Socioeconomic Status and Physical Attractiveness in Partner Selection Thirty-Two Years Later:

An Empirical Replication and Extension of Townsend and Levy (1990)

Elena Kelsey Henderson

A dissertation submitted to the faculty of
Brigham Young University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Scott Braithwaite, Chair
Derek Griner
Melissa Jones
Niwako Yamawaki

Department of Psychology

Brigham Young University

ABSTRACT

Socioeconomic Status and Physical Attractiveness in Partner Selection Thirty-Two Years Later: An Empirical Replication and Extension of Townsend and Levy (1990)

Elena Kelsey Henderson
Department of Psychology, Brigham Young University
Doctor of Philosophy

Partnership is a universal part of human existence. Human partner selection has been long studied within evolutionary and sociocultural frameworks. One study by Townsend and Levy (1990) found that physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status influence male and female partner selection in distinct ways. The present study replicated and extended the work of Townsend and Levy, investigating how physical attractiveness, socioeconomic status, and race and ethnicity influence relationship willingness at various levels of involvement. A repeated measures ANOVA was conducted, and planned post hoc pairwise comparisons and parameter estimates were analyzed. We analyzed responses from 503 single American adults of four racial/ethnic groups under 16 test conditions. We found no significant difference in relationship willingness between male and female participants, so the findings of Townsend and Levy were not replicated. Further, there was no significant difference in relationship willingness for one's own racial or ethnic group versus another racial or ethnic group. Implications for research and human partner selection are discussed.

Keywords: partner selection, relationships, sex, marriage, race, ethnicity, dating

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Socioeconomic Status and Physical Attractiveness in Partner Selection Thirty-Two Years Later: An Empirical Replication and Extension of Townsend and Levy (1990)

Overview

Finding love is complicated, even with online dating making it easier than ever to find potential partners. Some aspects of partner selection are deliberate like the need to allocate time and effort in order to find a good partner (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000). Other aspects are less intentional, like feelings of lust, aesthetic preferences, and situational inferences (Gigerenzer et al., 1999). Successful partner selection depends on the range of qualities in the existing pool of potential partners, and how a person solves conflicts in their own desires and preferences of an ideal partner and trade-offs in selecting an actual partner (Penke et al., 2005). Finding a partner is such an important goal for people that approximately 53% of American online daters lie about themselves in their online profile to attract more dates (Dion et al., 1972; Langlois et al., 2000; Anderson, 2016). In this dissertation, we reviewed relevant theories of partner selection and conducted a study designed to illuminate the role of physical attractiveness, socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and biological sex of participants in potential partner selection.

Human Partnership

Partner selection is a fundamental experience in human societies around the world. The human desire for sex, love, and partnership is nearly universal (Jankowiak & Fischer, 1992). There are benefits to human partnership. Benefits of long-term partnership include reduced risk of poverty (Amato & Maynard, 2007) and better physical health. Over the lifespan, married men are more likely to live longer than single men (Lillard & Waite, 1995), and married women are more likely to report good health than unmarried women (Waite &

Gallagher, 2001). Healthy romantic relationships are more predictive of happiness in coupled individuals than friendships or platonic relationships (Demir, 2008, 2010). Married men and women are less likely to suffer from long-term chronic illness or disabilities, and additional benefits for married individuals include lower disease risk, reductions in blood pressure and heart rate, and increased survivability for heart attacks (Birmingham et al., 2015; Sanbonmatsu et al., 2011). Although there are benefits to healthy romantic relationships, approximately 35% of Americans do not have a steady romantic partner (Smith et al., 2018). While relationships can have a positive effect on people, not all relationships are beneficial. Costs of relationships with an unfit partner may include the development and maintenance of depression, poor health habits, and problems with cardiovascular, endocrine, and immune functioning (Kiecolt-Glaser, 2001). Single men and women, that are open to marriage, report that a major reason they are single is because they have not found the right person (Pew Research Center, 2021). More information about partner selection patterns would likely help people better understand their preferences for a potential romantic partner.

Theories of Partner Selection

Theories regarding human partner selection are primarily categorized into biological or social frameworks (Casey et al., 2007). Biological frameworks assert that human partner selection is largely influenced by individuals wanting to select good genes for reproduction, and that this process has developed in humans over time (Darwin, 1859). Social frameworks largely suggest that people choose partners that will be easier to cooperate with in society, and that partner selection varies across situation and cultural context (Sprecher, 1998). In this section, we discuss the relevant partner selection theories for the present study. The overwhelming majority of research for partner selection uses the terms “male” and “female” interchangeably with

"men" and "women." We recognize that this limits the field's understanding of previously reported data. As the foundational studies for partner selection theories are decades old and report binary genders, we assume that researchers attributed gender labels based on biological sex. In this section, we strictly use the terms "male" and "female" when discussing the findings unless cited researchers reported both biological sex and gender in the data.

Sexual Selection Theory

One foundational theory regarding human partner selection is sexual selection theory. Charles Darwin proposed sexual selection as a type of natural selection in which members of one biological sex choose members of the other sex to mate with, typically involving competition between males over available females and the females making the choice (Darwin, 1859). The chosen males' traits are likely to be passed down through reproduction, and the quality of the offspring determines continued heritability of traits (e.g., likelihood of survival; fertility). Biology researchers have accepted and applied the concept of sexual selection in the research for animal mating behavior (Hosken & House, 2011).

In humans, sexual selection theory suggests that males compete for quantity of females to maximize reproduction, whereas females compete for quality of males (Daly & Wilson, 1983; Reynolds & Harvey, 1994; Trivers, 1985). This theory is supported by research in ancestral human mating patterns in which the males would physically compete for female choice (Puts, 2016). Such examples include male body mass comparable to primates that show a reasonable degree of mating competition among males (Puts, 2016). Sexual selection theory has been regarded as strong evolutionary contender for explaining human partner selection and the heritability of preferable genetic traits. Sexual selection theory asserts that human partner selection is largely

driven by biological instinct and has developed over many years in the human species as a means of survival.

Foundational research supportive of sexual selection theory suggests that the more investing sex – usually females – is more selective in choosing a partner (Daly & Wilson, 1983; Reynolds & Harvey, 1994; Trivers, 1985). Females tend to prefer male traits reflective of mate quality (e.g., being physically strong and capable of defending against other males) and deciding to reproduce with the males that win the competition of male genetic fitness (Puts, 2016). In 2014, results of a meta-analysis supported this claim: human females exhibited stronger preferences for male dominance and relevant traits when there was more potential genetic benefit (i.e., during the fertile phase of the ovulatory cycle and for short-term sexual relationships; Gildersleeve et al., 2014). Further, there is evidence supporting male secondary sex traits as being effectively intimidating for other males (Scott et al., 2014) and attractive for females (Puts, 2010; Fink et al., 2007).

While most studies for sexual selection theory were conducted before the year 2000, research has continued to develop in this area. Relatively recent studies have explored whether physical attractiveness is related to reproductive success in males and females living in industrialized settings (Pawlowski et al., 2008; Jokela, 2009; Prokop & Fedor, 2011). Pawlowski et al.(2008) reported no relationship between physical attractiveness and fertility in Polish females. A study on Slovakian male reproductive success found that married males have higher reproductive success than single males, and that married males with higher facial attractiveness had more reproductive success than less attractive males (Prokop & Fedor, 2011). In a 2009 study conducted in the USA, researchers identified that physical attractiveness is sometimes more predictive of reproductive success in females and males,

however, the directionality of the relationship for both genders regarding physical attractiveness and subsequent number of children in the US is weak and requires future study (Jokela, 2009). A 2019 study reported evidence that males are more attracted to physical signs of physical and sexual maturity of females who have not been pregnant (i.e., the waist hip ratio), and that the waist hip ratio is linked to pregnancy and higher blood levels of docosahexaenoic acid that promotes fetal brain development (Lassek & Gaulin, 2019). There are two potential explanations for these varied findings: one is that physical attractiveness is simply a preference and that those with preferred traits are more likely to be selected for reproduction or have more opportunities (and potential partners) for it, and the other is that physical attractiveness is sometimes linked to fertility in males and females but hard to consistently detect. Nevertheless, these explanations fit with the notion that desirable traits are passed down genetically and that offspring seek partners with similar desirable traits (Darwin, 1859).

Assortative and Disassortative Mating. Assortative mating is a form of sexual selection in which those with similar characteristics mate with one another more frequently (Thiessen & Gregg, 1980). This is evident in qualities that people seek in potential partners regardless of biological sex. For males and females, the highest valued characteristics of potential partners are “kind/considerate,” “likes children,” and “easygoing/adaptable” (Buss & Barnes, 1986, p. 568). In people, assortative mating would include people with athletic physiques partnering exclusively with others with athletic physiques, blonde haired people partnering with other blonde people, or dating within our own racial or ethnic group. Sexual selection theory and assortative mating have biological utility as they protect populations against extinction, however there are also limits, like inbreeding. To avoid inbreeding, there is

another mating style called disassortative mating that people engage in.

Disassortative mating is the partnering of people that have distinct traits from one another. In general, it is like the phrase “opposites attract” regarding relationships. There are benefits to disassortative mating (i.e., selecting partners with different traits) that are newly being explored: Individuals select their mates to increase variability of immune systems, increase genetic variance, and reduce inbreeding (Brown, 1995).

Evolutionary psychologists have explored interracial and inter-ethnic marriage as an avenue for human disassortative mating. During the early controversy of interracial marriage, opposers often questioned the health and safety of mixed-race offspring. However, monoracial children do not have marked physical or social benefits compared to biracial children (Campbell & Eggerling-Boeck, 2006). This is a particularly positive finding as interracial marriages and biracial children increase every year in the United States (U. S. Census Bureau, 2018). The rise of interethnic/interracial unions and healthy biracial offspring provide a counterpoint to the biological theory of assortative mating.

Evolutionary theory suggests that the areas in which males and females differ relate to ancestral sex roles. According to Reproductive Investment Theory (Symons, 1980), females’ physical attractiveness is closely linked to age and health to indicate their reproductive ability, whereas males’ reproductive capacity is not as easily evaluated from physical appearance, so male’s access to resources can provide material indicators of their reproductive worth. Due to these differences, females would need to exchange reproductive resources (i.e., pregnancy and birth) for the resources of physical protection and sustenance for themselves and their offspring during and after pregnancy. In this scenario the females would need to rely on the male partners to provide them resources that they would be less likely to obtain on their own.

Parental Investment Theory

Parental investment theory (Trivers, 1972) suggests that female mammals incur higher costs in reproduction than male mammals: The minimum parental investment by female humans involve long, uncomfortable pregnancy for nine months and potential breastfeeding and childcare for several years. On the contrary, the minimum parental investment by male humans involves the release of semen during sex. Trivers (1985) asserts that the greater the biological investment one makes in reproduction predicts greater voluntary investment. Before a child is born, the female has already made more of an investment in the offspring than the male through the biological process of pregnancy. Consistent with Trivers's theory, females would be more likely to invest resources in the offspring than males. Conversely, males would be less likely to invest resources in the offspring after childbirth. Further, females would be vulnerable and require protection during the recovery of childbirth and early childcare.

As females would make significant physical sacrifices during pregnancy and birth and be at the mercy of their environment and community after childbirth, the decision to reproduce would not be taken lightly. Females would be selective in exchanging reproductive resources for those allowing greater chances of survival and safety, like food and shelter. Because of these factors, female mammals are choosier than male mammals regarding reproductive partners due to long-term investment, and males are less choosy than females because they are not as biologically invested (Miller, 1998). This idea has been posited and has empirical support for female participants reporting more selectiveness than male participants (Kenrick et al.,1990). This is evident in the rates of single mothers compared to single fathers (Pew Research Center, 2013). Interestingly, this gap is decreasing, potentially suggesting that humans are adapting behaviorally in recent years.

Evolutionary Theory in Sexual Minorities

One complex area of evolutionary research and human partner selection relates to homosexual and heterosexual partner selection. This makes sense because the basis of evolutionary theory primarily involves reproduction. Research has explored differences in gay, lesbian, and heterosexual partners, biological sex, and age regarding partner selection. A 1987 study found that, while there were similarities between straight and gay mate selection, there were also significant differences when controlling for sexual orientation, suggesting that social factors are involved in choosing a mate (Howard et al., 1987). Bailey et al.(1994) found many similarities between gay, lesbian, and heterosexual participants when answering questions about partner selection: biological sex had a considerably greater impact on partner selection than sexual orientation. Similar scores between gay, lesbian, and heterosexual participants included interest in uncommitted sex, visual sexual stimuli, unimportance of partner's stats, importance of partner's physical attractiveness, and socio-sexuality (i.e., the willingness to engage in casual and uncommitted sexual relationships; Kinsey et al., 2003).

However, within the sexes, there is a difference in response style for gay, lesbian, and heterosexual participants: lesbian females are significantly more interested than heterosexual females in visual sexual stimuli (i.e., physical attractiveness) and significantly less concerned about their partner's status (Bailey et al., 1994). In males, gay participants weighed sexual jealousy relatively less and cared less about their partner's youth than heterosexual participants (Bailey et al., 1994). A 2013 study found that age preferences of potential mates differ between gay, lesbian, and straight populations within the male and female sexes (Burrows, 2013). So, evolutionary research on human partner selection finds more differences between biological sexes than within the biological sexes even when accounting for sexual

orientation. A 2007 study by Gobrogge et al.identified similarities and differences between straight and gay male partner selection, notably that gay males sought sexual encounters more than straight males, and that straight and gay males seeking sexual encounters preferred a significantly wider age range of partners than males seeking long-term relationships. These findings suggest that partner preferences are independent from the drive to procreate, and that male partner selection differs depending on the type of desired relationship.

Russock (2011) conducted a similar study and found that gay males seek physical attractiveness more than heterosexual males and offered resources less than heterosexual males, suggesting that some gay male preferences are inconsistent with evolutionary theory. Further, lesbian and heterosexual females differed in preferences for age, physical attractiveness, resources, and commitment (Russock, 2011). Further, a 2011 study found that transgender mate selection was not influenced by the gender or sexual identity of transgender participants (Forde, 2011). These findings suggest that research about human partner selection is hard to generalize by biological sex and may be limited to cisgender, heterosexual reproductive patterns.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Evolutionary Theory

There is substantial research in line with evolutionary theory of human partner selection. However, there are limitations in the research both physically and socially. Humans lack physical evidence of the evolution of typical competitive mating behaviors. Humans lack the canine tooth distinction of most primates with intense male-male mate competition (Puts, 2016). People tend to exhibit biparental care and social monogamy, phenomena consistent with species of low-level male mating competition, in addition to the concealed ovulation of females (Puts, 2016). Collectively, research suggests that males and females vary more

between sexes than within sexes when it comes to partner selection, regardless of sexual orientation. There are limits to the utility of sexual selection theory regarding those who do not seek heterosexual partnership, partners that differ significantly from one another in preferred traits, along with those who are seeking partnership without reproduction. There are also sociocultural differences in human partner selection, suggesting that there are more than biological factors at play.

