Gender is conceptualized in different ways across cultures

**Supplementary Materials**

**Table 1.** *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants in Study 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sociodemographic characteristic | Italian | | Dutch | | English | |
| *n* | % | *n* | % | *n* | % |
| Birth sex |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 34 | 62 | 28 | 53 | 47 | 61 |
| Male | 20 | 37 | 23 | 44 | 29 | 38 |
| Intersex | 0 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Gender identity |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | 30 | 55 | 26 | 50 | 53 | 69 |
| Man | 20 | 37 | 16 | 30 | 14 | 18 |
| Queer | 2 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 | 3 |
| Transgender | 2 | 3 | 4 | 7 | 3 | 3 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 5 | 9 | 3 | 3 |
| Kinsey score |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (exclusively heterosexual) | 31 | 57 | 20 | 39 | 41 | 53 |
| 2 | 10 | 19 | 3 | 6 | 12 | 16 |
| 3 | 2 | 4 | 2 | 4 | 3 | 4 |
| 4 | 3 | 6 | 5 | 10 | 4 | 5 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| 6 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
| 7 (exclusively homosexual) | 4 | 7 | 9 | 18 | 5 | 6 |
| 8 (other) | 3 | 6 | 10 | 20 | 7 | 9 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

*Note.* *N* = 182 (Italian *N* = 54, *M*age = 28.87, *SD* = 6.62; Dutch *N* = 51 *M*age = 33.9, *SD* = 12.85; English *N* = 77, *M*age = 33.72, *SD* = 10.28).

**Table 2.** *Education of participants in Study 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | None/Primary School | Vocational High School | High School | Vocational Bachelor or Master Degree | Bachelor or Master Degree | Postgraduate/PhD |
| Italian | 0.0% (0) | 0.0% (0) | 18.5% (10) | 0.0% (0) | 59.3% (32) | 22.2% (12) |
| Dutch | 2.0% (1) | 3.9% (2) | 3.9% (2) | 5.9% (3) | 21.6% (11) | 62.7% (32) |
| English | 0.0% (0) | 0.0% (0) | 3.9% (3) | 0.0% (0) | 39.0% (30) | 57.1% (44) |

**Table 3.** *Means and standard deviations of scores on Traditional Masculinity and Femininity Scale (Kachel et al., 2016) of the three groups of participants in Study 1 by gender identity.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Italian | | | Dutch | | English | | |
|  | TMF scores (SD) | *n* | TMF scores (SD) | *n* | | TMF scores (SD) | *n* |
| women | 5.07 (1.14) | 30 | 5.38 (1.10) | 25 | | 4.50 (1.57) | 54 |
| men | 2.62 (0.58) | 20 | 2.41 (0.68) | 16 | | 2.78 (0.81) | 14 |
| queer | 4.41 (1.29) | 2 | 3.17 | 1 | | 2.78 (0.34) | 3 |
| trans\* | 1.83 (0.94) | 2 | 4.25 (1.05) | 4 | | 3.33 (1.69) | 3 |
| other | NA | NA | 3.73 (0.85) | 5 | | 4.05 (0.25) | 3 |

