mediated moderation for each moderator (target sex and participant sex), and for each mediator—a test of equality of the conditional indirect effects within each variable. Each of these indices straddles zero, suggesting that the indirect effect is not significantly different as a function of target sex or of participant sex. In sum, the hypothesized effect does not seem to be qualified by target or participant sex in a consistent or meaningful way.

Discussion

In sum, the main effect of target religion on perceptions of life-history traits and trust held across participant sex/target sex constellations.

Experiment 2: Supplemental Analyses

Here, we present the results of several 2 (Target Sex) \times 2 (Target Religion) \times 2 (Target Reproductive Strategy) ANOVAs using data from Experiment 2. Again, all significant main and interaction effects are reported. All comparisons are committed vs. uncommitted target, male vs. female target, and religious vs. nonreligious target.

Table S2: Mean (SD) Ratings by Target Sex, Target Reproductive Strategy, and Target Religion in Experiment 2.

Outcome	Male Target				Female Target			
	Committed Strategists		Uncommitted Strategist		Committed Strategist		Uncommitted Strategist	
	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious	Religious	Nonreligious
(Non)Impulsivity	5.18 (.88)	4.99 (.97)	3.44 (1.11)	3.24 (.92)	5.42 (.93)	4.99 (1.03)	3.86 (1.02)	3.06 (1.24)
(Non)Opportunistic Behavior	5.91 (1.29)	5.96 (1.19)	5.68 (1.24)	5.31 (1.27)	6.52 (.95)	6.28 (.96)	5.76 (1.31)	5.62 (1.35)
Education	5.38 (.97)	5.75 (1.02)	4.71 (1.23)	4.79 (1.11)	5.85 (1.06)	5.56 (1.01)	4.74 (.126)	4.69 (1.40)
Ecology	5.31 (1.00)	5.06 (1.07)	4.98 (1.18)	5.17 (1.07)	5.64 (1.13)	5.17 (1.21)	5.06 (1.05)	4.83 (1.28)
Trust	5.31 (.80)	4.81 (1.18)	4.30 (1.17)	4.22 (1.07)	5.72 (.95)	5.47 (.93)	4.85 (1.12)	4.36 (1.12)

(Non)Impulsivity. Committed strategists were judged less likely to be impulsive, $F(1, 437) = 318.68, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .422$. Religious targets were rated less impulsive, $F(1, 437) = 17.10, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .038$. The effect of target religion was qualified by a Target Religion \times Target Sex interaction, $F(1, 437) = 4.46, p = .035, \eta_p^2 = .010$, such that the effect of target religion was stronger when viewing female targets. In other words, perceivers may view religion as somewhat more diagnostic of a woman's self-control than a man's.

(Non)Opportunistic Behavior. Committed strategists were viewed as less opportunistic, $F(1, 437) = 24.91, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .054$. Female targets were viewed as less opportunistic, $F(1, 437) = 8.20, p = .004, \eta_p^2 = .018$. The effect of target religion was not significant ($p = .131$), and no interactions were significant ($ps > .240$).

Education. Committed strategists were viewed as more educated, $F(1, 437) = 59.37, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .120$. Main effects of target sex and target religion were not significant ($ps > .250$). However, there was a significant Target Religion \times Target Sex interaction, $F(1, 437) = 5.70, p = .017, \eta_p^2 = .013$, such that nonreligious male targets were viewed as more educated, but religious female targets were judged to be more educated.

Hopeful Ecology. Committed strategists were judged to be from less harsh ecologies, $F(1, 437) = 6.91, p = .009, \eta_p^2 = .016$. Religious targets were viewed as marginally less likely to come from harsh ecologies, $F(1, 437) = 3.12, p = .078, \eta_p^2 = .007$. There were no significant interactions ($ps > .112$).

Trust. Committed strategists were rated more trustworthy, $F(1, 436) = 107.13, p < .001, \eta_p^2 = .197$. Religious targets were rated more trustworthy, $F(1, 436) = 3.98, p = .047, \eta_p^2 = .009$. Female targets were rated more trustworthy, $F(1, 436) = 9.56, p = .002, \eta_p^2 = .021$. There was a marginally significant Target Religion \times Target Sex interaction, $F(1, 436) = 2.80, p = .095, \eta_p^2 = .006$, such that the effect of target religion on trust was larger for female targets than for male targets.

Discussion

The supplemental analyses described here demonstrate that the effect of target reproductive strategy holds across constellations of target sex and target religion.