Social Exchange Theory

Social exchange theory was largely studied in the late 1900s and early 2000s, and there is a lack of updated research on social exchange theory in romantic relationships. Nevertheless, this theory is foundational to understanding social factors related to human partner selection. Social exchange theory suggests that people use a cost-benefit analysis to determine how to progress in interpersonal relationships (Cook & Emerson, 1987). If the costs of a relationship are higher than the rewards, the relationship may be discontinued or changed so that more rewards can be pursued (Sprecher, 1998). This exchange is thought to be foundational of all relationships between people within society like exchanging money for goods and services, or exchanging time for positive social interaction (Chavannes, 1901).

Social exchange theory is supported in studies regarding roommates disclosing rewarding things to one another (Auld & Case, 1997) and romantic relationships between those of different financial classes, educational status, or racial/ethnic background (Kalmijn, 1993). In relationships, social exchange can be conceptualized as patterns of transactions of valued resources between partners, culminating in dyadic or individual outcomes (McDonald, 1981; Nakonezney & Denton, 2008). Online daters also report presenting themselves in a way to maximize reward from potential dates by editing their photos, lying about their appearance,

or presenting themselves to be wealthier than they are (Shtatfeld & Barak, 2009). Social exchange theory suggests that partner selection involves dynamic mechanisms involved with their situation and cultural context, like economic support for both partners and social cooperation (Jaffe, 2002; Stafford, 2017). Within the framework of social exchange theory, human partner selection is influenced by one's social context and the fair exchange of romantic relationship resources.

Research about romantic couples suggests that couples who receive favorable rewards from each other are more likely to be satisfied with their marriage (Homans, 1974; Sprecher, 2001). Further, the harmony of a marital relationship is dependent on both past experiences and future expectations of rewards and costs in relationship exchanges (Levinger & Snoek, 1972). In romantic relationships, social exchange involves the transfer of resources between partners like attention, sexual intercourse, financial resources, and physical protection.

Relatively recent research has added nuance to the notion of social exchange theory in romantic relationships. For example, intimate relationships might be distinct from other social relationships because of their complex nature. A proposed update for social exchange theory in relationships would account for the expectations, available resources, social norms and values, trust, and commitment within the relationship, controlling for cultural and gender norms (Chiang et al., 2013). Additional research supports this notion, as there are significant differences between the genders in interracial and interethnic romantic pairings in Western countries like the United States and United Kingdom, noting different reported attractiveness as well (Lewis, 2012).

Status-Caste Exchange Theory

Another type of social exchange is status-caste (i.e., social status – racial class)

exchange (Davis, 1941; Merton, 1941). This theory suggests that in interracial marriages, one partner's socioeconomic status is exchanged for the other's racial caste status. Davis (1941) and Merton (1941) argued that dating pattens in areas with the strong focus on social status (i.e., marrying in order to move up within caste systems) in Eastern cultures likely occur in Western culture as well. The researchers defined the high-caste population in the United States to be White people, and they defined the low-caste population in the United States to be Black people, predicting that marriage between high-status Black people and lower-status White people would represent an informal exchange in that the higher socioeconomic status of the Black spouse would compensate the White spouse for the loss of social standing that the White spouse would experience for marrying out of their racial group. This idea was adapted by later researchers to a generalized exchange theory (Ekeh, 1974; Levi- Strauss, 1969; Bearman, 1997).

Generalized Exchange Theory

Generalized exchange theory suggests that marrying outside of one's racial group does not require any involvement of the partners' socioeconomic status because of its potential benefits for interracial harmony in a community. Upon reviewing both theories, Rosenfield (2005) found that American mate selection mirrors status-caste exchange theory more than generalized exchange theory, likely due to the tension between Black and White populations in America. Additional research supports this conclusion of status-caste exchange and its social complications. Non-White males report disapproval from their White female partner's friends and family, and White females report disapproval for dating members of low status groups. Further, White females anticipate disapproval for dating non-whites if their parents are prejudiced (Miller et al., 2004). The majority of people hesitant to date outside of their race

cite family and society as primary deterrents to interracial romantic relationships (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000).

Social Factors in Partner Selection

The influence of social factors on human partner selection is seen in marriage, divorce, remarriage, and dating in different age groups. First, contradictory to the evolutionary idea that males prioritize potential fertility of their partner, divorced females with children are less likely to remarry than divorced females without children (Buckle et al., 1996). Regarding older adults, social factors play into partner preferences, namely the age and income of older females who tend to care less about the age, income, and status of potential partners (McIntosh et al., 2011; Alterovitz & Mendelsohn, 2011). However, older male and female adults are more selective than younger adults when regarding the age, race, religion, income, and height of a prospective dating partner, and the older adults are willing to travel much farther than younger adults to meet the right partner (McIntosh et al., 2011). Recent research suggests that older adults' likelihood to marry, remarry, or date is very low compared to younger adults (Raterman, 2013).

Another social factor involved in human partner selection is education. Educated individuals are more likely to date outside of their cultural group, prioritize education over race/ethnicity in a potential partner, and be less likely to use resources seeking a partner of the same ethnicity (Chiswick, & Houseworth, 2011). Further, people prefer higher levels of intelligence and education of prospective long-term partners than short-term partners, and higher educated people tend to marry later in life with a decreased risk of divorce than couples with lower education (Buunk et al., 2002). These findings suggest that short and long-term romantic relationships are socially influenced. So, it is unlikely that human partner selection is

fully explained by biological theories.

While there is substantial evidence supporting the role of social factors in partner selection, there are limits to their implications: social factors are more individualized, complicating empirical observation of large groups. Further, social factors are experienced differently by people of different ages and genders. Lastly, social factors are often implicit to those who are affected by them, so their influence can be tough to study. For example, potential rewards and costs to a relationship may be hard for partners to consider within their community. Within this social framework, potential partners may be attracted to each other and willing to pursue a relationship with one another, but experience obstacles to attaining such relationship in society.

Strengths and Weaknesses of Social Theories of Partner Selection

Researchers have attempted to integrate the theories of sexual selection and social exchange. Biologically based theories may be better at understanding partner selection cross-culturally. Social psychologically based theories are better at understanding such trends over time, in particular contexts, and across age groups while accounting for demographic characteristics (Kenrick et al., 1990). There is substantial evidence for both evolutionary and social influence on human partner selection, however neither theory can sufficiently account for it completely. The integration of these theories allows for more flexibility and applicability in partner selection research within and across cultures. Integrating the ideas and evidence of evolutionary theory of partner selection and social theory of partner selection would benefit future research by accounting for universal human trends in partner selection while accounting for sociocultural influences that cause differences in human behavior to better understand and predict human partner selection (Shoemake, 2007).

Patterns in Partner Selection

Physical Attractiveness in Partner Selection

Facial Symmetry. Physical attractiveness has some shared cross-cultural attributes. For example, people tend to find symmetrical faces attractive. When people view images of people of the opposite sex with their faces modified to show various levels of facial symmetry, the viewers' ratings of physical attractiveness of the faces change (Light et al., 1981). Female faces with more than average symmetry are perceived by males as more attractive than those with average symmetry. Interestingly, males that are considered average in their facial symmetry are more physically attractive to female raters than male faces considered above average in their facial symmetry (Cunningham et al., 1995; Grammar & Thornhill, 1994). However, most cultures find symmetrically average faces attractive as well, allowing a range of normal variation in facial symmetry. Across cultures, symmetrically average faces are consistently rated as more attractive than symmetrically or asymmetrically distinctive faces (Light et al., 1981; Morris & Wickham, 2001; O'Toole et al., 1994; Rhodes & Tremewan, 1996; Rhodes et al., 1999, 2005; Vokey & Read, 1992). Meta-analyses demonstrate a large effect of averageness in facial symmetry on attractiveness for both male and female faces (Rhodes, 2006). To summarize, people prefer faces that are less distinctive than others as long as they fit within the normal variation of facial symmetry, suggesting that physical attractiveness is more complex than previously assumed.

Cultural Differences and Physical Attractiveness. Some cultures differ in what they find attractive. For example, many male raters report that female representations of colorful skin, thick lips, and large eyes to be youthful looking. Youthful-looking female faces are often perceived by male raters as more attractive than older-looking female faces, regardless of the

actual age of photographed female subjects (Jones et al., 1995). However, this finding varies depending on the racial/ethnic background of the individual rater. For example, Asian raters prefer females with less sexual maturity in their faces (i.e., high cheekbones) than White and Hispanic raters, even when controlling for cultural customs of Asian countries (Cunningham et al., 1995).

Across 28 countries, heterosexual males report differences in preferred facial femininity for White females (i.e., facial features more related to being female such as large lips and high cheekbones compared to masculine features like strong jawlines), accounting for the countries' health conditions, male desire for short-term or long-term relationships, male sexual motivation, and whether the country reinforces the perception of facial femininity as an indicator for maternal tendencies, maternal investment, and parental qualities (i.e., large women are good at cooking and can feed a child; Marcinkowska et al., 2014). These findings suggest that desirable traits of a society influence the perception of physical attractiveness on an individual level.

Race and Ethnicity and Physical Attractiveness. Regarding other physical features (i.e., buttocks, breasts), there are racial and ethnic differences in perceived physical attractiveness like large Black women being rated as more attractive than large White women (Hebl & Heatherton, 1997). Further, there is no stable preference for female breast size for both male and female raters (Furnham & Swami, 2007). Preference in skin color also varies across culture and time, with males tending to be consistent in rating dark and light female depictions equally regarding physical attractiveness (Dixson et al., 2007; Singer & Beyer, 2008), with mixed-race and Black male faces being rated as more attractive than White male faces, and White female faces being rated as more attractive than mixed or Black female faces, with a significant overall

preference for mixed-race individuals in Western countries compared to Eastern countries (Lewis, 2010). Further, there is no general preference for people's own race in perceiving physical attractiveness of others in multicultural societies, regardless of biological sex (Burke et al., 2013). These findings suggest that it is common for people to find others attractive even when they have distinct physical features from themselves and that may contrast with the context in which they grew up.

Sexual Dimorphism and Physical Attractiveness. Sexual dimorphism – the differentiation between male and female sex characteristics that make up physical masculinity and femininity – is another contributor to physical attractiveness (Jones & Jaeger, 2019). Examples of sexual dimorphism in humans include males typically being taller and larger than females, and females carrying different proportions of fat and muscle than males. Sexual dimorphic traits are related to physical attractiveness for male perceptions of females (Perrett et al., 1998). Overall, femininity is strongly attractive across many studies, with large effect sizes regardless of race (Rhodes, 2006). However, the relationship between masculinity and female-perceived male physical attractiveness is less clear. Ratings of masculinity correlate positively with female-rated attractiveness, but these associations are weaker for masculinity than for male-rated femininity. These findings suggest that there is probably an optimal, moderate level of masculine traits for females to determine male physical attractiveness (Rhodes, 2006). This suggests that physical attractiveness is difficult to measure and that our perception of it is fluid.

Health and Physical Attractiveness. Evolutionary psychologists suggest that physical attractiveness is a sign of genetic fitness. This is supported by findings about physical attractiveness and intelligence scores in children (Kanazawa, 2011), fertility (Stephen & Tan, 2015) and physiological health like body mass index and blood pressure (Stephen et al., 2017).

Sexual selection theory posits that preferences evolve to enhance reproductive success and those specific traits signal partner quality (Barrett et al., 2002). Regarding attractiveness and health, meta-analyses suggest a weak relationship with mental health and a moderate association with physical health (Feingold, 1992; Langlois et al., 2000). Facial masculinity is weakly associated with male adolescent health (Rhodes et al., 2003), however there is no relationship between femininity and health. There is little evidence that facial symmetry is related to health in humans despite its large role in female attractiveness (Rhodes, 2006). These findings suggest that physical attractiveness may be more of a preference than an indicator for good genes.

Socioeconomic Status in Partner Selection

Socioeconomic status plays a role in partner selection (Karney, 2021). When considering long-term romantic partners, females place more importance on socioeconomic status more than males do (Buss, 1989; Buss & Barnes, 1986; Khallad, 2005; Sprecher et al., 1994; Wiederman, 1993). However, when given a direct choice between a potential partner with high socioeconomic status or high physical attractiveness, females are equally willing to choose one of the two options, and males report greater willingness to accept offers to engage with physically attractive potential partners (Greitemeyer, 2005). These findings suggest that there are differences in human partner selection between the male and female sexes.

Socioeconomic status of the single person matters in partner selection. For example, individuals with high socioeconomic status are more likely to divorce and pursue other potential romantic partners (Fu, 2006). Culture influences partner selection as well, when controlling for age. Spanish females under 40 seek mainly physical attractiveness in males, whereas those over 40 seek mainly socioeconomic status (Gil-Burmann et al., 2002). Socioeconomic status plays a different role in partner selection depending on the term of the

relationship. For short-term romantic relationships, both males and females are likely to prioritize physical attractiveness over socioeconomic status (Greitemeyer, 2005; Li et al., 2013), whereas males and females are likely to differ in trait priorities for long-term relationships (Li et al., 2013). So, dating is a different experience for males and females when it comes to finding a partner.

The role of socioeconomic status also changes in relationship levels (i.e., marriage, serious relationship, falling in love, casual sex, and sexual fantasies; Buunk et al., 2002). For both males and females, the lower the level of relationship involvement, the lower the preferred levels of education, physical attractiveness, and intelligence of the prospective partner. Regarding sexual fantasies, both males and females preferred mates higher in physical attractiveness than those they preferred in real partners. For marriage, males preferred physical attractiveness of their partner to be greater than their own. Females preferred partners who had higher income, education, social position than themselves (Buunk et al., 2002). These findings suggest that females are more likely to consider social factors of their potential partnership than males.

