**Supplementary Materials**

## Pilot Study for Simulated Player Creation

A pilot study was conducted to select profiles of simulated players as dominant, prestigious, or neutral. Participants (n=432) were recruited via Prolific recruitment platform in this pilot study. They were shown profiles with images and descriptions of individuals and asked to rate their dominance and prestige using the Cheng et al. dominance/prestige scales [1].

The results were analyzed to ensure that the simulated players accurately represented the intended profiles of dominance and prestige, and to identify which profiles were most suitable for use in the experimental conditions.

Procedure:

1. **Image and Profile Selection:**

   A total of 29 profiles were created, one profile served as a neutral reference while the other 28 were rated by pilot participants on how dominant or prestigious they perceived the individuals in each profile.

   Mileva [2] produced validated headshots that participants in their study viewed as the faces of prestigious and dominant individuals. We used these validated headshots in the profiles to differentiate facial cues of dominance and prestige on the simulated player profiles used in this study. Each profile included the simulated player's age (35 years old) and sex (male or female). For some simulated players, additional profile information, such as occupation and self-described best quality, was provided. Occupations were assigned based on the intended status type: simulated players had roles like "Combat Sports Athlete", "Finance Professional", "Professor", or "Medical Worker.". Profiles with specified self-described best qualities, included "Competitive," and "Leadership".

   The neutral profile was not rated. It was constructed after the pilot by replacing the photograph with a generic silhouette and marking occupation and best quality as not disclosed, with the aim of carrying no status cue and this serve as a reference condition rather than a validated neutral

2. **Participant Rating:** In the pilot study, participants evaluated the profiles using the Cheng, Tracy, and Henrich [1] dominance/prestige scales. These ratings were used to identify the most suitable profilesto serve as the dominant and prestigious simulated players in the main experiment. Example questions include:

   - Dominance: "To what extent does this person seem likely to impose their will on others?"
   - Prestige: "How respected and admired is this person by others?"
   - Ratings were made on a 7-point Likert scale, from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely).
   - Recruitment: Only male profiles were included in the final analysis, as they consistently ranked higher than female profiles in both dominance and prestige, warranting a focus on male-dominated outcomes.

**Weighted Proportion Analysis**

The ratings for dominance and prestige were calculated using a weighted proportion approach to emphasize the relative imbalance between these traits. This method allowed for the identification of profiles where one trait (dominance or prestige) significantly outweighed the other to ensure the selected profiles represented the intended status type.

- Dominance Weighted Proportion: For each profile, the dominance score was divided by the prestige score. This ratio was then multiplied by the raw dominance score to emphasize profiles where dominance significantly outweighed prestige:

$$\text{Custom Dominance Metric} = \left(\frac{Dominance}{Prestige}\right) \times Dominance$$

- Prestige Weighted Proportion: Similarly, the prestige score was divided by the dominance score, and this ratio was multiplied by the raw prestige score to highlight profiles where prestige significantly outweighed dominance:

$$\text{Custom Prestige Metric} = \left(\frac{Prestige}{Dominance}\right) \times Prestige$$

Profiles were ranked based on these metrics to identify the most dominant and most prestigious profiles. For instance:

- The *most dominant profile* was a finance professional, with a self-described best quality of competitiveness, and a headshot from Mileva [2] reflecting dominance; this profile had a dominance score of 5.8.
- The *most prestigious profile* (mean prestige rating 5.3) was a medical professional shown with a prestige headshot from Mileva [2]. It carried no self-described best quality, in line with work associating prestige with humility and dominance with self-aggrandisement [1, 3].

This weighted proportion approach provided a clearer distinction between dominance and prestige, ensuring the profiles selected for the main experiment represented these traits in an unambiguous and meaningful way.

**Note on Table Interpretation**

Dependent variable: participant percentage of remaining pot taken. Reference categories: neutral profile and equal-share model behaviour (£25); female is the reference category in models that include sex. SES is ordinal from 1 to 5. N = 462 (254 men, 208 women).