**Table 4.** *Features produced by an independent sample of Italian participants and their gender related ratings from Italian, Dutch, and English participants in Study 1.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Features of gender produced by an independent Italian sample | Italian mean (*SD*) ratings of gender relatedness | Dutch mean ratings (*SD*) of gender relatedness | English mean ratings (*SD*) of gender relatedness |
| category | 5.35 (1.91) | 6.16 (1.35) | 4.95 (1.90) |
| culture | 5.78 (1.62) | 5.20 (1.65) | 5.52 (1.54) |
| difference | 5.95 (1.51) | 5.59 (1.55) | 4.96 (1.70) |
| discrimination | 6.07 (1.30) | 5.53 (1.59) | 5.90 (1.26) |
| education | 5.51 (1.73) | 4.22 (1.91) | 4.66 (1.74) |
| female | 5.29 (1.82) | 6.20 (1.31) | 5.75 (1.60) |
| feminine | 5.64 (1.59) | 5.84 (1.53) | 6.10 (1.25) |
| femininity | 5.15 (2.10) | 5.73 (1.59) | 6.13 (1.20) |
| feminism | 5.51 (1.83) | 5.49 (1.77) | 5.64 (1.49) |
| fluidity | 5.22 (2.11) | 3.86 (2.03) | 5.34 (1.62) |
| freedom | 5.40 (2.00) | 4.67 (2.08) | 4.81 (1.74) |
| grammar | 3.76 (2.11) | 3.69 (2.02) | 4.52 (1.90) |
| identity | 6.33 (1.16) | 5.63 (1.67) | 6.22 (1.15) |
| literature | 4.73 (1.72) | 3.76 (1.90) | 4.16 (1.77) |
| male | 5.16 (1.92) | 6.16 (1.35) | 5.64 (1.69) |
| man | 5.44 (1.64) | 5.35 (1.60) | 5.90 (1.43) |
| masculine | 5.67 (1.44) | 5.88 (1.52) | 5.99 (1.37) |
| masculinity | 5.29 (1.95) | 5.88 (1.56) | 6.01 (1.40) |
| music | 3.55 (1.87) | 2.96 (1.95) | 3.43 (1.86) |
| politics | 5.44 (1.75) | 4.20 (1.88) | 5.22 (1.68) |
| queer | 5.65 (1.82) | 5.14 (1.94) | 5.56 (1.47) |
| rights | 6.07 (1.36) | 4.45 (2.11) | 5.29 (1.61) |
| role | 5.38 (1.84) | 4.88 (1.85) | 5.48 (1.81) |
| sex | 5.69 (1.74) | 5.43 (1.78) | 5.03 (1.89) |
| sexuality | 5.71 (1.87) | 5.45 (2.01) | 5.10 (1.68) |
| society | 6.18 (1.17) | 5.33 (1.68) | 5.60 (1.42) |
| stereotype | 6.02 (1.57) | 5.78 (1.59) | 5.65 (1.60) |
| transgender | 6.20 (1.41) | 5.86 (1.73) | 6.13 (1.40) |
| type | 4.38 (2.03) | 3.94 (1.93) | 4.52 (1.69) |
| woman | 5.60 (1.72) | 6.20 (1.31) | 5.83 (1.48) |

**Study 1: Ratings of gender relatedness differed for specific features across Italians, Dutch, and English**

Italian participants rated *fluidity*, *t*(103) = 3.304, *p* = .001, *d* =0.645, *politics*, *t*(103) = 3.511, *p*<.001, *d =* 0.685, *education*, *t*(103) = 3.875, *p*<.001, *d* = 0.756, *rights, t*(103) = 4.651, *p* =.024, *d* = 0.908, *identity, t*(103) = 2.793 *p =* .006*, d =* 0.545,and *literature*, *t*(103) = 2.699, *p* = .008, *d* = 0.527 as more related to gender than Dutch participants. On the other hand, Dutch participants thought *female*, *t*(103) = 2.871, *p* = .004, *d* = 0.560, *male*, *t*(103) = 3.152, *p* = .002, *d =* 0.615, *woman t*(103) = 2.072, *p* = .040, *d =* 0.404, and *category, t*(103) = 2.527, *p* = .013, *d* = 0.493 were more linked to gender in comparison with Italian participants.

Italian participants also rated *society*, *t*(129) = 2.422, *p* = .016, *d =* 0.430, *rights*, *t*(129) = 2.860, *p* = .004, *d =* 0.507, *difference*, *t*(129) = 3.345, *p* =.001, *d =* 0.593, and *education*, *t*(129)= 2.991, *p* =.003, *d* = 0.530 as more related to gender than English-speaking participants, who in turn rated *femininity*, *t*(129) = 3.514, *p*<.001, *d =* 0.623 and *masculinity*, *t*(129) = 2.573, *p* =.011, *d* =0.456 as more linked to gender than Italian participants. Finally, Dutch participants rated *category*, *t*(126) =3.936, *p*<.001, *d =* 0.710 and *difference*, *t*(126) = 2.211, *p* = .036, *d =* 0.382 as more related to gender than English-speaking participants, who in turn rated *fluidity*, *t*(126) = 4.555, *p* = .008, *d* = 0.822 and *identity*, *t*(126) =-2.375, *p* = .019, *d* = 0.428 as more related to gender than Dutch participants. Among the five features we found in common in the free-listing of the three groups (*identity, sex, sexuality, transgender,* and *woman*) we found that ratings of gender relatedness differed only between Italian and Dutch participants, and exclusively for *identity* and *woman*.