Race and Ethnicity in Partner Selection. The vast majority of American married couples are intra-racial or intra-ethnic – married within the same group of race or ethnicity (U.S. Census Bureau, 2018). Although there is no difference in marital satisfaction between those who are in a same-group or cross-group relationship (Henderson & Braithwaite, 2021), cross-group (i.e., interracial/interethnic) partnerships are substantially less common. This may be attributed to individual factors or systemic factors. When examining differences between cultures and partner selection, Chen and Austin (2017) found that external influences accounted for a significant amount of the variation in perceived necessary traits of potential partners (i.e., peer/parental

influence, media representation of partner selection). Cross-group romantic relationships face many social challenges from both the majority and minority racial/ethnic groups in the United States. Some individuals feel hesitant to engage in cross-group relationships because of potential disapproval (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000). A 1995 study found that many cross-group couples experience social pressure to represent successful cross-group relationships and defend their relationships against racism or prejudice (Rosenblatt et al.,1995).

Social attitudes towards cross-group relationships are complicated. When comparing predominantly White universities with historically Black universities, Field et al. (2013) found that Black students disapproved of interracial dating more than White students. When responding to the statement "My parents think it is good for African Americans and Whites to date," 54.5% of students at historically Black universities said their parents would disagree or strongly disagree with that statement, compared to 41% of students from predominantly White universities (Field et al., 2013, p. 762). This finding is particularly concerning because, at both types of universities, students currently in same-group relationships reported the lowest level of approval for Black/White relationships (Field et al., 2013). These findings suggest that negative social attitudes toward cross-group relationships are present in American society and are likely a prevalent issue for cross-group couples, but that they differ for specific racial pairings (i.e., Asian individuals may be more accepted as interracial daters in the United States than Black individuals), suggesting that cross-group partner selection is complex for individuals to navigate within their social context.

Replication and Original Study

Psychology is facing a crisis of scientific replication. Replication studies are needed in the field of psychology to increase confidence in alleged scientific findings (Makel et al.,

2012; Earp & Trafimow, 2015). The need for replicated findings has been discussed for decades by social scientists; however, scientific claims continue to go unchecked due to the perception that replication studies are less rigorous and prestigious than upcoming, original projects (Smith, 1970; Mulkay & Gilbert, 1986).

In the present study, we replicated the work of Townsend and Levy (1990). We chose this study because it has been cited over 100 times by evolutionary and social psychologists as a reference for male and female dating patterns. In sum, the findings suggest that females prioritize socioeconomic status in evaluating a potential dating partner and that males prioritize physical attractiveness. There is supporting evidence of these ideas in evolutionary psychology, however social psychology suggests that context plays a larger role in partner selection than researchers previously believed, as well as recent research on mating selection in which partner preferences have changed in their levels of prioritization (i.e., domestic skills; financial prospects; Buss et al., 2001). Perhaps 30 years later, partner preferences have changed in the Digital Age and differences between genders have leveled out, or perhaps they have persisted over time. The methods used by Townsend and Levy were limited to their context and their findings may not have been generalizable today as technology has rapidly updated (i.e., changing from the use of Black and White photos and gathering responses of individuals in classroom groups to individuals independently viewing colored photos via computer screen at home). The original sample was limited to college-educated, unmarried adults aged 18-21 and may not apply to other populations. Further, the economic situation of 2022 in the United States is quite different from 1990, so the role of socioeconomic status might play a different role in partner selection today.

The value in replicating this study was to revisit a topic that has been debated for

years in the field: how do physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status influence human partner selection? This study answers this question and assesses generalizability of these findings across demographic characteristics like age, race/ethnicity, sexual orientation, education, biological sex, and gender. Further, this study contributes valuable information to the field of psychology by practicing empirical replication, supporting scientific transparency, and ethical research practices. Finally, Townsend and Levy (1990) and the present study measured romantic partner selection, an ever-relevant concept in human behavior that continues to be studied. For these reasons, this current study contributes to understanding the replicability of the methods, contexts, and theories that social scientists' base human partner selection research on.

Townsend and Levy (1990) conducted their study to understand better sex differences in partner selection regarding socioeconomic status and physical characteristics of potential partners. The study had three aims. The first aim was to explore biological sex differences in the willingness to enter into various kinds of relationships and the influence of physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status of the potential partner on the participants' level of willingness. Second, the study aimed to precisely define the relative effects of physical attractiveness and status in different types of relationships and the interactional effects of these factors on partner selection between men and women. The third aim was to use the findings to test predictions generated by parental investment theory (i.e., various ways that socioeconomic status and physical attractiveness affect willingness to enter romantic relationships between men and women).

The Present Study

Our study had two aims. First, we empirically replicated the study of Townsend and Levy (1990) about partner selection based on physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status between males and females. Second, we extended the work of Townsend and Levy by utilizing a broader sample and gathered rich demographic data to account for sociocultural characteristics in partner selection 30 years since the original study was conducted. Townsend and Levy (1990) reported four hypotheses in their study, which we tested:

1. Males report more willingness than females to enter relationships that specifically involve sexual intercourse.

2. Physical attractiveness of partners affects both sexes' stated desire to enter into relationships of varying levels of sexual intimacy and marital potential. Still, physical attractiveness is a better predictor of males' willingness to enter relationships that specifically involved sexual intercourse or marital potential.

3. The socioeconomic status of potential partners is a better predictor of females' reported willingness than of males' stated desire to enter all proposed types of relationships.

4. Sex differences in the effects on partner selection of potential partner's status increase sexual involvement or marital potential of relationships increase. (pp. 151-152)

For the extension of this study, we hypothesized that the willingness to engage in various relationships with a potential cross-group partner would be influenced differently by socioeconomic status and physical attractiveness than the desire for a prospective same-group partner as a reflection of social attitudes toward cross-group relationships.

Methods

The present study included a direct replication of Townsend and Levy's (1990) study and an extension question not included in the original study. We examined these questions using a

more current approach to data collection, subject recruitment, and modernized representation of partner selection in the digital age.

Study Replication and Extension

Subjects

To appropriately replicate the work of Townsend and Levy (1990), American adults were recruited to participate. Townsend and Levy (1990) recruited 212 unmarried, female students between the ages of 18 and 21, and 170 unmarried, male students between the ages of 18 and 21. In line with the original study, we recruited 248 single (never married) self-reported female adults and 255 single (never married) self-reported male adults. While we did not use a strictly college sample, this sample is appropriate because Townsend and Levy's original sample was never married, single adults. Further, we compared the responses of student and non-student participants to identify any group differences. The extension of this study includes adults of all educational backgrounds and various ages to broaden our sample of diverse, adult participants. We recruited participants online via an online participant sourcing platform, CloudResearch (formerly TurkPrime; see Litman et al., 2017), utilizing their Prime Panels feature to promote high quality responses from participants within our targeted demographic (Chandler et al., 2019). We recruited adults of all ages, all education levels, and from four racial/ethnic groups: White, Black, Asian, and Latinx/Hispanic/of Spanish descent. We recruited these groups because they are the largest racial/ethnic groups in the United States, and to ensure large enough groups to statistically identify meaningful differences between the groups. Our recruitment procedures allowed us to explore partner selection in a broader, more nationally representative population. This tested the theory of sexual selection in people of various backgrounds, and their willingness to date within/outside of their own racial or ethnic group. We financially compensated the

participants for their participation, at approximately $2.00 per 10–15-minute survey. Participants signed an electronic informed consent form before the study, informing them that they would be answering questions about their dating preferences and that they were free to withdraw from the study participation at any time.

We recruited 503 single, adult, American participants. The sample was predominantly people aged 25-44 years old. There were 255 male participants and 248 female participants. Our sample was predominantly straight (83.9%), followed by bisexual (13.3%), gay (1.6%), and lesbian (1.2%). Of the 503 participants, 227 (45.1%) were White, 124 (24.7%) were Black, 94 (18.7%) were Hispanic/Latinx/of Spanish descent, and 58 (11.5%) were Asian. Most of the sample had completed high school and some college. The majority of the sample was employed at least part-time at the time of study completion. Most of the participants reported an annual income of less than $35,000. Most participants lived in a large city or suburb near a large city at the time of study completion.

Data about gender identity and self-reported biological sex were obtained in this study. Our sample did not yield any “other” or “intersex” responses for biological sex. To streamline the study’s aim of understanding the role of biological sex in partner selection, the variable “biological sex” was used in main data analyses, and results will be discussed using the words “male” and “female” for participant response styles.

Instruments

One hundred and fifty photographs were selected from The Chicago Face Database (Ma et al., 2015). These faces were for physical attractiveness by the software developers. 36 male and 36 female photographs were selected on the basis of their mean ratings of high, medium, and low levels of attractiveness. We utilized the Chicago Face Database to select photos of White,

Black, Asian, and Hispanic/Latinx subjects for our test conditions. Each racial or ethnic group included four conditions for attractiveness and socioeconomic status: High Physical Attractiveness, High Salary; Low Physical Attractiveness, Low Salary; High Physical Attractiveness, Low Salary; Low Physical Attractiveness, High Salary. We used colored photos to explore any differences in perceived race (skin tone) or ethnicity (cultural background) that could be ambiguous in greyscale photos. This extends the original study that only featured greyscale photos.

We asked participants the same six questions used from the original study (Townsend & Levy, 1990):

(1) I would have a cup of coffee and a casual conversation with a person like this.

(2) I would go out on a date with a person like this.

(3) I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.

(4) I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.

(5) I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.

(6) I would be willing to marry a person like this.

Procedure

Participants signed informed consent documents and had the option to provide demographic characteristics (e.g., biological sex, race, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, income, and relationship status). Participants were asked about their typical attraction to masculine presenting persons, feminine presenting persons, or both. Online participants viewed 16-32 photographs of people, along with the same instructions and socioeconomic descriptions

as Study One. However, based on the participant's responses to their sexual orientation and typical partner attraction, they were presented with potential partners of cisgender men, cisgender women, or both. For a self-reported female, heterosexual participant, who reports typically being attracted to masculine persons, the following item was presented.

> Please read the following description and answer the following questions pertaining to it and the picture you are about to see.
>
> (1) This young man is training to be a doctor/high school teacher/waiter. He is doing quite well and plans to stick with it. When he finishes his training and gets established, he will make about 165,000/46,000/30,000 dollars a year.

Self-reported male heterosexual participants would read the same socioeconomic status descriptions in which she/her pronouns and nouns are substituted. These status descriptions were selected because they represent upper middle-class, middle-class, and working-class incomes and occupational statuses, according to recent U. S. Census Data (2019) and because they all have large numbers of both men and women presently working in each field. The salaries and occupations have been updated from Townsend and Levy's (1990) study that used 1980 Census Data. For reported bisexual and typically attracted to "both masculine and feminine" persons, photographed subjects of men and women were included in the questions and presented. For lesbian participants, photographed female subjects were presented in the study. For gay participants, photographed male subjects were presented in the study.

All subjects completed the six partner-selection questions using the same Likert agree-disagree scale as the original study: (1) *strongly agree;* (2) *agree;* (3) *undecided;* (4) *disagree;* (5) *strongly disagree.*

Study Design

We used a cross-sectional online study design to gather sufficient information from research participants at a single time point so that the study was attractive for prospective participants to choose, and so participants could complete the questions in a timely manner. We required at least 64 participants to properly power this study at 80% with a potential effect size of $d = 0.5$, $p < .05$. We recruited significantly more participants than indicated by the power analysis, with a total of 503 participants.

Data Analysis

We analyzed four independent variables (photographed subject's biological sex, socioeconomic status, physical attractiveness, race/ethnicity) and the answers to six questions regarding willingness to engage in relationships with photographed people (the six items on the willingness questionnaire) to identify their influence with a repeated measures analysis of variance (ANOVA). To better understand our findings, we independently analyzed these variables with post hoc pairwise comparisons and parameter estimates.

To assess for inter-ethnic or inter-racial relationship willingness, we coded the subjects' race and ethnicity from 1 to 4 as White, Black/African American, Asian, and Hispanic/Latinx, respectively. We measured differences between participants' reported willingness to engage in relationships within or across their own racial/ethnic group by comparing the coding of the participant's race/ethnicity with that of the photographed subjects in each test condition. To control for any potential effects of the order of photos presented, each participant was first presented with photos of potential partners of their own racial/ethnic group, then the remaining racial/ethnic groups followed.

Results

Our study has two aims. The first is to replicate the work of Townsend and Levy's (1990) study regarding biological sex and partner selection. The second is to extend their research by examining whether race or ethnicity influences partner selection behavior. We tested five hypotheses, the first four being replicas from the original study:

1. Male participants will report more willingness than female participants to enter relationships that specifically involve sexual intercourse.
2. The physical attractiveness of potential partners will affect both sexes' desire to enter into all types of relationships (e.g., dating, relationship, hookup). Still, physical attractiveness will be a better predictor of male willingness to enter relationships that specifically involved sexual intercourse or marital potential, because of the interaction between attractiveness and sexual opportunity.
3. The socioeconomic status of potential partners will be a better predictor of willingness to enter all kinds of relationships for female participants than male participants.
4. Differences between male and female willingness to enter relationships will increase as the level of sexual involvement and/or marital potential of relationships increase.

The fifth research question extends the original study by investigating the role of race and ethnicity on partner selection:

1. Willingness to engage in various relationships with a potential cross-group partner will be influenced differently by socioeconomic status and physical attractiveness than the desire for a prospective same-group partner. We predict that there will be a

difference between partner selection for one's own racial/ethnic group than another group.

The present design contained four independent variables: sex subject, level of socioeconomic status, race/ethnicity, and pre-rated level of physical attractiveness. It yielded six dependent variables: participants' responses to the six relationship willingness questions. These responses were investigated via repeated-measures analyses of variance: 2 (biological sex of subject) X 2 (level of ascribed status) X 2 (pre-rated level of physical attractiveness) X 4 (race/ethnicity of subject).

The following analyses were conducted in IBM SPSS 28 Statistics. To answer the research questions, we conducted a series of repeated measures ANOVA. For our study, we used a 3x4 design for between-subjects variables (i.e., biological sex, sexual orientation, and race/ethnicity), and used four within-subjects variables (race/ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status, physical attractiveness) to investigate the dependent variable of relationship willingness. This variable had 96 factor levels to evaluate 96 conditions and responses of participants (i.e., 6 relationship questions for each category: high attractiveness, high salary; high attractiveness, low salary; low attractiveness, high salary; low attractiveness, low salary). These analyses were conducted to evaluate the effects of physical attractiveness, socioeconomic status, and race on relationship willingness in six conditions: casual conversation, dating, sex, serious relationship, serious sexual relationship, and marriage. Planned Post hoc pairwise comparisons and parameter estimates were observed to evaluate participant responses at the item level.