**Table S1. Pooled cell means by modelled behaviour and status**

| Action | Status | N | Mean | SD | SE | 95% CI lower | 95% CI upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Altruistic | Neutral | 45 | 32.15 | 21.93 | 3.27 | 25.74 | 38.56 |
| Altruistic | Dominant | 53 | 33.58 | 22.16 | 3.04 | 27.62 | 39.55 |
| Altruistic | Prestigious | 55 | 25.94 | 14.98 | 2.02 | 21.98 | 29.90 |
| Fair | Neutral | 52 | 45.56 | 24.49 | 3.40 | 38.91 | 52.22 |
| Fair | Dominant | 56 | 43.33 | 23.23 | 3.10 | 37.25 | 49.42 |
| Fair | Prestigious | 57 | 49.26 | 26.35 | 3.49 | 42.42 | 56.10 |
| Selfish | Neutral | 54 | 57.70 | 28.76 | 3.91 | 50.03 | 65.37 |
| Selfish | Dominant | 46 | 66.74 | 28.30 | 4.17 | 58.56 | 74.92 |
| Selfish | Prestigious | 44 | 62.86 | 28.06 | 4.23 | 54.57 | 71.16 |

*Note. Means are percentages of the remaining pot taken by participants. CI = mean ± 1.96 × SE.*

**Table S2. Cell means by sex, modelled behaviour, and status**

| Sex | Action | Status | N | Mean | SD | SE | 95% CI lower | 95% CI upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Male | Altruistic | Neutral | 22 | 35.81 | 26.71 | 5.69 | 24.65 | 46.97 |
| Male | Altruistic | Dominant | 28 | 38.49 | 27.88 | 5.27 | 28.16 | 48.82 |
| Male | Altruistic | Prestigious | 29 | 27.01 | 19.64 | 3.65 | 19.86 | 34.16 |
| Male | Fair | Neutral | 28 | 55.33 | 30.18 | 5.70 | 44.16 | 66.51 |
| Male | Fair | Dominant | 34 | 47.25 | 28.54 | 4.89 | 37.66 | 56.85 |
| Male | Fair | Prestigious | 34 | 47.88 | 26.64 | 4.57 | 38.93 | 56.84 |
| Male | Selfish | Neutral | 26 | 51.23 | 28.05 | 5.50 | 40.45 | 62.01 |
| Male | Selfish | Dominant | 29 | 72.21 | 28.49 | 5.29 | 61.84 | 82.58 |
| Male | Selfish | Prestigious | 24 | 66.92 | 30.17 | 6.16 | 54.85 | 78.99 |
| Female | Altruistic | Neutral | 23 | 28.65 | 15.96 | 3.33 | 22.12 | 35.17 |
| Female | Altruistic | Dominant | 25 | 28.09 | 11.38 | 2.28 | 23.63 | 32.55 |
| Female | Altruistic | Prestigious | 26 | 24.74 | 7.05 | 1.38 | 22.03 | 27.45 |
| Female | Fair | Neutral | 24 | 34.17 | 2.99 | 0.61 | 32.97 | 35.36 |
| Female | Fair | Dominant | 22 | 37.27 | 8.40 | 1.79 | 33.76 | 40.78 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Female | Fair | Prestigious | 23 | 51.30 | 26.37 | 5.50 | 40.53 | 62.08 |
| Female | Selfish | Neutral | 28 | 63.71 | 28.58 | 5.40 | 53.13 | 74.30 |
| Female | Selfish | Dominant | 17 | 57.41 | 26.18 | 6.35 | 44.97 | 69.86 |
| Female | Selfish | Prestigious | 20 | 58.00 | 25.19 | 5.63 | 46.96 | 69.04 |

*Note. Means are percentages of the remaining pot taken by participants. CI = mean ± 1.96 × SE.*

**Table S3. Primary full-sample Huber's T robust regression**

| Predictor | b | SE | z | p | 95% CI lower | 95% CI upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 43.18*** | 3.90 | 11.06 | < .001 | 35.53 | 50.83 |
| Sex: male | 2.81 | 1.56 | 1.80 | .072 | -0.26 | 5.88 |
| Dominance | -1.44 | 3.21 | -0.45 | .652 | -7.73 | 4.84 |
| Prestige | 2.36 | 3.19 | 0.74 | .460 | -3.90 | 8.62 |
| Altruistic | -10.32** | 3.39 | -3.05 | .002 | -16.97 | -3.68 |
| Selfish | 13.02*** | 3.23 | 4.03 | < .001 | 6.69 | 19.35 |
| Dominance × Altruistic | 2.42 | 4.64 | 0.52 | .602 | -6.68 | 11.52 |
| Prestige × Altruistic | -5.42 | 4.61 | -1.17 | .240 | -14.46 | 3.62 |
| Dominance × Selfish | 11.62* | 4.62 | 2.51 | .012 | 2.56 | 20.68 |
| Prestige × Selfish | 2.97 | 4.64 | 0.64 | .522 | -6.12 | 12.07 |
| Age | -0.16** | 0.06 | -2.86 | .004 | -0.27 | -0.05 |
| SES | 0.17 | 0.64 | 0.26 | .791 | -1.08 | 1.42 |