**Study 1: Ratings of gender relatedness varied as a function of concreteness~abstractness across Italians, Dutch, and English**

We looked for concreteness norms of the gender features in various existing databases. All features were rated for concreteness in a previous study by Italian participants (Mazzuca et al., 2020), where participants rated each term separately for how concrete it was, as well as how abstract it was (i.e., on two separate scales). In addition, norms for translation equivalent terms were found for 29 out of 30 features in English (Brysbaert et al., 2014) and 22 out of 30 in Dutch (Brysbaert, Stevens, De Deyne, Voorspoels & Storms, 2014), that were rated on a single scale ranging from 1 (“abstract, language based”) to 7 (“concrete, experience based”).

We first established the correspondence between concreteness ratings in the datasets. All concreteness ratings were positively correlated: Italian and English, *r*(27) = .67, *p =* .047; Italian and Dutch, *r*(20) = .62, *p =*.002; English and Dutch, *r*(20) =.65, *p*<.001. In addition, English, *r*(27) *=* -.74, *p* = .01, and Dutch, *r*(20) = -.79, *p*<.001 concreteness ratings negatively correlated with Italian abstractness ratings. Based on the stronger correlation of English and Dutch concreteness ratings with Italian abstractness ratings, and the fact that the Italian dataset contained all our features of interest, we used the Italian abstractness ratings in subsequent analyses.

A linear mixed-effects model (Baayen, 2008; Baayen, Davidson & Bates, 2008; Winter, 2020) fit by maximum likelihood was used to assess the impact of Abstractness Scores, Culture (Italian, Dutch, English), and their interaction on ratings of “gender relatedness”, implemented in R with the ‘afex’ package (Singmann, Bolker, Westfall, Aust, & Ben-Shachar, 2020). Abstractness Scores were entered in the model as a mean-centered continuous predictor. The model included random intercepts for Participants and Items. Statistical significance of fixed effects was determined using type III ANOVA test with the ‘mixed’ function from ‘afex’ R package; p-values were calculated with likelihood ratio tests comparing the model including the interaction term to models varying for the complexity of fixed effects. Post-hoc comparisons were performed with the ‘emmeans’ R package (Lenth, 2020) and Tukey correction for multiple comparisons.

Ratings of gender-relatedness did not vary significantly as a function of Culture alone, 2(2) = 2.63, *p* = .27, nor Abstractness Scores, 2(1) = 0.52, *p* =. 47, but there was a significant interaction between Culture and Abstractness Scores, 2(2) = 28.84, *p* <.0001 (see Figure 5).
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Figure 5. Interaction between Culture (Italian, Dutch, and English) and Abstractness on gender relatedness ratings. Shaded regions represent confidence intervals of 95% for regression slopes.

Post-hoc comparisons revealed that the features Italian participants rated as more related to the concept gender, also had higher scores of abstractness; whereas features Dutch participants rated as more related to gender had lower scores of abstractness, *t*(5251) = 5.376, *p* <.0001. Dutch and English ratings also differed as a function of Abstractness Scores, *t*(5251) = -2.929, *p =* .009. Although the two groups showed the same qualitative pattern, Dutch gender related ratings significantly decreased for more abstract words, and similarly Italian and English ratings differed, *t*(5251) = -2.935, *p* = .009 in the same qualitative manner as Italian and Dutch.

Finally, we asked whether the common set of words shared by the three cultures in the free-listing data were equally concrete~abstract. We retrieved concreteness scores for words shared by the three groups (i.e., *identity, sex, sexuality, transgender,* and *woman*) in each norming dataset. Except for the word *transgender*, which is not present in the Dutch database, we found all five words have different scores of concreteness across the three groups. We ran a linear mixed-effects model to investigate whether scores of concreteness for the five target words differed across the three Cultures (Italian, Dutch, English) with a random intercept for Items. We found that scores of concreteness varied significantly as a function of Culture, 2(2) = 16.11, *p* <.001. Post-hoc contrasts revealed that the target words were considered as more concrete in Italian than Dutch, *t*(9.18) = 5.826, *p* <.001, and English, *t*(9.07) = 5.560, *p* <.001 but there was no difference between Dutch and English, *t*(9.18) = -0.707, *p* =.765.