Research Question 1: Male Adults Report More Willingness Than Female Adults to Enter Relationships That Specifically Involve Sexual Intercourse

Results of a repeated measures ANOVA measured responses to items explicitly indicated a potential sexual relationship: item 3 “I would be willing to have sex with a person like this,” and item 5 “I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.” Results of the ANOVA indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female willingness to pursue sexual relationships (F = .878, p = 0.349, ηp2 = .002). These results remained insignificant when we compared race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation.

The results of Research Question 1 indicate that there is no significant difference between male and female willingness to enter sexual relationships. This finding is distinct from that of Townsend and Levy’s original study (1990). These findings suggest that males and females are not motivated by theories suggested by evolutionary psychology like sexual selection and parental investment theory. This may be explained by more egalitarian attitudes toward male and female adults today when compared to 1990 and agrees with literature about sociocultural factors of human partner selection.

Research Question 2: Physical Attractiveness of Partners Affects Both Sexes’ Stated Desire to Enter into Relationships of Varying Levels of Sexual Intimacy and Marital Potential. Still, Physical Attractiveness is a Better Predictor of Men’s Willingness to Enter Relationships That Specifically Involved Sexual Intercourse or Marital Potential

Results of this analysis identified that overall, there is no significant difference in the response patterns of male and female participants regarding physical attractiveness and partner selection (F = .443, p = .506, ηp 2 = .001). However, at the item level, we discovered some differences in the response styles of male and female participants (See Table 6 – page 155) for parameter estimates). When presented with a photo of a White person with high attractiveness

and high salary, male participants were significantly less willing to have a cup of coffee with the subject than female participants (B = .3.250, p = 0.016, 95% CI [.618; 5.882], ηp2 = .012). We also identified sex difference in responding to photos of a highly attractive, low salary, Asian subject. Male participants reported less willingness to have a cup of coffee with the subject than female participants (B = .3.250, p = 0.026, 95% CI [.105; 3.395], ηp2 = .009).

When participants were shown a photo of a low attractive, low salary Asian participant, male participants were significantly less willing to have a cup of coffee with the subject than female participants (B = .3.250, p = 0.039, 95% CI [.160; 6.340], ηp2 = .009). We also identified sex difference in responding to photos of a highly attractive, high salary, Black subject. Male participants reported less willingness to have a cup of coffee with the subject than female participants (B = 3.250, p = 0.018, 95% CI [.599; 6.401], ηp2 = .012). Similar findings were identified regarding photographed subjects that were low attractive, low salary, Black subjects (B = .3.500, p = 0.031, 95% CI [.321; 6.679], ηp2 = .010). Further, male participants were less willing than female participants to have a cup of coffee with a photographed high attractive, low salary, Latinx subject (B = 3.500, p = 0.020, 95% CI [.544; 6.456], ηp2 = .011). This was true for photographed low attractive, high salary, Latinx subjects (B = 3.500, p = 0.031, 95% CI [.320; 6.680], ηp2 = .010), and photographed high attractive, high salary, Latinx subjects (B = 3.500, p = 0.025, 95% CI [.448; 6.552], ηp2 = .011). For all other items about relationship willingness, there was no difference between male and female participant responses, regardless of physical attractiveness.

The results of Research Question 2 indicate that, overall, there is no difference between biological sex on willingness to pursue romantic or sexual relationships with hypothetical partners. Further, there is no significant difference in male willingness to have sexual encounters

with a hypothetical partner than female willingness. However, there is a difference between male and female participants for casual, platonic encounters. Males were significantly less willing to pursue casual encounters with hypothetical partners than females, regardless of the attractiveness level of the photographed subject. This suggests that males are less willing to pursue casual encounters with potential partners. This may be explained by sexual selection theory that asserts males being more sexually motivated than females in partner selection. Further, parental investment theory suggests that females are more selective with reproductive partner selection than males. Casual coffee may be an avenue for females to evaluate the potential benefit of reproducing with the photographed individual, so it would be beneficial to pursue a casual encounter to gather more information about the potential partner.

Research Question 3: The Socioeconomic Status of Potential Partners is a Better Predictor of Women's Reported Willingness Than of Men's Stated Desire to Enter All Proposed Types of Relationships

The results of our study indicate that, overall, there are no significant differences between the responses of male and female participants regarding socioeconomic status of potential partners. As mentioned in the response for Research Question 2, the general trend we found was that male participants reported less willingness for coffee and casual conversation encounters across various racial/ethnic, attractiveness, and socioeconomic lines.

Research Question 4: Sex Differences in the Effects on Partner Selection of Potential Partner's Status Increase Sexual Involvement or Marital Potential of Relationships Increase

The results of this study indicate no significant sex differences in male and female partner selection behavior. As reported in Research Question 2, the only significant difference found for

biological sex was less willingness for casual encounters for male participants across various test conditions.

Research Question 5: Willingness to Engage in Various Relationships with a Potential Cross-Group Partner Will be Influenced Differently by Socioeconomic Status and Physical Attractiveness Than for a Prospective Same-Group Partner

Overall, we found no significant difference between racial or ethnic groups' partner selection. However, at the item level, we found some interesting trends.

White Photographed Subjects

Regarding photographed White subjects with high attractiveness and low salary, White participants were significantly more willing than Asian and Latinx participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with the subject (MD = -1.028, p = .007; MD = -1.065, p = .002, respectively). White participants were also more willing than Latinx participants to date a person like this (MD = .924, p = .010). White participants were more willing than Asian and Latinx participants to have a serious relationship with a person like this (MD = -.984, p = .011; MD = -1.019; p = .004, respectively). White participants were more willing than Latinx participants to marry a person like this (MD = -.696, p =.048).

When presented with a low attractiveness, high salary White subject, White participants were more willing than Asian and Latinx participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with them (MD = -1.327, p = .001; MD = -1.116, p = .002, respectively), and for going on a date with the subject (MD = -1.335, p = .002; MD = -1.023, p = .008, respectively). White participants were more willing to have sex with a person like this than Asian participants (MD = -.988, p = .014) and Latinx participants (MD = -.807, p = .027). Black participants also reported more willingness than Asian participants to have sex with a person like this (MD = -

.944, p = .049). White participants were more willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this than Asian participants (MD = -1.136, p = .006) and Latinx participants (MD = -1.179, p = .002). White participants were more willing to have a serious sexual relationship with this subject than Latinx participants (MD = -.802, p = .034). White participants were also more willing than Asian and Latinx participants to marry this subject (MD = -1.078, p = .008; MD = -1.066, p = .004, respectively).

These results indicate that White participants tend to demonstrate more willingness than Latinx and Asian participants to pursue relationships with White subjects at various levels of physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status. Black participants were more willing than Asian participants to pursue relationships with White subjects. There was virtually no difference between White and Black willingness to pursue relationships with White subjects, nor was there a difference between Latinx and Asian relationship willingness for these subjects.

Asian Photographed Subjects

Pairwise comparisons indicate that White participants were more willing to pursue relationships with highly attractive, low salary Asian subjects than Latinx participants on specific items, including going out for coffee and going on a date (MD = -.723, p = .042; MD = -.743, p = .043, respectively). White participants were significantly more willing to pursue a serious relationship with a highly attractive, low salary Asian subject than Latinx participants (MD = -.873, p = .016). Regarding highly attractive, high salary Asian subjects, White participants reported more willingness than Latinx participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation (MD = -.970, p =.010). White participants and Asian participants reported more willingness than Latinx participants to go on a date with this subject (MD = -.776, p = .040; MD = -.899, p = .041, respectively). Regarding low attractiveness, low salary Asian subjects, White

participants reported significantly more willingness than Asian participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation (MD = -1.006, p = .018).

These results indicate that there is no difference between Black and White willingness for relationships with Asian subjects. There was an observed difference between White and Latinx relationships for these subjects at various levels of physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status. Further, under one test condition, White participants were more willing than Asian participants to have a social interaction with an Asian subject.

Black Photographed Subjects

Pairwise comparisons indicate that there were observed differences in participant responses by race and ethnicity under some conditions. Black participants were more willing than Latinx participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation, more willing to have a serious relationship, more willing to have a serious sexual relationship, and more willing to marry the highly attractive, low salary Black subject (MD = -.858, p = .047; MD = -1.005, p = .032; MD = -1.076, p = .023; MD = -1.138, p = .013, respectively).

Regarding low attractiveness, high salary Black subjects, participant responses varied between racial and ethnic groups. White participants and Black participants reported significantly more willingness than Asian participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with the subject (MD = -.888, p = .040; MD = -1.179, p = .023, respectively). When presented with photos of a highly attractive, high salary Black subject, White participants and Black participants reported more willingness than Latinx participants to go on a date with the subject (MD = -.812, p = .033; MD = -.978, p = .037, respectively).

These results indicate that there is no difference in White and Black relationship willingness with Black subjects across various levels of physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status. However, there were some test conditions in which Black relationship willingness was higher than Latinx and Asian participants.

Latinx Photographed Subjects

Pairwise comparisons indicate that participant responses varied under various conditions. When presented with a photographed low attractiveness, high salary Latinx subject, White participants were more willing than Asian participants to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with them (MD = -1.123, p = .010). Black participants were more willing than Asian participants to have coffee and casual conversation (MD = -1.189, p = .023) and to date this subject (MD = -.984, p = .049).

Regarding highly attractive, high salary Latinx subject, White participants reported significantly more willingness than Latinx participants to have a serious relationship with them (MD = -.769, p = .036). For low attractiveness, low salary Latinx subjects, White participants report more willingness to marry a person like this (MD = -.823, p = .021).

These results indicate that there were some differences in relationship willingness for Latinx subjects between each racial and ethnic group depending on test conditions. In some cases, White participants reported more willingness than Latinx participants to pursue relationships with Latinx subjects.

Comparing Student Responses to Non-Student Responses

The results of this study indicate that, overall, there was no significant difference between relationship willingness of adult college students compared to non-student adults ($F = 1.339$, $p =$

.150, ηp2 = .003). At the item level, we identified two differences. When presented with photos of highly attractive, high salary, White subjects, student participants reported more relationship willingness than non-student participants to have a serious relationship with this person (B = -1.616, p = .029, 95% CI [-3.069; -.162]). When presented with a photographed Latinx subject with high attractiveness and low salary, college students were more likely than non-student adults to report willingness to go on a date (B = -1.837, p = .012, 95% CI –3.266; -.407]). These differences suggest that there may be a difference in college and non-college adults in relationship willingness, however it is unclear what motivates these differences.

Discussion

Summary of the Evidence

This study is an empirical replication and extension of Townsend and Levy's (1990) study about human partner selection. We investigated five research questions about human partner selection. The first four of which were originally investigated in Townsend and Levy's original (1990) study. The fifth question extends the replication by investigating the role of race and ethnicity in human partner selection. The results of the original study did not replicate in our study. The results indicate that, overall, there is no difference between biological sex on willingness to pursue romantic or sexual relationships with hypothetical partners. Further, there is no significant difference in male willingness to have sexual encounters with a hypothetical partner than female willingness. However, there is a difference between male and female participants for casual, platonic encounters. Males were significantly less willing to pursue casual encounters with hypothetical partners than females, regardless of the attractiveness level, socioeconomic status, or race/ethnicity of the photographed subject.

Regarding race and ethnicity, overall, there was no significant difference in relationship willingness for same-group or cross-group relationships of the participants. We identified some interesting trends at the item level, particularly the tendency for Black participants to report more relationship willingness for Black subjects than Asian and Latinx participants, and White participants to report more relationship willingness for White subjects than Asian and Latinx participants. At the item level, there were several instances of Asian and Latinx participants reporting lower relationship willingness than Black and White participants. This might suggest more selectivity in partner selection, under certain conditions, by Asian Americans and Latinx Americans. However, this finding may be related to the fetishization of Asian and Latinx culture by White Americans in the United States (Stacey & Forbes, 2022; Azhar et al., 2021; Buggs, 2017; Silvestrini, 2020; Balzer Carr, 2021). In our study, there were several instances of White participants reporting higher levels of relationship willingness across socioeconomic status, physical attractiveness, and subject race or ethnicity. This might suggest less selectivity in partner selection, under certain conditions, by White Americans.

Comparison to Original Study

Research Question 1: Male Participants Will Report More Willingness Than Female Participants to Enter Relationships That Specifically Involve Sexual Intercourse. The original study reported significant difference in male and female relationship willingness when the questions included the mention of sex, and that this was the largest differences between the sexes. They concluded that males were significantly more willing to have a sexual relationship than female participants. This finding was not replicated in our study, nor was any significant difference found between the college sample and non-college sample. We found no significant difference between male and female willingness for sexual relationships.

The difference in our findings and those of Townsend and Levy reflect the complexity of human partner selection, particularly that it cannot be explained by evolutionary theory alone. Thus, finding challenges in evolutionary theory that males are more sexually motivated than females, suggesting that there are other factors at play including a potential partner's personal values and shared interests (Buss and Barnes, 1986). Given the time difference between the original study and the replication, it is possible that as social attitudes toward sex and relationships have changed for the sexes, that partner selection patterns have also changed. This suggestion is consistent with recent findings of changes in dating trends over the past 30 years (Souza et al., 2016).

Research Question 2: The Physical Attractiveness of Potential Partners Will Affect Both Sexes' Desire to Enter Into all Types of Relationships (E.G., Dating, Relationship, Hookup). Still, Physical Attractiveness Will be a Better Predictor of Male Willingness to Enter Relationships That Specifically Involved Sexual Intercourse or Marital Potential. The original study reported physical attractiveness significantly affected both sexes' willingness to enter all proposed types of relationships. They concluded that physical attractiveness may affect male and female relationship willingness depending on socioeconomic status, relationship type, or other personal factors. This finding was replicated in our study. We found no significant difference overall between male and female relationship willingness at various levels of physical attractiveness.

At the item level in planned post-hoc comparisons, we observed a slight difference between male and female participants for casual, platonic encounters under some test conditions. Males were significantly less willing to pursue casual encounters with hypothetical partners than females, regardless of the attractiveness level of the photographed subject. This suggests that

males are less likely to be willing to pursue casual encounters with potential partners. This finding differs from the original study in which no difference was observed between the participants on willingness for casual, platonic encounters.

