**Supplementary Analyses for Trustworthiness and Dominance**

I considered PRNE and gender’s relation to trustworthiness and dominance, which are related to but distinct from judgments of attractiveness and threat. In this data set, attractiveness and trustworthiness shared 36% variance; threat and dominance shared 54% variance. After considering trustworthiness and dominance on their own, I also demonstrated that effects for attractiveness and threat hold controlling for trustworthiness and dominance.

**Effects of PRNE on Trustworthiness**

A regression predicting trustworthiness with PRNE and target gender showed a main effect of PRNE, *b*= ‑.58, *t*(594)= ‑19.22, *p*< .001, 95%CI[‑.63, ‑.52], as well as a main effect of target gender, *b*= .22, *t*(594)= 8.54, *p*< .001, 95%CI[.17, .27], such that female targets were rated as more trustworthy (*M*= 3.53) than male targets (*M*= 3.31). Two generalized linear models including target race and target age showed no interaction between race and PRNE, *X*2(3)= 1.35, *p*= .72, and no interaction between age and PRNE, *X*2(1)= .89, *p*= .35. These findings suggest that PRNE predicts judgments of trustworthiness across race and age categories.

However, analyses revealed no interaction between PRNE and target gender, *b*= ‑.02, *t*(593)= ‑.28, *p*= .78, 95%CI[‑.14, .10]. This result suggests that PRNE negatively predicts trustworthiness regardless of gender, in line with expectations that people are similarly motivated to discern trustworthiness in both women and men.

To address the possibility that specific emotions drives the main effect of PRNE on trustworthiness, I predicted trustworthiness with each of the five emotions comprising PRNE. All results were significant, *p*s< .001, supporting the idea that general valance underlies PRNE’s effect on trustworthiness. To address the possibility that target gender interacts with specific emotions to predict trustworthiness, I included target gender as a moderator for each specific emotion. No interactions emerged, *p*s> .15. See Table SM1.

Table SM1.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Outcome: Trustworthiness* | | | | | |
| **Predictor** | **Coeff.** | **SE** | **t-value** | **p-value** | **95% CI, Lower-Upper** | |
| Angry | -.39 | .02 | ‑18.39 | .000 | ‑.43, ‑.35 | |
| Disgusted | -.46 | .03 | ‑14.85 | .000 | ‑.52, ‑.40 | |
| Afraid | -.20 | .04 | ‑4.82 | .000 | ‑.28, ‑.12 | |
| Sad | ‑.26 | .03 | ‑9.52 | .000 | ‑.31, ‑.21 | |
| Happy | .43 | .02 | 23.32 | .000 | .40, .47 | |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | |
| Angry\*Target Gender | -.00 | .04 | ‑.01 | .99 | ‑.08, .08 | |
| Disgusted\*Target Gender | ‑.00 | .06 | ‑.06 | .96 | ‑.12, .12 | |
| Afraid\*Target Gender | ‑.11 | .08 | ‑1.34 | .18 | ‑.28, .05 | |
| Sad\*Target Gender | ‑.08 | .05 | ‑1.37 | .17 | ‑.30, ‑.14 | |
| Happy\*Target Gender | ‑.02 | .04 | ‑.48 | .63 | ‑.09, .06 | |

**Effects of PRNE on Dominance**

A regression predicting dominance with PRNE and target gender showed a main effect of PRNE, *b*= .42, *t*(594)= 7.47, *p*< .001, 95%CI[.31, .53], as well as a main effect of target gender, *b*= ‑.54, *t*(594)= ‑11.00, *p*< .001, 95%CI[‑.63, ‑.44], such that male targets were rated as more dominant (*M*= 3.11) than female targets (*M*= 2.55). Two generalized linear models including target race and target age showed no interaction between race and PRNE, *X*2(3)= 2.07, *p*= .56, and no interaction between age and PRNE, *X*2(1)= .23, *p*= .63. These findings suggest that PRNE predicts judgments of dominance across race and age categories.

However, analyses revealed no interaction between PRNE and target gender, *b*= .16, *t*(593)= 1.39, *p*= .17, 95%CI[‑.07, .38]. This result suggests that PRNE positively predicts dominance regardless of gender, in line with expectations that people are similarly motivated to discern trustworthiness in both women and men.

To address the possibility that specific emotions drives the main effect of PRNE on dominance, I predicted dominance with each of the five emotions comprising PRNE. Results were significant for anger, disgust, and happiness, *p*s< .001, suggesting that these emotions may explain PRNE’s main effect on dominance. To address the possibility that target gender interacts with specific emotions to predict dominance, I included target gender as a moderator for each specific emotion. Marginal interactions emerged for fear, sadness, and happiness, providing tentative evidence that specific emotions interact with target gender to predict dominance. See Table SM2.

Table SM2.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Outcome: Dominance* |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Predictor** | **Coeff.** | **SE** | **t-value** | **p-value** | **95% CI, Lower-Upper** |
| Angry | .58 | .03 | 17.58 | .000 | .52, .65 |
| Disgusted | .55 | .05 | 10.88 | .000 | .45, .65 |
| Afraid | ‑.06 | .06 | ‑.90 | .37 | ‑.19, .07 |
| Sad | ‑.02 | .05 | ‑.35 | .72 | .23, .38 |
| Happy | -.16 | .04 | ‑4.00 | .000 | ‑.23, ‑.08 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Angry\*Target Gender | .02 | .07 | .29 | .78 | ‑.11, .15 |
| Disgusted\*Target Gender | .05 | .10 | .44 | .66 | ‑.16, .25 |
| Afraid\*Target Gender | .22 | .13 | 1.71 | .088 | ‑.03, .48 |
| Sad\*Target Gender | .17 | .09 | 1.92 | .055 | ‑.004, .35 |
| Happy\*Target Gender | ‑.13 | .08 | ‑1.69 | .092 | ‑.29, .02 |

**Controlling for Trustworthiness and Dominance**

Controlling for trustworthiness and dominance, a regression predicting attractiveness with PRNE and target gender still showed a main effect of PRNE, *b*= ‑.23, *t*(591)= ‑3.37, *p*= .001, 95%CI[‑.37, ‑.10]. Importantly, this regression also still showed the interaction between PRNE and target gender, *b*= ‑.37, *t*(590) = ‑3.21, *p*= .001, 95%CI[‑.59, ‑.14], demonstrating that gender moderates PRNE’s relation to attractiveness even after removing variance accounted for by trustworthiness and dominance.

Furthermore, controlling for trustworthiness and dominance, a regression predicting threat with PRNE and target gender still showed a main effect of PRNE, *b*= .52, *t*(589)= 17.74, *p*< .001, 95%CI[.47, .58] (one outlier excluded). Importantly, this regression also still showed the interaction between PRNE and target gender, *b*= ‑.28, *t*(588) = ‑5.85, *p*< .001, 95%CI[‑.38, ‑.19], demonstrating that gender moderates PRNE’s relation to threat even after removing variance accounted for by trustworthiness and dominance.

I also tested the two moderated mediation models controlling for trustworthiness and dominance (for both the the mediator and outcome). With threat as a mediator (Model A), the magnitude of the indirect effect only marginally differed by gender, *Index of Moderated Mediation*= .10, 90%CI[.006, .207]. This effect, as in the main manuscript, accounts for target gender’s moderation of PRNE’s effect on attractiveness, which was no longer significant, *p*= .41. Conversely, with attractiveness as a mediator (Model B), the magnitude of the indirect effect did not differ by gender, *Index of Moderated Mediation*= ‑.001, 95%CI[‑.02, .02].