To summarize, the results show that Italian participants rated more abstract features as more related to gender than Dutch participants, who instead rated features with lower scores of abstractness as more related to gender; English-speaking participants represented a middle point.

**Table 5.** *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants in Study 2*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sociodemographic characteristic | Italian | | Dutch | |
| *n* | % | *n* | % |
| Birth sex |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 21 | 84 | 18 | 69 |
| Male | 3 | 12 | 8 | 31 |
| Intersex | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Gender identity |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | 22 | 88 | 17 | 65 |
| Man | 3 | 12 | 8 | 31 |
| Queer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transgender | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| Kinsey score |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (exclusively heterosexual) | 17 | 68 | 17 | 65 |
| 2 | 6 | 24 | 1 | 4 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 15 |
| 4 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 7 (exclusively homosexual) | 0 | 0 | 2 | 8 |
| 8 (other) | 1 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Note.* *N* = 51 (Italian *N*= 25, *M*age = 25.44, *SD* = 3.06; Dutch *N* = 26 *M*age= 27.23, *SD* = 10.83).

**Table 6.** *Education of participants in Study 2*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High School | Vocational Bachelor or Master Degree | Bachelor or Master Degree | Postgraduate/PhD |
| Italian | 4.0% (1) | 0.0% (0) | 92.0% (23) | 4.0% (1) |
| Dutch | 7.7% (2) | 3.8% (1) | 26.9% (7) | 61.5% (16) |

**Table 7.** *Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants in Study 3*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Sociodemographic characteristic | Italian | | Dutch | |
| *n* | % | *n* | % |
| Birth sex |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 18 | 72 | 18 | 72 |
| Male | 7 | 28 | 7 | 28 |
| Intersex | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gender identity |  |  |  |  |
| Woman | 18 | 72 | 18 | 72 |
| Man | 7 | 28 | 7 | 28 |
| Queer | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Transgender | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Other | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Kinsey score |  |  |  |  |
| 1 (exclusively heterosexual) | 11 | 44 | 14 | 56 |
| 2 | 8 | 32 | 3 | 12 |
| 3 | 0 | 0 | 1 | 4 |
| 4 | 1 | 4 | 3 | 12 |
| 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 6 | 1 | 4 | 1 | 4 |
| 7 (exclusively homosexual) | 1 | 4 | 2 | 8 |
| 8 (other) | 3 | 12 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

*Note.* *N* = 50 (Italian *N* = 25, *M*age= 26.16, *SD* = 3.59; Dutch *N* = 25 *M*age = 18.92, *SD* = 1.49).

**Table 8.** *Education of participants in Study 3*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | High School | Bachelor or Master Degree | Postgraduate/PhD |
| Italian | 4.0% (1) | 92.0% (23) | 4.0% (1) |
| Dutch | 52.0% (13) | 16.0% (4) | 32.0% (8) |