This finding suggests that, under some circumstances, females are more willing than males to invest in a social relationship that is platonic. Within the framework of parental investment theory, this could be explained by females being more selective and willing than males to gather more information and be more selective about a potential partner when faced with a potential sexual relationship due to the costs of pregnancy, birth, and child-rearing. Socially, this finding may be explained by the persistence of gendered dating expectations for cisgender men and women (Lamont, 2021). For example, cismen are often expected to pay for a date with a woman and going against this script can cause awkward encounters (Lamont, 2020), so they may be more apprehensive to pursue a casual encounter with a potential partner. Nevertheless, the vast majority of test conditions observed no difference between male and female willingness to pursue casual encounters with a potential partner.

Research Question 3: The Socioeconomic Status of Potential Partners Will be A Better Predictor of Willingness to Enter All Kinds of Relationships for Female Participants Than Male Participants for all Types of Relationships. The original study reported significant support for this research question. The authors concluded that males are less influenced than females about the potential earning power and occupational status in a potential partner. Our study did not replicate this finding. We observed no significant differences between male and female relationship willingness regarding socioeconomic status of the potential partner.

Research Question 4: Sex Differences in the Effects on Partner Selection of Potential Partner's Status Will Increase as the Level of Sexual Involvement and/or Marital Potential

of Relationships Increase. The original study reported significant support for this research question, particularly that female responses were more influenced by socioeconomic status regarding the potential for sex and serious relationships, and that male responses were more influenced by physical attractiveness at higher levels of sexual involvement. These findings were not replicated in our study. We observed no significant difference between male and female relationship willingness under the majority of test conditions. As noted in the findings of Research Question Two, the only significant differences between male and female responses were found at the item level in which males were less likely than females to be willing for casual, platonic encounters.

The findings of our study replication are distinct from Townsend and Levy's (1990) study on human partner selection. While they found significant differences between the sexes regarding relationship willingness, physical attractiveness, and socioeconomic status, we found no significant differences between male and female relationship willingness across test conditions. The findings of Townsend and Levy may not have been replicated because of difference in methodology, gender roles and stereotypes that have changed over the past 32 years, and sample characteristics used in the present study.

Extension of Original Study

We extended the original study by investigating the role of race and ethnicity in human partner selection. We added a fifth research question: Willingness to engage in various relationships with a potential cross-group partner will be influenced differently by socioeconomic status and physical attractiveness than the desire for a prospective same-group partner. Our findings did not support this research question. The results of our study found that, overall, there is no difference between racial or ethnic groups' same-group or cross-group partner

selection. However, when focusing on participant responses to photographed subjects of various racial and ethnic backgrounds, we identified some differences at the item level under some test conditions.

We found that, when presented with photos of Black subjects, Black participants often reported more relationship willingness than Asian and Latinx participants. Regarding photographed White subjects, White participants often reported more willingness than Asian and Latinx participants. When presented with photographed Asian subjects, White participants sometimes reported more willingness than Latinx participants. And when presented with photographed Latinx participants, Black and White participants sometimes reported more relationship willingness than Asian and Latinx participants. These results indicate that there is generally no difference in partner selection for one's own racial or ethnic group compared to partner selection for another racial or ethnic group. However, under some circumstances, Latinx and Asian individuals may be less willing to pursue relationships with people of all racial/ethnic groups than Black or White individuals.

Comparison to Partner Selection Theories

The findings of this study are related to partner selection theories within biological and social frameworks. Biological frameworks largely suggest that human partner selection is influenced by gene selection for reproduction. Social frameworks suggest that partner selection is influenced by cooperation in society and varies across social and cultural context.

Biological Frameworks

Sexual selection theory asserts that males compete for quantity of females to reproduce, and that female compete for quality of males to reproduce (Daly & Wilson, 1983; Reynolds & Harvey, 1994; Trivers, 1985). Within this theory, females are more selective in partner selection

because there is more risk involved in their parental investment (Trivers, 1985; Puts, 2016). The results of our study are generally incongruent with this theory, as we observed no difference in male or female willingness for sexual relationships. However, our findings suggest that, under some specific test conditions, males are less willing than females to have casual, platonic encounters with potential partners. Within sexual selection theory, this finding could be explained by females investing more time than males to gather information about a potential partner before pursuing a serious relationship. However, due to the vastly insignificant differences between male and female relationship willingness found in the study, it may be that another variable could affect female and male willingness to pursue casual encounters, and that our study did not clearly identify it, and more research is needed to identify the differences between male and female attitude and behavior for platonic relationship willingness.

Assortative mating is a form of sexual selection in which those with similar characteristics mate with one another more frequently. This can include values that they share or physical characteristics they share. This type of mating can prevent extinction; however, mating with others that are too similar genetically can lead to inbreeding. Our findings suggest support for both assortative mating and disassortative mating in human partner selection. In some conditions for photographed White subjects and Black subjects, we observed preference for one's own racial group, supporting the theory of assortative mating. However, across photographed Latinx and Asian subjects, there was virtually no observed preference for one's own racial or ethnic group. In fact, across all conditions, most items yielded no significant difference between same-group and cross-group relationship willingness.

Overall, the results of our study suggest that assortative mating and disassortative mating are present in human behavior, and our overall findings have stronger evidence for disassortative

mating. Applications of this finding include recognizing the complexity of human mate selection, particularly that people are generally willing to date within and outside of their own racial/ethnic group and are affected by factors aside of physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status. While we find a few significant differences in mate selection under test conditions, it cannot be overstated that the vast majority of test conditions and participant characteristics demonstrated insignificant differences in relationship willingness. The challenges that individuals face in finding a mate are more likely affected by social factors than previously posited within biological frameworks.

Social Frameworks

Social exchange theory suggests that people use a cost-benefit analysis to determine how to progress in interpersonal relationships (Sprecher, 1998). Another type of social exchange is status-caste (i.e., social status – racial class) exchange (Davis, 1941; Merton, 1941). This theory suggests that in interracial marriages, one partner's socioeconomic status is exchanged for the other's racial caste status. Further, the majority of people hesitant to date outside of their race cite family and society as primary deterrents to interracial romantic relationships (Harris & Kalbfleisch, 2000). The results of our study indicate that there is no overall difference in human partner selection for same-group or cross-group relationships, suggesting that American individuals are comfortable with pursuing relationships across racial and ethnic lines.

Regarding cross-group (i.e., inter-ethnic or interracial) human mating behavior, the findings suggest societal attitudes influence willingness to pursue such relationships. This may be due to rising social acceptance and prevalence of cross-group relationships in American society (U.S. Census, 2018). With rising acceptance of such relationships and a more racially and ethnically diverse society, it may be that people feel more socially safe to pursue a relationship

across racial and ethnic lines, and may see more models of satisfactory cross-group relationships compared to same-group relationships (Henderson & Braithwaite, 2021). However, there are still significant challenges reported by people in cross-group relationships, and personal attitudes likely influence one's willingness to confront potential challenges in such partnerships.

Physical Attractiveness and Socioeconomic Status

Our study found that physical attractiveness and socioeconomic status influence male and female relationship willingness equally in the overwhelming majority of test conditions. This suggests that the role of physical attractiveness in male partner selection is not as superior to its role in female partner selection as previously believed by relationship researchers. Further, our results suggest that socioeconomic status of potential partners affected male and female relationship willingness equally in the vast majority of test conditions. These findings challenge the previously held notion that male mate selection is driven more by physical attractiveness than socioeconomic status, and that socioeconomic status more so drives female mate selection than physical attractiveness. The results of our study suggest that male and female mate selection is influenced fairly equally by these factors, and that mate selection is more complicated than money, status, and appearance. Our findings, compared to previous research on mate selection, suggest that human partner selection patterns and behaviors are fluid and influenced by societal and individual factors.

Limitations

Our study has limitations. The first limitation relates to our study sample. While we evaluated responses from four major racial and ethnic groups in the United States (i.e., White, Black, Asian, Latinx), there were many groups excluded from the study. Further, to adequately power the study, racial and ethnic combinations were combined for the Latinx population. This

limits our understanding of the complexities that race plays in the Latinx identity, particularly how a White Latinx participant responds compared to a Black Latinx participant. Further, multiracial and biracial participants were underrepresented in this study as they were grouped into the "Other" category which was not used in data analysis. As American society continues to diversify, and as interracial and interethnic relationships increase, it is vital that representation for biracial and multiracial individuals also increases. Our study was also limited to four racial and ethnic groups because of access to validated photos of such populations that were objectively rated for physical attractiveness. While our results suggest largely insignificant findings regarding human mate selection, this only is supported by data received from four major racial and ethnic groups, and additional research is needed to represent the general US population.

Another limitation of our study could be the lack of a direct comparison between classroom, in-person responses conducted in a group setting, and online, individual responses of participants. It may be that the setting in which questions are presented affects the dataset. However, the extension of this study accounts for a more modern approach to dating and is much more generalizable for evaluating human partner selection in the digital age. One potential limitation, though, is that online participants may be better able to lie about their demographic characteristics or have another person complete their responses. While we recruited participants that have been validated and promoted by the CloudResearch platform, along with preventing the use of VPNs, there is inherent risk in online recruitment and study generalizability.

Another limitation of our study relates to the underrepresentation of LGBTQ+ participants. While we had enough of a sample of LGBQ+ participants to compare responses to those of the straight sample, the sample sizes were significantly different, limiting the power of the LGBQ+ responses. Further, we did not recruit enough transgender participants to adequately

power an analysis of their responses. This limits the ability to assess partner selection behavior of the LGBTQ+ population. To accurately evaluate the strength of evolutionary and biological theories of human mate selection, more research is needed in the partner selection behavior of sexual minority and transgender populations.

Implications and Future Research

Our study has implications for future research and practical applications. Our study did not replicate the findings of Townsend and Levy's original (1990) study that supported evolutionary frameworks for human partner selection. This might suggest that human partner selection has adapted over the past 30 years as gender stereotypes and expectations have changed. Our study identified no significant difference between male and female partner selection in human behavior, nor a significant difference between racial and ethnic groups dating within or outside of their own group. This indicates that human partner selection is much more complicated than factors like physical attractiveness, socioeconomic status, or race/ethnicity. Additional research about the factors involved in partner selection is needed to identify potential differences between biological sex, race, and ethnicity.

Our findings challenge the previously held biases that males are motivated by physical attractiveness and sex, and that females are motivated by money and social resources. Future research should consider the other factors that go into partner selection like shared values, personality characteristics, shared views on social or political issues, and a common goal for the future. Future research would benefit from exploring the complex nature of human partner selection in the modern, digital age. One particular area of research that may help with understanding such behavior includes virtual communication between potential partners before

meeting in person, identifying conversations about personal values, desired partner characteristics, and shared goals before pursuing an in vivo encounter with a potential mate.

Further, additional research is needed about the dating and partner selection behavior of underrepresented racial and ethnic groups in the United States. Our study featured four large racial/ethnic groups in the United States; however, the racial and ethnic makeup of the nation is not limited to these four groups. Further, the sociocultural attitudes toward mate selection within such groups would shed light on dating patterns in modern American society. Another potential implication of this study relates to social theory of human partner selection. Social exchange theory and generalized exchange theory suggest that more interracial or interethnic relationships increase harmony in a community. Our study indicates that there is significant willingness to date outside of one's own racial and ethnic group. So, although there are still many social challenges for minority racial and ethnic groups, willingness for relationships across racial and ethnic lines is present in modern American society.

References

Alterovitz, S. S.-R., & Mendelsohn, G. A. (2011). Partner preferences across the life span: Online dating by older adults. *Psychology of Popular Media Culture, 1*(S), 89–95.

Amato, P. R., & Maynard, R. A. (2007). Decreasing nonmarital births and strengthening marriage to reduce poverty. *The Future of Children*, 117-141.

Anderson, R. (2016, September). The ugly truth about online dating: Are we sacrificing love for convenience? *Psychology Today.* https://www.psychologytoday.com/us/blog/the-mating-game/201609/the-ugly-truth-about-online-dating?eml

Auld, C. J., & Case, A. J. (1997). Social exchange processes in leisure and non-leisure settings: A review and exploratory investigation. *Journal of Leisure Research*, *29*(2), 183-200.

Azhar, S., Alvarez, A. R. G., Farina, A. S. J., & Klumpner, S. (2021). "You're so exotic looking": An intersectional analysis of Asian American and Pacific Islander stereotypes. *Affilia, 36*(3), 282-301.

Bailey, J. M., Gaulin, S., Agyei, Y., & Gladue, B. A. (1994). Effects of gender and sexual orientation on evolutionarily relevant aspects of human mating psychology. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 66*(6), 1081-1093.

Balzer Carr, B. (2021). Ethnosexuality: A qualitative exploration of racialized sexual attractions and experiences (Doctoral dissertation, UC Santa Cruz).

Barrett, L., Dunbar, R., Lycett, J. (2002). *Human evolutionary psychology*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Bearman, P. (1997). Generalized exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, *102*(5), 1383-1415.

Birmingham, W. C., Uchino, B. N., Smith, T. W., Light, K. C., & Butner, J. (2015). It's complicated: Marital ambivalence on ambulatory blood pressure and daily interpersonal functioning. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 49*(5), 743-753.

Brown, N. R. (1995). Estimation strategies and the judgment of event frequency. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: Learning, Memory, and Cognition*, *21*(6), 1539.

Buckle, L., Gallup, G. G., & Rodd, Z. A. (1996). Marriage as a reproductive contract: Patterns of marriage, divorce, and remarriage. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 17*(6), 363-377.

Buggs, S. G. (2017). Does (mixed-) race matter? The role of race in interracial sex, dating, and marriage. *Sociology Compass, 11*(11), e12531.

Burke, D., Nolan, C., Hayward, W. G., Russell, R., & Sulikowski, D. (2013). Is there an own-race preference in attractiveness? *Evolutionary Psychology, 11*(4), 855-872.

Burrows, K. (2013). Age preferences in dating advertisements by homosexuals and heterosexuals: From sociobiological to sociological explanations. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 42*, 203-211.

Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human partner preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 12*, 1-49.

Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. F. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 559-570.

Buss, D. M., Shackelford, T. K., Kirkpatrick, L. A., & Larsen, R. J. (2001). A half century of mate preferences: The cultural evolution of values. *Journal of Marriage & Family, 63*, 491-503.

