Supplementary Materials S1

Validation of internet search term indexes in Study 4.

To validate the search lists, the search terms were rated by sixty subjects on two questions. The first question was, "Imagine someone wanted to get money right away and didn't care about longer term costs. Please rate the following 8 search terms below for how likely this person would be to search for each term." The second question was, "Now once again, imagine someone wanted to earn money over the long term, and didn't want to take many risks. Please rate the following 8 search terms below for how likely this person would be to search for each term." Ratings were made on a scale from 1 (not at all likely) to 5 (very likely). Participants rated the high risk terms as more likely search terms when searching for short-term gains, $M = 3.17$, $SD = .84$ than when searching for long-term gains, $M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.02$, $t\ (60) = 8.55$, $P < .001$. They rated the low-risk terms as more likely search terms when searching for long-term gains, $M = 4.12$, $SD = .70$ than when searching for short-term gains, $M = 2.55$, $SD = 1.02$, $t\ (60) = 11.09$, $P < .001$.

We also validated the risk taking index by comparing Google searches to behavioral data, where possible. Of the search terms in the risk index, only lottery sales data were available at the state level. As expected, states with more frequent searches for the term "lottery" had higher lottery sales per capita, $r = .44$, $P = .001$. Lottery sales were not correlated with the low-risk search index, $r = -.09$, $P = .52$. The search index thus correlates with other estimates of risk behavior as expected.

Regression tables for Study 4.

		High-risk searches			Low-risk searches		
		Coefficient	*t*	*P*	Coefficient	*t*	*P*
Model 1	Gini	.40	2.42*	.020	-.32	1.72	.09
	Md income	-.48	3.07*	.004	.21	1.21	.23
	Population	-.07	.53	.60	-.28	1.89	.07
	Density	.24	1.51	.14			
Model 2	90/50 ratio	.88	4.97*	< .001	-.63	3.51*	.001
	50/10 ratio	-.33	1.72	.093	.20	1.04	.30
	Population	-.23	1.67	.102	-.17	1.23	.23
	Density	.09	.61	.55	.16	1.06	.30

Note. Regression coefficients are standardized regression coefficients. * $P < .05$. Median income is not included in models that include the 90/50 and 50/10 ratios because median income is represented in both ratios, creating high multicolinearity with median income.

Mediation analysis for Study 4. Independent variable: Gini coefficient.

	Outcome: Status goods R^2 = .73, P < .001			
	Coefficient	t	P	95% CI
Gini	.65	5.94	<.001	.43, .87
Md income	.02	.17	.87	-.17, .21
Population	-.18	2.06	.05	-.35, 0.00
Density	.34	3.52	.001	.15, .53
	Outcome: Risk index R^2 = .68, P < .001			
Status goods	.84	4.65	<.001	.48, 1.21
Gini	-.22	1.23	.23	-.58, .14
Md income	-.56	4.72	<.001	-.80, -.32
Population	.09	.83	.41	-.13, .31
Density	-.04	.32	.75	-.31, .22
	Indirect effect of Gini on Risk index via Status goods			
	.55	--	--	.31, .94

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized. All variables were standardized before entering into the model.

Mediation analysis for Study 4. Independent variable: 90/50 ratio.

	Outcome: Status goods R^2 = .69, P < .001			
	Coefficient	t	P	95% CI
90/50 ratio	.61	5.26	< .001	.37, .84
50/10 ratio	.00	.00	1.0	-.25, .25
Population	-.17	1.95	.06	-.35, .01
Density	.39	3.98	< .001	.19, .58
	Outcome: Risk index R^2 = .56, P < .001			
Status goods	.80	4.00	< .001	.40, 1.20
90/50 ratio	.40	2.05	.05	.01, .79
50/10 ratio	-.33	1.98	.05	-.67, .01
Population	-.09	.74	.47	-.34, .16
Density	-.22	1.44	.16	-.52, .09
	Indirect effect of 90/50 ratio on Risk index via Status goods			
	.48	--	--	.18, .90

Note. Coefficients are unstandardized. All variables were standardized before entering into the model.