*Note. Reference categories: neutral profile, equal-share behaviour (£25), and female. SES is ordinal from 1 to 5.* * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

**Table S4. Sex-stratified Huber's T robust regressions**

| Predictor | Men b | Men SE | Men p | Women b | Women SE | Women p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 54.51*** | 8.10 | < .001 | 38.84*** | 3.43 | < .001 |
| Dominance | -7.49 | 6.81 | .272 | 1.49 | 2.73 | .586 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prestige | -6.13 | 6.79 | .367 | 4.63 | 2.73 | .090 |
| Altruistic | -17.30* | 7.60 | .023 | -8.26** | 2.71 | .002 |
| Selfish | -2.02 | 7.25 | .780 | 20.84*** | 2.58 | < .001 |
| Dominance × Altruistic | 9.01 | 10.18 | .376 | -1.22 | 3.82 | .749 |
| Prestige × Altruistic | -0.71 | 10.15 | .944 | -4.63 | 3.80 | .223 |
| Dominance × Selfish | 34.13*** | 9.90 | < .001 | -5.15 | 3.94 | .191 |
| Prestige × Selfish | 26.45** | 10.16 | .009 | -8.41* | 3.86 | .030 |
| Age | -0.19 | 0.12 | .117 | -0.11* | 0.05 | .021 |
| SES | 1.27 | 1.42 | .373 | -0.07 | 0.54 | .902 |

*Note. Reference categories: neutral profile and equal-share behaviour (£25). Sex is not included as a predictor in the stratified models.* * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

**Table S5. Full Huber's T three-way model testing sex moderation**

| Predictor | b | SE | z | p | 95% CI lower | 95% CI upper |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 39.65*** | 5.04 | 7.86 | < .001 | 29.76 | 49.53 |
| Dominance | 2.03 | 5.41 | 0.37 | .708 | -8.58 | 12.64 |
| Prestige | 9.73 | 5.38 | 1.81 | .071 | -0.82 | 20.27 |
| Altruistic | -7.20 | 5.36 | -1.34 | .179 | -17.70 | 3.31 |
| Selfish | 24.89*** | 5.11 | 4.87 | < .001 | 14.87 | 34.91 |
| Sex: male | 10.26* | 5.10 | 2.01 | .044 | 0.26 | 20.27 |
| Dominance × Altruistic | -2.23 | 7.58 | -0.29 | .768 | -17.09 | 12.62 |
| Prestige × Altruistic | -11.57 | 7.52 | -1.54 | .124 | -26.31 | 3.16 |
| Dominance × Selfish | -9.03 | 7.82 | -1.16 | .248 | -24.35 | 6.29 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Prestige × Selfish | -15.21* | 7.61 | -2.00 | .046 | -30.13 | -0.29 |
| Dominance × Sex × male | -7.98 | 7.16 | -1.11 | .265 | -22.01 | 6.05 |
| Prestige × Sex × male | -13.70 | 7.13 | -1.92 | .055 | -27.67 | 0.27 |
| Altruistic × Sex × male | -7.34 | 7.48 | -0.98 | .327 | -22.01 | 7.33 |
| Selfish × Sex × male | -22.94** | 7.15 | -3.21 | .001 | -36.95 | -8.93 |
| Dominance × Altruistic × Sex × male | 10.35 | 10.33 | 1.00 | .316 | -9.90 | 30.59 |
| Prestige × Altruistic × Sex × male | 10.83 | 10.28 | 1.05 | .292 | -9.31 | 30.98 |
| Dominance × Selfish × Sex × male | 47.14*** | 10.37 | 4.55 | < .001 | 26.82 | 67.46 |
| Prestige × Selfish × Sex × male | 34.66*** | 10.36 | 3.35 | < .001 | 14.35 | 54.97 |
| Age | -0.16** | 0.06 | -2.58 | .010 | -0.28 | -0.04 |
| SES | 0.39 | 0.71 | 0.55 | .581 | -1.00 | 1.78 |