Buunk, B. P., Dijkstra, P., Fetchenhauer, D., & Kenrick, D. T. (2002). Age and gender differences in mate selection criteria for various involvement levels. *Personal Relationships, 9*(3), 271-278.

Campbell, M. E., & Eggerling-Boeck, J. (2006). "What about the children?" The psychological and social well-being of multiracial adolescents. *The Sociological Quarterly*, *47*(1), 147-173.

Casey, J. J., Garrett, J., Brackett, M. A., & Rivers, S. (2007). Emotional intelligence, relationship quality, and partner selection. In *Mating intelligence* (pp. 289-308). Psychology Press.

Chandler, J., Rosenzweig, C., Moss, A. J., Robinson, J., & Litman, L. (2019). Online panels in social science research: Expanding sampling methods beyond Mechanical Turk. *Behavior Research Methods, 51*(5), 2022-2038.

Chavannes, E. (1901). Le dieu du sol dans l'ancienne religion chinoise. *Revue de l'histoire des religions*, 125-146.

Chen, R., & Austin, J. P. (2017). The effect of external influences on partner selection necessity traits: Cross-cultural comparisons of Chinese and American men and women. *Marriage & Family Review, 53*(3), 246-261.

Chiang, H. H., Chang, A., Han, T. S., & McConville, D. (2013). Corporate branding, brand psychological ownership and brand citizenship behaviour: Multilevel analysis and managerial implications. *Journal of General Management*, *39*(1), 55-80.

Chiswick, B. R., & Houseworth, C. (2011). Ethnic intermarriage among immigrants: Human capital and assortative mating. *Review of Economics of the Household, 9,* 149-180.

Cook, K. S., & Emerson, R. M. (1987). *Social exchange theory*. Sage.

Cunningham, M. R., Roberts, A. R., Barbee, A. P., Druen, P. B., & Wu, C. H. (1995). Their ideas of beauty are, on the whole, the same as ours: Consistency and variability in the cross- cultural perception of female physical attractiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*(2), 261–279.

Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1983). *Sex, evolution, and behavior* (No. Sirsi) i9780871507679). Boston: Willard Grant Press.

Darwin, C. (1859). *On the origin of species by means of natural selection or the preservation of favoured races in the struggle for life.* Murray.

Davis, K. (1941). Intermarriage in caste societies. *American Anthropologist*, *43*(3), 376-395.

Demir, M. (2008). Sweetheart, you really make me happy: Romantic relationship quality and personality as predictors of happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 9,* 257-277.

Demir, M. (2010). Close relationships and happiness among emerging adults. *Journal of Happiness Studies, 11,* 293-313.

Dion, K., Berscheid, E., & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24*(3), 285–290.

Dixson, B. J., Dixson, A. F., Morgan, B., & Anderson, M. J. (2007). Human physique and sexual attractiveness: Sexual preferences of men and women in Bakossiland, Cameroon. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*(3), 369–375.

Earp, B. D., & Trafimow, D. (2015). Replication, falsification, and the crisis of confidence in social psychology. *Frontiers in Psychology, 6*, 621 – 632.

Ekeh, P. (1974). *Social exchange theory: The two traditions*. Heinemann.

Feingold, A. (1992). Good-looking people are not what we think. *Psychological Bulletin*, *111*(1), 304–341.

Field, C. J., Kimuna, S. R., & Straus, M. A. (2013). Attitudes toward interracial relationships among college students: Race, class, gender, and perceptions of parental views. *Journal of Black Studies, 44*(7), 741-776.

Fink, B., Neave, N., & Seydel, H. (2007). Male facial appearance signals physical strength to women. *American Journal of Human Biology, 19*(1), 82–87.

Forde, A. (2011). Evolutionary theory of mate selection and partners of trans people: A qualitative study using interpretative phenomenological analysis. *Qualitative Report, 16*(5), 1407-1434.

Fu, X. (2006). Impact of socioeconomic status on inter-racial mate selection and divorce. *The Social Science Journal, 43*(2), 239-258.

Furnham, A., & Swami, V. (2007). Perception of female buttocks and breast size in profile. *Social Behavior and Personality, 35*(1), 1–8.

Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Tradeoffs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 23*, 573-644.

Gigerenzer, G., Todd, P. M., & the ABC Research Group (Eds.) (1999). *Simple heuristics that make us smart*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gil-Burmann, C., Peláez, F., & Sánchez, S. (2002). Mate choice differences according to sex and age: An analysis of personal advertisements in Spanish newspapers. *Human Nature, 13*(1), 493-508.

Gildersleeve, K., Haselton, M. G., & Fales, M. R. (2014). Do women's mate preferences change across the ovulatory cycle? A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *140*(5), 1205.

Gobrogge, K.L., Perkins, P.S., Baker, J.H., Balcer, K. D., Breedlove, S. M., & Klump, K. L. (2007). Homosexual mating preferences from an evolutionary perspective: Sexual selection theory revisited. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 36*(1)*,* 717–723.

Grammar, K., & Thornhill, R. (1994). Human (homo sapiens) facial attractiveness and sexual selection: The role of symmetry and averageness. *Journal of Comparative Psychology, 108*(3), 233–242.

Greitemeyer, T. (2005). Receptivity to sexual offers as a function of sex, socioeconomic status, physical attractiveness, and intimacy of the offer. *Personal Relationships, 12*(3), 373-386.

Harris, T. M., & Kalbfleisch, P. J. (2000). Interracial dating: The implications of race for initiating a romantic relationship. *The Howard Journal of Communications, 11*, 49–64.

Hebl, M. R., & Heatherton, T. F. (1997). The stigma of obesity in women: The difference is black and white. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(4), 418.

Henderson, E. K., & Braithwaite, S. R. (2021). Cross-group relationship satisfaction: A meta-analysis. *Marriage & Family Review*, *57*(7), 621-646.

Homans, G. C. (1974). *Social behavior; Its elementary forms*. Houghton Mifflin Harcourt P.

Hosken, D. J., & House, C. M. (2011). Sexual selection. *Current Biology*, *21*(2), R62-R65.

Howard, J. A., Blumstein, P., & Schwartz, P. (1987). Social or evolutionary theories? Some observations on preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53*(1), 194-200.

Jaffe, K. (2002). On sex, mate selection, and evolution: An exploration. *Comments on Theoretical Biology, 7*(2), 91-107.

Jankowiak, W. R., & Fischer, E. F. (1992). A cross-cultural perspective on romantic love.

Ethnology, 31(2), 149-155.

Jokela, M. (2009). Physical attractiveness and reproductive success in humans: Evidence from the late 20th century United States. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 30*(5), 342-350.

Jones, A. L., & Jaeger, B. (2019). Biological bases of beauty revisited: The effect of symmetry, averageness, and sexual dimorphism on female facial attractiveness. *Symmetry, 11*(2), 279.

Jones, D., Brace, C. L., Jankowiak, W., Laland, K. N., Musselman, L. E., Langlois, J. H., Roggman, L. A., Pérusse, D., Schweder, B., & Symons, D. (1995). Sexual selection, physical attractiveness, and facial neoteny: Cross-cultural evidence and implications. *Current Anthropology, 36*(5), 723–748.

Kalmijn, M. (1993). Spouse selection among the children of European immigrants: A comparison of marriage cohorts in the 1960 census. *International Migration Review*, *27*(1), 51-78.

Kanazawa, S. (2011). Intelligence and physical attractiveness. *Intelligence, 39*(1), 7–14.

Karney, B. R. (2021). Socioeconomic status and intimate relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology, 72,* 391.

Kenrick, D. T, Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G, & Trost, M. R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of courtship: Qualifying the parental investment model. *Journal of Personality, 58*, 97-116.

Khallad, Y. (2005). Mate selection in Jordan: Effects of sex, socio-economic status, and culture. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*(2), 155-168.

Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(4), 472-503.

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. R., & Martin, C. E. (2003). Sexual behavior in the human male. *American Journal of Public Health*, *93*(6), 894-898.

Lamont, E. (2020). *The mating game: How gender still shapes how we date*. University of California Press.

Lamont, E. (2021). The persistence of gendered dating. *Sociology Compass, 15*(11), e12933.

Langlois, J. H., Kalakanis, L., Rubenstein, A. J., Larson, A., Hallam, M., & Smoot, M. (2000). Maxims or myths of beauty? A meta-analytic and theoretical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(1), 390–423.

Lassek, W. D., & Gaulin, S. J. C. (2019). Evidence supporting nubility and reproductive value as the key to human female physical attractiveness. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 40*(5), 408-419.

Levinger, G. K., & Snoek, J. D. (1972). *Attraction in relationship: A new look at interpersonal attraction*. General Learning Press.

Levi-Strauss, C. (1969*). The elementary structures of kinship (Les structures elementaires de la parente).* Eyre & Spottiswoode.

Lewis, M. B. (2010). Why are mixed-race people perceived as more attractive? *Perception, 39*(1), 136-138.

Lewis, M. B. (2012). A facial attractiveness account of gender asymmetries in interracial marriage. *PLoS One*, *7*(2), e31703.

Li, N. P., Young, J. C., Tov, W., Sng, O., Fletcher, G. J. 0., Valentine, K. A., Jiang, Y. F., & Balliet, D. (2013). Mate preferences do predict attraction and choices in the early stages of mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 105*(5), 757-776.

Light, L. L, Hollander, S, & Kayra-Stuart, F. (1981). Why attractive people are harder to remember. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7*(1), 269-276.

Lillard, L. A., & Waite, L. J. (1995). 'Til death do us part: Marital disruption and mortality. *American Journal of Sociology*, *100*(5), 1131-1156.

Litman, L., Robinson, J., & Abberbock, T. (2017). TurkPrime.com: A versatile crowdsourcing data acquisition platform for the behavioral sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 49*(2), 433-442.

Ma, D. S., Correll, J., & Wittenbrink, B. (2015). The Chicago face database: A free stimulus set of faces and norming data. *Behavior Research Methods, 47*(4), 1122-1135.

Makel, M.C., Plucker, J.A., & Hegarty, B. (2012). Replications in psychology research: How often do they really occur? *Perspectives in Psychological Science, 7,* 537-542.

Marcinkowska, U. M., Kozlov, M. V., Cai, H., Contreras-Garduño, J., Dixson, B. J., Oana, G. A., … & Rantala, M. J. (2014). Cross-cultural variation in men's preference for sexual dimorphism in women's faces. *Biology Letters, 10*(4), 20130850.

McDonald, G. W. (1981). Structural exchange and marital interaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 825-839.

McIntosh, W. D., Locker, L., Briley, K., Ryan, R. & Scott, A. J. (2011). What do older adults seek in their potential romantic partners? Evidence from online personal ads. *The International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 72,* 67-82.

Merton, R. K. (1941). Intermarriage and the social structure: Fact and theory. *Psychiatry*, *4*(3), 361-374.

Miller, G. F. (1998). How mate choice shaped human nature: A review of sexual selection and human evolution. *Handbook of evolutionary psychology: Ideas, issues, and applications*, 87-129.

Miller, S. C., Olson, M. A., & Fazio, R. H. (2004). Perceived reactions to interracial romantic relationships: When race is used as a cue to status. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *7*(4), 354-369.

Morris, P. E, & Wickham, L. H. V. (2001). Typicality and face recognition: A critical re-evaluation of the two-factor theory. *The Quarterly Journal of Experimental Psychology Section A, 54*(3), 863– 877.

Mulkay, M., & Gilbert, N.G. (1986). Replication and mere replication. *Philosophy of the Social Sciences, 16*(1), 21-37.

Nakonezney, P. A., & Denton, W. H. (2008). Marital relationships: A social exchange theory perspective. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 36*(5), 402–412.

O'Toole A. J, Deffenbacher, K. A., Valentin, D., & Abdi, H. (1994). Structural aspects of face recognition and the other-race effect. *Memory and Cognition, 22*(2), 208–224.

Pawlowski B., Boothroyd L.G., Perrett D.I., & Kluska S. (2008). Is female attractiveness related to final reproductive success? *Collegium Antropologicum, 32*(2), 457-460.

Penke, L., Todd, P. M., Lenton, A. P. & Fasolo, B. (2005). How self-assessments can guide human mating decisions. In *Mating intelligence* (pp. 63-102). Psychology Press.

Perrett, D. I., Lee, K. J., Penton-Voak, I., Rowland, D., Yoshikawa, S., Burt, D. M., ... & Akamatsu, S. (1998). Effects of sexual dimorphism on facial attractiveness. *Nature, 394*(6696), 884-887.

Pew Research Center. (2013, July 2013). *The rise of single fathers: A ninefold increase since 1960* [Report]. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/wp-content/uploads/sites/3/2013/07/single-fathers-07-2013.pdf

Pew Research Center. (2021, October 2021). *Rising share of U.S. adults are living without a spouse or partner* [Report]. https://www.pewresearch.org/social-trends/2021/10/05/rising-share-of-u-s-adults-are-living-without-a-spouse-or-partner/

Prokop, P., & Fedor, P. (2011). Physical attractiveness influences reproductive success of modern men. *Journal of Ethology, 29*(3), 453-458.

Puts, D. A. (2010). Beauty and the beast: Mechanisms of sexual selection in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*(3), 157-175.

Puts, D. (2016). Human sexual selection. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 7*(1), 28-32.

Raterman, J. (2013). *Mate selection preferences of senescing adults in Cincinnati, Ohio* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Cincinnati).

Reynolds, J. D., & Harvey, P. H. (1994). Sexual selection and the evolution of sex differences. *The Differences Between the Sexes*, 53-70.

Rhodes, G. (2006). The evolutionary psychology of facial beauty. *Annual Review of Psychology, 57*, 199-226.

Rhodes, G., Chan, J., Zebrowitz, L. A., & Simmons, L. W. (2003). Does sexual dimorphism in human faces signal health? Proceedings. *Biological Sciences, 270*(1), S93–S95.

Rhodes, G., Simmons, L., & Peters, M. (2005). Attractiveness and sexual behaviour: Does attractiveness enhance mating success? *Evolutionary Human Behavior, 26*(2), 186–201.

Rhodes, G., Sumich, A., & Byatt, G. (1999). Are average facial configurations attractive only because of their symmetry? *Psychological Science, 10*(1), 52–58.

Rhodes, G., & Tremewan, T. (1996). Averageness, exaggeration, and facial attractiveness. *Psychological Science*, *7*(2), 105–110.

Rosenblatt, P. C., Karis, T. A., & Powell, R. D. (1995). *Multiracial couples: Black & white voices.* Sage.