**Table 9.** *Lloyd and Galupo’s (2019) essentialism~constructivism questionnaire used in Study 3, and its translation into Italian and Dutch*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | English | Italian | Dutch |
|  | *Gender* | | |
| Essentialist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fixed | In general, I believe GENDER to be relatively fixed | In generale, credo che il GENERE sia relativamente fisso | In het algemeen geloof ik dat GESLACHT relatief vaststaat |
|  |  |  |  |
| Binary | In general, I believe that GENDER can be understood as a binary concept naturally separating ‘masculinity’ from ‘femininity’ | In generale, credo che il GENERE possa essere concepito come un concetto binario, che separa ‘maschilità’ da 'femminilità' | In het algemeen geloof ik dat GESLACHT kan worden opgevat als een binair concept dat op natuurlijke wijze ‘masculiniteit’ van ‘femininiteit’ scheidt |
| Social Constructivist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fluid | In general, I believe GENDER to be relatively fluid | In generale, credo che il GENERE sia relativamente fluido | In het algemeen geloof ik dat GESLACHT relatief fluïde is |
|  |  |  |  |
| Continuous | In general, I believe that GENDER exists on a continuum between ‘masculinity’ and ‘femininity’ with varying points in between | In generale, credo che il GENERE esista su un continuum tra maschilità e femminilità, con vari punti nel mezzo | In het algemeen geloof ik dat GESLACHT bestaat op een continuüm tussen masculiniteit en femininiteit met verschillende punten ertussenin |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Sex* | | |
| Essentialist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fixed | In general, I believe SEX to be relatively fixed | In generale, credo che il SESSO sia relativamente fisso | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSE relatief vaststaat |
|  |  |  |  |
| Binary | In general, I believe that SEX can be understood as a binary concept naturally separating ‘male’ from ‘female’ | In generale, credo che il SESSO possa essere concepito come un concetto binario, che separa ‘maschio’ da ‘femmina’ | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSE kan worden opgevat als een binair concept dat op natuurlijke wijze ‘mannelijk’ van ‘vrouwelijk’ scheidt. |
| Social Constructivist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fluid | In general, I believe SEX to be relatively fluid | In generale, credo che il SESSO sia relativamente fluido | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSE relatief fluïde is |
|  |  |  |  |
| Continuous | In general, I believe that SEX exists on a continuum between ‘male’ness and ‘female’ness with varying points in between | In generale, credo che il SESSO esista su un continuum tra l’essere maschio e l’essere femmina, con vari punti nel mezzo | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSE bestaat op een continuüm tussen mannelijkheid en vrouwelijkheid met verschillende punten ertussenin |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *Sexual Orientation* | | |
| Essentialist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fixed | In general, I believe SEXUAL ORIENTATION to be relatively fixed | In generale, credo che l’ORIENTAMENTO SESSUALE sia relativamente fisso | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSUELE ORIËNTATIE relatief vaststaat |
|  |  |  |  |
| Binary | In general, I believe that SEXUAL ORIENTATION can be understood as a binary concept naturally separating heterosexual individuals from gay and lesbian individuals | In generale, credo che l’ORIENTAMENTO SESSUALE possa essere concepito come un concetto binario, che separa eterosessuali da gay e lesbiche | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSUELE ORIËNTATIE gezien kan worden als een binair concept dat op natuurlijke wijze heteroseksuele personen scheidt van homoseksuele en lesbische personen |
| Social Constructivist Beliefs |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Fluid | In general, I believe SEXUAL ORIENTATION to be relatively fluid | In generale, credo che l’ORIENTAMENTO SESSUALE sia relativamente fluido | In het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSUELE ORIENTATIE relatief fluïde is |
|  |  |  |  |
| Continuous | In general, I believe that SEXUAL ORIENTATION exists on a continuum between same-sex and other-sex attracted with varying points in between | In generale, credo che l’ORIENTAMENTO SESSUALE esista su un continuum tra attrazione per persone dello stesso sesso e dell’altro sesso, con vari punti nel mezzo | Over het algemeen geloof ik dat SEKSUELE ORIËNTATIE bestaat op een continuüm tussen aantrekking tot hetzelfde geslacht en aantrekking tot het andere geslacht met verschillende punten ertussenin |

*Note.* A PDF version of the questionnaire with its Italian and Dutch translations can be found at https://osf.io/zdnhb/

**Study 3: Essentialist~Constructivist Beliefs about Sex and Sexual Orientation among Italian and Dutch participants**

***Italian and Dutch Essentialist Beliefs about Sex***

Italian and Dutch participants did not differ in their ratings to whether sex is fixed, *t*(44.63) = -0.235, *p* = .814, (Italian *M* = 2.72; Italian *SD* = 1.02; Dutch *M* = 2.80, Dutch *SD* = 1.35). Similarly, they did not differ in how binary they considered sex to be, *t*(47.93) = -1.258, *p* = .214, (Italian *M* = 2.40; Italian *SD* = 1.25; Dutch *M* = 2.84, Dutch *SD* = 1.21).

***Italian and Dutch Constructivist Beliefs about Sex***

Italian and Dutch participants also did not differ in how fluid they considered sex to be, *t*(48) = -0.897, *p* = .373, (Italian *M* = 3.20; Italian *SD* = 1.25; Dutch *M* = 3.52, Dutch *SD* = 1.26). Similarly, they did not differ in how continuous they considered sex to be, *t*(46.66) = .789, *p* = .434, (Italian *M* = 3.44; Italian *SD* = 1.35; Dutch *M* = 3.16, Dutch *SD* = 1.14).