*Note. Joint Wald test of four Status × Action × Sex terms: $\chi^2(4) = 24.36$, $p = < .001$.* * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

**Table S6. Full-sample robustness across estimator specifications**

| Predictor | Huber T b | Huber T SE | Huber T p | Fractional logit b | Fractional logit SE | Fractional logit p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 43.18*** | 3.90 | < .001 | -0.122 | 0.227 | .590 |
| Sex: male | 2.81 | 1.56 | .072 | 0.274** | 0.095 | .004 |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dominance | -1.44 | 3.21 | .652 | -0.123 | 0.182 | .499 |
| Prestige | 2.36 | 3.19 | .460 | 0.142 | 0.193 | .463 |
| Altruistic | -10.32** | 3.39 | .002 | -0.534** | 0.196 | .006 |
| Selfish | 13.02*** | 3.23 | < .001 | 0.525* | 0.210 | .012 |
| Dominance × Altruistic | 2.42 | 4.64 | .602 | 0.157 | 0.267 | .556 |
| Prestige × Altruistic | -5.42 | 4.61 | .240 | -0.453 | 0.264 | .086 |
| Dominance × Selfish | 11.62* | 4.62 | .012 | 0.475 | 0.303 | .117 |
| Prestige × Selfish | 2.97 | 4.64 | .522 | 0.060 | 0.308 | .845 |
| Age | -0.16** | 0.06 | .004 | -0.006 | 0.004 | .069 |
| SES | 0.17 | 0.64 | .791 | 0.026 | 0.042 | .545 |

*Note. Fractional logit uses the dependent variable rescaled to 0–1 with robust HC1 standard errors.* * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001. *Fractional-logit coefficients are on the log-odds scale and are not directly comparable in magnitude with the Huber's T coefficients; across the two estimators we compare sign and inference only. In percentage points (average marginal contrasts) the action effects correspond to roughly −13 and +13 and the pooled Dominance × Selfish interaction to roughly +11.*

**Table S7. Sex-stratified fractional-logit robustness models**

| Predictor | Men frac. logit b | Men frac. logit SE | Men frac. logit p | Women frac. logit b | Women frac. logit SE | Women frac. logit p |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Intercept | 0.37 | 0.36 | .295 | -0.42 | 0.23 | .075 |
| Dominance | -0.33 | 0.30 | .270 | 0.12 | 0.09 | .182 |
| Prestige | -0.30 | 0.29 | .306 | 0.72** | 0.22 | .001 |
| Altruistic | -0.79* | 0.33 | .016 | -0.22 | 0.16 | .169 |
| Selfish | -0.18 | 0.32 | .576 | 1.26*** | 0.23 | < .001 |
| Dominance × Altruistic | 0.46 | 0.43 | .289 | -0.19 | 0.21 | .360 |
| Prestige × Altruistic | -0.07 | 0.41 | .857 | -0.94*** | 0.28 | < .001 |
| Dominance × Selfish | 1.27** | 0.45 | .005 | -0.39 | 0.35 | .271 |
| Prestige × Selfish | 0.98* | 0.46 | .033 | -0.95* | 0.39 | .015 |
| Age | -0.01 | 0.01 | .144 | -0.01 | 0.00 | .133 |
| SES | 0.07 | 0.07 | .336 | 0.01 | 0.05 | .796 |

*Note. Fractional logit uses the dependent variable rescaled to 0–1 with robust HC1 standard errors. Joint fractional-logit Wald test of Status × Action × Sex terms:* $\chi^2(4) = 13.36$, $p = .010$. * p < .05, ** p < .01, *** p < .001.

## Supplementary Materials References

[1] Cheng, J. T., Tracy, J. L. & Henrich, J. Pride, personality, and the evolutionary foundations of human social status. *Evol. Hum. Behav.* **31**, 334–347 (2010).

[2] Mileva, V. R. Social status in humans: differentiating the cues to dominance and prestige in men and women. PhD thesis, University of Stirling (2016).

[3] Weidman, A. C., Cheng, J. T. & Tracy, J. L. The psychological structure of humility. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* **114**, 153–178 (2018).