Rosenfield, M. J. (2005). A critique of exchange theory in mate selection. *American Journal of Sociology, 110*(5), 1284-1325.

Russock, H. (2011). An evolutionary interpretation of the effect of gender and sexual orientation on human mate selection preferences, as indicated by an analysis of personal advertisements. *Behaviour, 148*(3), 307-323.

Sanbonmatsu, D. M., Uchino, B. N., & Birmingham, W. (2011). On the importance of knowing your partner's views: Attitude familiarity is associated with better interpersonal functioning and lower ambulatory blood pressure in daily life. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 41*(1), 131-137.

Scott, I. M., Clark, A. P., Josephson, S. C., Boyette, A. H., Cuthill, I. C., Fried, R. L., & Penton-Voak. (2014). Human preferences for sexually dimorphic faces may be evolutionarily novel. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 111*, 14388–14393.

Shoemake, E. G. (2007). Human mate selection theory: An integrated evolutionary and social approach. *Journal of Scientific Psychology, 11,* 35-41.

Shtatfeld, R., & Barak, A. (2009). Factors related to initiating interpersonal contacts on Internet dating sites: A view from the social exchange theory. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships*, *3*, 19-37.

Silvestrini, M. (2020). “It’s not something I can shake”: The effect of racial stereotypes, beauty standards, and sexual racism on interracial attraction. *Sexuality & Culture, 24*(1), 305-325.

Singer, M., & Beyer, H. (2008). *Killer commodities: Public health and the corporate production of harm*. Rowman Altamira.

Smith, T. W., Davern, M., Freese, J., & Morgan, S. L. (2018). *General social surveys, 1972-2018* [machine readable data file]. Chicago: NORC at the University of Chicago.

Smith, N. C. (1970). Replication studies: A neglected aspect of psychological research. *American Psychologist, 25*(10), 970–975.

Souza, A. L., Conroy-Beam, D., & Buss, D. M. (2016). Mate preferences in Brazil: Evolved desires and cultural evolution over three decades. *Personality and Individual Differences, 95*, 45-49.

Sprecher, S. (1998). Social exchange theories and sexuality. *Journal of Sex Research*, *35*(1), 32-43.

Sprecher, S., Sullivan, Q., & Hatfield, E. (1994). Mate selection preferences: Gender differences examined in a national sample. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 66(6)*, 1074-1080.

Sprecher, S. (2001). Equity and social exchange in dating couples: Associations with satisfaction, commitment, and stability. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 63*(3), 599-613.

Stacey, L., & Forbes, T. D. (2022). Feeling like a fetish: Racialized feelings, fetishization, and the contours of sexual racism on gay dating apps. *The Journal of Sex Research, 59*(3), 372-384.

Stafford, L. (2017). Social exchange theory: A cost-benefit approach to relationships. In *Engaging theories in family communication* (pp. 279-289). Routledge.

Stephen, I. D., & Tan, K. W. (2015). Healthy body, healthy face? Evolutionary approaches to health perception. In *Culture and cognition: A collection of critical essays* (pp. 45-65). Peter Lang International Publishers.

Stephen, I. D., Hiew, V., Coetzee, V., Tiddeman, B. P., & Perrett, D. I. (2017). Facial shape analysis identifies valid cues to aspects of physiological health in Caucasian, Asian, and African populations. *Frontiers in Psychology, 8*, 1883.

Symons, D. (1980). Précis of the evolution of human sexuality. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 3*(2), 171-181.

Thiessen, D., & Gregg, B. (1980). Human assortative mating and genetic equilibrium: An evolutionary perspective. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 1*(2), 111-140.

Townsend, J. M., & Levy, G. D. (1990). Effects of potential partners' costume and physical attractiveness on sexuality and partner selection. *The Journal of Psychology, 124*(4), 371-389.

Trivers, R. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In *Sexual selection and the descent of man* (pp. 136-179). Aldine.

Trivers, R. (1985). *Social evolution*. Benjamin/Cummings.

U.S. Census Bureau. (2019). *American community survey: Occupation by sex and median earnings in the past 12 months.* https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=s2412&tid=ACSST1Y2019.S2412

U.S. Census Bureau. (2018). *Growth in interracial and interethnic married-couple households.* https://www.census.gov/library/stories/2018/07/interracial-marriages.html

Vokey, J. R., & Read, J., (1992). Familiarity, memorability, and the effect of typicality on the recognition of faces. *Memory and Cognition, 20*(3), 291–302.

Waite, L. J., & Gallagher, M. (2001). *The case for marriage: Why married people are happier, healthier, and better off financially*. Crown Publishing Group (NY).

Wiederman, M. W. (1993). Evolved gender differences in mate preferences: Evidence from personal advertisements. *Ethology and Sociobiology, 14*(5), 331-351.

Appendix

Table 1

Mean Scores of Relationship Willingness by Biological Sex

Attractiveness, SES, & Race/Ethnicity of Photographed Subject	1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.		2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.		3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.		4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.		5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.		6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	
High Attractiveness	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F
High Salary	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean	Mean
White	2.167	2.274	2.418	2.691	2.491	3.020	2.561	2.988	2.607	3.103	2.721	3.065
Black	2.288	2.399	2.531	2.891	2.637	3.179	2.704	3.129	2.706	3.242	2.824	3.212
Asian	2.504	2.605	2.726	3.071	2.768	3.294	2.919	3.238	2.925	3.274	3.030	3.313
Latinx	2.575	2.639	2.812	3.028	2.898	3.298	2.896	3.254	2.926	3.339	3.090	3.381
High Attractiveness												
Low Salary												
White	2.282*	2.343*	2.598	2.863	2.641	3.139	2.723	2.882	2.729	3.159	2.863	3.151
Black	2.335	2.355	2.649	2.867	2.733	3.260	2.826	3.107	2.818	3.244	2.986	3.246
Asian	2.241	2.494	2.455	3.024	2.512	3.252	2.601	3.232	2.651	3.317	2.785	3.228
Latinx	2.514	2.577	2.867	2.960	2.914	3.252	2.928	3.260	2.977	3.333	3.102	3.323
Low Attractiveness												
High Salary												
White	2.555	2.476	2.947	2.986	3.051	3.169	3.051	3.169	3.031	3.272	3.129	3.224
Black	2.853	2.772	3.298	3.248	3.284	3.520	3.314	3.361	3.398	3.375	3.426	3.491
	2.7118	2.661	3.051	3.254	3.135	3.500	3.198	3.409	3.249	3.464	3.274	3.476

	Asian	2.775	2.915	3.106	3.436	3.235	3.655	3.331	3.583	3.292	3.665	3.382	3.643
	Latinx												
Low Attractiveness													
Low Salary													
	White	2.906	2.870	3.247	3.377	3.277	3.655	3.304	3.581	3.337	3.629	3.457	3.635
	Black	2.829	2.849	3.237	3.375	3.332	3.663	3.362	3.546	3.416	3.647	3.408	3.611
	Asian	2.875	3.014	3.280	3.468	3.316	3.635	3.375	3.569	3.400	3.684	3.418	3.750
	Latinx	2.833	2.857	3.220	3.371	3.251	3.677	3.305	3.573	3.321	3.677	3.398	3.6835

Table 2
Mean Scores for Relationship Willingness by Race/Ethnicity

Relationship Willingness	White Mean	Black Mean	Asian Mean	Latinx Mean
High Attractiveness, High Salary White Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.0925	2.3589	2.2845	2.3032
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.4493	2.6210	2.6466	2.6543
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.6300	2.7661	2.8879	2.9441
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.6520	2.7944	3.0000	2.8883
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.7181	2.9435	3.0948	2.9016
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	2.6982	3.0121	3.1121	3.0559
Low Attractive, Low Salary White Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.7489	2.8468	3.1638	3.1064
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	3.2379	3.1452	3.6121	3.5213
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.4119	3.3387	3.5948	3.6702

4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.3877	3.3589	3.6638	3.5372
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4405	3.4113	3.5603	3.6223
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.4934	3.3992	3.8621	3.6649
High Attractive, Low Salary White Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.035*	2.5040	2.6983*	2.4894*
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.460*	2.9073	3.0000	2.9734*
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.606	3.1008	3.1379	3.1277
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.582*	3.1169	3.3103*	3.0319*
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.648	3.1532	3.2845	3.1596
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	2.703*	3.1371	3.4914	3.2633*
Low Attractive, High Salary White Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and	2.218*	2.7218	2.9483*	2.6968*

casual conversation with a person like this.				
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.670*	3.0565	3.6121*	3.1649*
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.837*	3.2218*	3.7328*	3.3936*
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.846	3.2137	3.6466*	3.2766*
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.923*	3.2419	3.5345	3.3404*
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	2.912*	3.2500	3.7241*	3.3777*
High Attractive, High Salary Asian Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.3436*	2.6250	2.6207	2.9255*
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.7247*	2.9637	2.8017*	3.2766*
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.8965	3.0121	3.0948	3.3218
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.9604	3.1210	3.0517	3.3112
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with	2.9978	3.1694	3.1207	3.2261

a person like this, that could lead to marriage.				
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.0242	3.2540	3.1552	3.4176
Low Attractive, Low Salary Asian Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.7401*	2.9516	3.3017*	3.2021
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	3.2203	3.2500	3.6983	3.7021
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.3722	3.4032	3.8362	3.5851
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.3348	3.3710	3.8190	3.7128
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4295	3.4718	3.7672	3.7553
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.4427	3.4476	3.8879	3.9043
High Attractive, Low Salary Asian Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.2048*	2.3629	2.6983	2.5532*
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.5837*	2.7137	3.0086	2.9628*
3. I would be willing to have	2.6718	2.8306	3.2328	3.2128

sex with a person like this.				
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.7467*	2.9234	3.1034	3.1782*
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.8348	3.0403	3.0431	3.2074
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	2.8260	3.0726	3.1466	3.2527
Low Attractive, High Salary Asian Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.5286	2.9073	2.6293	2.8138
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.9802	3.2863	3.3879	3.2394
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.1586	3.4234	3.4828	3.4468
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.2070	3.3629	3.3190	3.4415
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.2533	3.5000	3.3793	3.3936
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.2731	3.4839	3.4224	3.4388
High Attractive, High Salary Black Subject				

1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.2930	2.2702	2.6034	2.3989
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.6344*	2.5565*	3.1034	2.8457*
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.8392	2.6976	3.2759	3.1064
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.8767	2.6935	3.1379	3.1543
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.9493	2.7782	3.1897	3.1383
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	2.9978	2.7702	3.4224	3.1277
Low Attractive, Low Salary Black Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.7291	2.7379	3.2155	3.0053
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	3.1718	3.2218	3.6034	3.5532
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.3811	3.4113	3.7586	3.7207
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.3921	3.3387	3.8103	3.5293

5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4251	3.4798	3.8017	3.6809
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.4251	3.3790	3.8534	3.6649
High Attractive, Low Salary Black Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.3282	2.1371*	2.7845	2.3883*
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.7115	2.6290	3.0690	2.8404
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.9009	2.8508	3.2241	3.2606
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.9559	2.7661*	3.2414	3.0745*
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.0176	2.7903*	3.2241	3.2447*
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.0683	2.8629*	3.4655	3.3404*
Low Attractive, High Salary Black Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.8260*	2.5806*	3.1293*	2.8936
2. I would be willing to go on a	3.3084	3.0161	3.5431	3.3617

date with a person like this.				
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.4780	3.1815	3.5517	3.4096
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4295	3.0282	3.5603	3.3830
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4251	3.1452	3.5345	3.5213
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.5330	3.0645	3.7672	3.6064
High Attractive, High Salary Latinx Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.4493	2.7097	2.9052	2.6649
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.7819	2.9556	3.2328	3.0053
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.9692	3.0806	3.4138	3.2234
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	2.9912*	3.0444	3.3707	3.1223*
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.0661	3.0645	3.3707	3.2181

6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.1300	3.2540	3.4828	3.3032
Low Attractive, Low Salary Latinx Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.6850	2.8871	3.1983	2.9574
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	3.1652	3.2379	3.5948	3.4947
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.3458	3.4556	3.7586	3.5638
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.3414	3.3790	3.7759	3.5346
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4295	3.4597	3.7414	3.5559
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.3833	3.5282	3.9224	3.6915
High Attractive, Low Salary Latinx Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.3987	2.7218	2.7672	2.5266
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	2.7930	3.0444	3.3276	2.7713
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	2.9075	3.2984	3.3707	3.0319
4. I would be willing to have a	2.9736	3.2903	3.2500	3.0160

serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.				
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.0529	3.3024	3.3448	3.0745
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.0881	3.4113	3.4052	3.1755
Low Attractive, High Salary Latinx Subject				
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	2.8018*	2.8266*	3.1638*	2.7713
2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	3.2996	3.0484*	3.6379*	3.2553
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	3.3987	3.3589	3.7759	3.4521
4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.4383	3.3387	3.8621	3.3989
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	3.5485	3.3024	3.7414	3.3670
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	3.5419*	3.3548	3.8103	3.4574*

**Significant at the .05 level*

Table 3

Pairwise Comparisons for Relationship Willingness and Biological Sex

Relationship Willingness			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[d]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[d] Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	Male	Female	.309[a,b]	0.276	0.263	-0.233	0.852
	Female	Male	-.309[a,b]	0.276	0.263	-0.852	0.233
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 2. I would be willing to date a person like this.	Male	Female	-.246[a,b]	0.288	0.394	-0.812	0.321
	Female	Male	.246[a,b]	0.288	0.394	-0.321	0.812
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	Male	Female	-.076[a,b]	0.285	0.789	-0.637	0.484
	Female	Male	.076[a,b]	0.285	0.789	-0.484	0.637
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	Male	Female	-.241[a,b]	0.284	0.397	-0.798	0.317
	Female	Male	.241[a,b]	0.284	0.397	-0.317	0.798
High Attractiveness,	Male	Female	.006[a,b]	0.285	0.983	-0.553	0.565
	Female	Male	-.006[a,b]	0.285	0.983	-0.565	0.553

Low Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	Male	Female	.037[a,b]	0.283	0.897	-0.520	0.594
	Female	Male	-.037[a,b]	0.283	0.897	-0.594	0.520
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	Male	Female	.246[a,b]	0.293	0.401	-0.330	0.822
	Female	Male	-.246[a,b]	0.293	0.401	-0.822	0.330
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 2. I would be willing to date a person like this.	Male	Female	.031[a,b]	0.310	0.921	-0.578	0.640
	Female	Male	-.031[a,b]	0.310	0.921	-0.640	0.578
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	Male	Female	.035[a,b]	0.294	0.906	-0.543	0.613
	Female	Male	-.035[a,b]	0.294	0.906	-0.613	0.543
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	-.241[a,b]	0.299	0.422	-0.828	0.347
	Female	Male	.241[a,b]	0.299	0.422	-0.347	0.828