***Italian and Dutch Essentialist Beliefs about Sexual Orientation***

Italian and Dutch participants did not differ in their ratings to whether sexual orientation is fixed, *t*(47.83) = -1.247, *p* = .218, (Italian *M* = 1.72; Italian *SD* = 1.10; Dutch *M* = 2.12, Dutch *SD* = 1.16). Italians rated sexual orientation to be slightly less binary than Dutch participants, (Italian *M* = 1.36; Italian *SD* = 0.70; Dutch *M* = 1.88, Dutch *SD* = 1.12), but the trend is only approaching significance, *t*(40.05) = -1.956, *p* = .057.

***Italian and Dutch Constructivist Beliefs about Sexual Orientation***

Italian and Dutch participants also did not differ in how fluid they considered sexual orientation to be, *t*(47.61) = -0.186, *p* = .852, (Italian *M* = 4.24; Italian *SD* = 0.72; Dutch *M* = 4.28, Dutch *SD* = 0.79). Similarly, they did not differ in how continuous they considered sexual orientation to be, *t*(47.40) = .610, *p* = .544, (Italian *M* = 4.12; Italian *SD* = 1.09; Dutch *M* = 3.92, Dutch *SD* = 1.22).

**Table 10.** *Descriptive statistics of Italian and Dutch responses to the essentialism~constructivism questionnaire (Lloyd & Galupo, 2019) of Study 3 ordered by Identity Construct and Culture.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Culture | Construct | Belief | *M* | *SE* | *SD* |
| Dutch | Gender | Fixed | 2.84 | 0.29 | 1.43 |
| Dutch | Gender | Binary | 2.96 | 0.29 | 1.43 |
| Dutch | Gender | Fluid | 3.24 | 0.27 | 1.36 |
| Dutch | Gender | Continuous | 3.48 | 0.23 | 1.16 |
| Italian | Gender | Fixed | 1.96 | 0.25 | 1.27 |
| Italian | Gender | Binary | 1.96 | 0.26 | 1.31 |
| Italian | Gender | Fluid | 3.96 | 0.20 | 0.98 |
| Italian | Gender | Continuous | 4.08 | 0.23 | 1.15 |
| Dutch | Sex | Fixed | 2.80 | 0.27 | 1.35 |
| Dutch | Sex | Binary | 2.84 | 0.24 | 1.21 |
| Dutch | Sex | Fluid | 3.52 | 0.25 | 1.26 |
| Dutch | Sex | Continuous | 3.16 | 0.23 | 1.14 |
| Italian | Sex | Fixed | 2.72 | 0.20 | 1.02 |
| Italian | Sex | Binary | 2.40 | 0.25 | 1.26 |
| Italian | Sex | Fluid | 3.20 | 0.25 | 1.26 |
| Italian | Sex | Continuous | 3.44 | 0.27 | 1.36 |
| Dutch | Sexual Orientation | Fixed | 2.12 | 0.23 | 1.17 |
| Dutch | Sexual Orientation | Binary | 1.88 | 0.23 | 1.13 |
| Dutch | Sexual Orientation | Fluid | 4.28 | 0.16 | 0.79 |
| Dutch | Sexual Orientation | Continuous | 3.92 | 0.24 | 1.22 |
| Italian | Sexual Orientation | Fixed | 1.72 | 0.22 | 1.10 |
| Italian | Sexual Orientation | Binary | 1.36 | 0.14 | 0.70 |
| Italian | Sexual Orientation | Fluid | 4.24 | 0.14 | 0.72 |
| Italian | Sexual Orientation | Continuous | 4.12 | 0.22 | 1.09 |

*Note on the age of participants across the three studies.* The three groups differed in terms of age across the three studies, *F*(2, 276) = 7.97, *p* < .001. The difference was specifically driven by Dutch participants that were older in Study 1 (EMM= 33.9; *SE* = 1.25) compared to both Study 2, *t*(276) = 3.091, *p* = .006, and Study 3, *t*(276) = 6.851, *p* < .001. Dutch participants also varied in terms of age across Study 2 and 3, *t*(276) = 3.313, *p* = .003, with Study 2 participants being older than Study 3 participants, Study 2: EMM = 27.2; *SE* = 1.76; Study 3: EMM = 18.9, *SE* = 1.79. No other significant difference emerged, all *p*s > .254.