4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	-.314[a,b]	0.304	0.302	-0.911	0.283
	Female	Male	.314[a,b]	0.304	0.302	-0.283	0.911
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	-.161[a,b]	0.294	0.585	-0.739	0.417
	Female	Male	.161[a,b]	0.294	0.585	-0.417	0.739
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	.423[a,b]	0.264	0.110	-0.096	0.942
	Female	Male	-.423[a,b]	0.264	0.110	-0.942	0.096
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	.076[a,b]	0.294	0.797	-0.502	0.653
	Female	Male	-.076[a,b]	0.294	0.797	-0.653	0.502
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White	Male	Female	.048[a,b]	0.301	0.874	-0.544	0.640
	Female	Male	-.048[a,b]	0.301	0.874	-0.640	0.544

3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	Male	Female	-.347[a,b]	0.300	0.248	-0.937	0.243
	Female	Male	.347[a,b]	0.300	0.248	-0.243	0.937
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	Male	Female	-.287[a,b]	0.309	0.353	-0.893	0.320
	Female	Male	.287[a,b]	0.309	0.353	-0.320	0.893
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	Male	Female	-.256[a,b]	0.312	0.412	-0.868	0.356
	Female	Male	.256[a,b]	0.312	0.412	-0.356	0.868
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	Male	Female	.625[a,b,*]	0.315	0.048	0.006	1.243
	Female	Male	-.625[a,b,*]	0.315	0.048	-1.243	-0.006
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	Male	Female	.238[a,b]	0.303	0.431	-0.356	0.833
	Female	Male	-.238[a,b]	0.303	0.431	-0.833	0.356

2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	Male	Female	-.287[a,b]	0.294	0.329	-0.864	0.290
	Female	Male	.287[a,b]	0.294	0.329	-0.290	0.864
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	Male	Female	-.189[a,b]	0.298	0.528	-0.775	0.397
	Female	Male	.189[a,b]	0.298	0.528	-0.397	0.775
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	Male	Female	-.242[a,b]	0.290	0.405	-0.813	0.329
	Female	Male	.242[a,b]	0.290	0.405	-0.329	0.813
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	Male	Female	-.104[a,b]	0.290	0.721	-0.673	0.466
	Female	Male	.104[a,b]	0.290	0.721	-0.466	0.673
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.232[a,b]	0.286	0.418	-0.330	0.794
	Female	Male	-.232[a,b]	0.286	0.418	-0.794	0.330
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and							

casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.108[a,b]	0.294	0.713	-0.686	0.470
	Female	Male	.108[a,b]	0.294	0.713	-0.470	0.686
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.075[a,b]	0.296	0.800	-0.507	0.657
	Female	Male	-.075[a,b]	0.296	0.800	-0.657	0.507
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.285[a,b]	0.292	0.329	-0.857	0.288
	Female	Male	.285[a,b]	0.292	0.329	-0.288	0.857
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.229[a,b]	0.301	0.446	-0.820	0.362
	Female	Male	.229[a,b]	0.301	0.446	-0.362	0.820
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.001[a,b]	0.294	0.997	-0.579	0.577
	Female	Male	.001[a,b]	0.294	0.997	-0.577	0.579
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							

Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.265[a,b]	0.313	0.399	-0.351	0.880
	Female	Male	-.265[a,b]	0.313	0.399	-0.880	0.351
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.129[a,b]	0.308	0.675	-0.735	0.477
	Female	Male	.129[a,b]	0.308	0.675	-0.477	0.735
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.305[a,b]	0.298	0.306	-0.890	0.280
	Female	Male	.305[a,b]	0.298	0.306	-0.280	0.890
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.334[a,b]	0.294	0.255	-0.911	0.243
	Female	Male	.334[a,b]	0.294	0.255	-0.243	0.911
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.270[a,b]	0.292	0.356	-0.844	0.304
	Female	Male	.270[a,b]	0.292	0.356	-0.304	0.844
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this,							

that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.440[a,b]	0.289	0.128	-1.008	0.128
	Female	Male	.440[a,b]	0.289	0.128	-0.128	1.008
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.048[a,b]	0.303	0.875	-0.548	0.644
	Female	Male	-.048[a,b]	0.303	0.875	-0.644	0.548
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.139[a,b]	0.304	0.647	-0.738	0.459
	Female	Male	.139[a,b]	0.304	0.647	-0.459	0.738
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.028[a,b]	0.296	0.924	-0.609	0.553
	Female	Male	.028[a,b]	0.296	0.924	-0.553	0.609
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.116[a,b]	0.303	0.703	-0.711	0.480
	Female	Male	.116[a,b]	0.303	0.703	-0.480	0.711
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
	Male	Female	-.016[a,b]	0.296	0.958	-0.598	0.567

High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Female	Male	.016[a,b]	0.296	0.958	-0.567	0.598
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.060[a,b]	0.292	0.837	-0.514	0.635
	Female	Male	-.060[a,b]	0.292	0.837	-0.635	0.514
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.495[a,b]	0.310	0.111	-0.115	1.104
	Female	Male	-.495[a,b]	0.310	0.111	-1.104	0.115
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.169[a,b]	0.303	0.576	-0.425	0.764
	Female	Male	-.169[a,b]	0.303	0.576	-0.764	0.425
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.056[a,b]	0.305	0.855	-0.654	0.543
	Female	Male	.056[a,b]	0.305	0.855	-0.543	0.654
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.055[a,b]	0.295	0.853	-0.635	0.526
	Female	Male	.055[a,b]	0.295	0.853	-0.526	0.635

4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	.029[a,b]	0.296	0.923	-0.553	0.610
	Female	Male	-.029[a,b]	0.296	0.923	-0.610	0.553
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	Male	Female	-.098[a,b]	0.282	0.728	-0.652	0.456
	Female	Male	.098[a,b]	0.282	0.728	-0.456	0.652
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	.269[a,b]	0.282	0.341	-0.286	0.823
	Female	Male	-.269[a,b]	0.282	0.341	-0.823	0.286
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.044[a,b]	0.306	0.886	-0.645	0.558
	Female	Male	.044[a,b]	0.306	0.886	-0.558	0.645
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.173[a,b]	0.308	0.575	-0.779	0.433
	Female	Male	.173[a,b]	0.308	0.575	-0.433	0.779

3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.086[a,b]	0.307	0.779	-0.690	0.517
	Female	Male	.086[a,b]	0.307	0.779	-0.517	0.690
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	.161[a,b]	0.309	0.603	-0.447	0.769
	Female	Male	-.161[a,b]	0.309	0.603	-0.769	0.447
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	.029[a,b]	0.298	0.923	-0.557	0.615
	Female	Male	-.029[a,b]	0.298	0.923	-0.615	0.557
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.517[a,b]	0.316	0.103	-0.105	1.139
	Female	Male	-.517[a,b]	0.316	0.103	-1.139	0.105
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.044[a,b]	0.300	0.884	-0.546	0.634
	Female	Male	-.044[a,b]	0.300	0.884	-0.634	0.546

2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.230[a,b]	0.293	0.432	-0.806	0.345
	Female	Male	.230[a,b]	0.293	0.432	-0.345	0.806
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.150[a,b]	0.297	0.615	-0.734	0.434
	Female	Male	.150[a,b]	0.297	0.615	-0.434	0.734
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.199[a,b]	0.299	0.506	-0.388	0.786
	Female	Male	-.199[a,b]	0.299	0.506	-0.786	0.388
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.025[a,b]	0.292	0.931	-0.599	0.548
	Female	Male	.025[a,b]	0.292	0.931	-0.548	0.599
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.253[a,b]	0.291	0.386	-0.319	0.825
	Female	Male	-.253[a,b]	0.291	0.386	-0.825	0.319
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and							

casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.112[a,b]	0.306	0.715	-0.713	0.490
	Female	Male	.112[a,b]	0.306	0.715	-0.490	0.713
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.070[a,b]	0.301	0.816	-0.522	0.661
	Female	Male	-.070[a,b]	0.301	0.816	-0.661	0.522
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.091[a,b]	0.305	0.766	-0.690	0.508
	Female	Male	.091[a,b]	0.305	0.766	-0.508	0.690
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.266[a,b]	0.302	0.378	-0.860	0.327
	Female	Male	.266[a,b]	0.302	0.378	-0.327	0.860
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	Male	Female	.078[a,b]	0.306	0.800	-0.524	0.679
	Female	Male	-.078[a,b]	0.306	0.800	-0.679	0.524
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							

Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	.569[a,b]	0.319	0.075	-0.058	1.196
	Female	Male	-.569[a,b]	0.319	0.075	-1.196	0.058
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	.109[a,b]	0.305	0.721	-0.490	0.708
	Female	Male	-.109[a,b]	0.305	0.721	-0.708	0.490
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.167[a,b]	0.284	0.557	-0.725	0.391
	Female	Male	.167[a,b]	0.284	0.557	-0.391	0.725
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.076[a,b]	0.297	0.799	-0.659	0.508
	Female	Male	.076[a,b]	0.297	0.799	-0.508	0.659
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.163[a,b]	0.286	0.569	-0.725	0.399
	Female	Male	.163[a,b]	0.286	0.569	-0.399	0.725
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this,							

that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	Male	Female	-.167[a,b]	0.287	0.561	-0.731	0.397
	Female	Male	.167[a,b]	0.287	0.561	-0.397	0.731
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.081[a,b]	0.297	0.786	-0.502	0.664
	Female	Male	-.081[a,b]	0.297	0.786	-0.664	0.502
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.015[a,b]	0.298	0.960	-0.571	0.601
	Female	Male	-.015[a,b]	0.298	0.960	-0.601	0.571
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.059[a,b]	0.287	0.836	-0.623	0.504
	Female	Male	.059[a,b]	0.287	0.836	-0.504	0.623
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.495[a,b]	0.290	0.088	-1.064	0.074
	Female	Male	.495[a,b]	0.290	0.088	-0.074	1.064
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
	Male	Female	-.326[a,b]	0.287	0.256	-0.890	0.237

High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Female	Male	.326[a,b]	0.287	0.256	-0.237	0.890
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.217[a,b]	0.287	0.449	-0.780	0.346
	Female	Male	.217[a,b]	0.287	0.449	-0.346	0.780
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.470[a,b]	0.319	0.142	-0.157	1.097
	Female	Male	-.470[a,b]	0.319	0.142	-1.097	0.157
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.088[a,b]	0.305	0.773	-0.512	0.688
	Female	Male	-.088[a,b]	0.305	0.773	-0.688	0.512
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.108[a,b]	0.299	0.718	-0.694	0.479
	Female	Male	.108[a,b]	0.299	0.718	-0.479	0.694
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.211[a,b]	0.292	0.469	-0.785	0.362
	Female	Male	.211[a,b]	0.292	0.469	-0.362	0.785

4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.220[a,b]	0.293	0.452	-0.796	0.355
	Female	Male	.220[a,b]	0.293	0.452	-0.355	0.796
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.129[a,b]	0.290	0.655	-0.699	0.440
	Female	Male	.129[a,b]	0.290	0.655	-0.440	0.699
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.286[a,b]	0.306	0.352	-0.316	0.887
	Female	Male	-.286[a,b]	0.306	0.352	-0.887	0.316
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.058[a,b]	0.305	0.848	-0.541	0.658
	Female	Male	-.058[a,b]	0.305	0.848	-0.658	0.541
2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.137[a,b]	0.302	0.650	-0.456	0.730
	Female	Male	-.137[a,b]	0.302	0.650	-0.730	0.456

3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.114[a,b]	0.296	0.701	-0.694	0.467
	Female	Male	.114[a,b]	0.296	0.701	-0.467	0.694
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.083[a,b]	0.303	0.784	-0.678	0.512
	Female	Male	.083[a,b]	0.303	0.784	-0.512	0.678
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.179[a,b]	0.292	0.540	-0.752	0.395
	Female	Male	.179[a,b]	0.292	0.540	-0.395	0.752
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.573[a,b]	0.314	0.068	-0.043	1.190
	Female	Male	-.573[a,b]	0.314	0.068	-1.190	0.043
1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.320[a,b]	0.308	0.300	-0.285	0.925
	Female	Male	-.320[a,b]	0.308	0.300	-0.925	0.285

2. I would be willing to date a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.037[a,b]	0.291	0.898	-0.609	0.535
	Female	Male	.037[a,b]	0.291	0.898	-0.535	0.609
3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	.023[a,b]	0.297	0.938	-0.561	0.607
	Female	Male	-.023[a,b]	0.297	0.938	-0.607	0.561
4. I would be willing to have serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.341[a,b]	0.289	0.238	-0.908	0.226
	Female	Male	.341[a,b]	0.289	0.238	-0.226	0.908
5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.							
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx	Male	Female	-.131[a,b]	0.285	0.646	-0.692	0.430
	Female	Male	.131[a,b]	0.285	0.646	-0.430	0.692
6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.							

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

a. An estimate of the modified population marginal mean (I).

b. An estimate of the modified population marginal mean (J).

d. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).

Table 4

Pairwise Comparisons for Relationship Willingness and Race/Ethnicity

Relationship Willingness			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.[d]	95% Confidence Interval for Difference[d] Lower Bound	Upper Bound
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	-.495[a]	0.402	0.219	-1.285	0.295
		Asian	-1.028[a,*]	0.377	0.007	-1.769	-0.288
		Latinx	-1.065[a,*]	0.342	0.002	-1.738	-0.392
	Black	White	.495[c]	0.402	0.219	-0.295	1.285
		Asian	-.533[a,c]	0.449	0.236	-1.416	0.350
		Latinx	-.570[a,c]	0.421	0.176	-1.398	0.257
	Asian	White	1.028[*,c]	0.377	0.007	0.288	1.769
		Black	.533[a,c]	0.449	0.236	-0.350	1.416
		Latinx	-.037[a,c]	0.397	0.926	-0.817	0.743
	Latinx	White	1.065[*,c]	0.342	0.002	0.392	1.738
		Black	.570[a,c]	0.421	0.176	-0.257	1.398
		Asian	.037[a,c]	0.397	0.926	-0.743	0.817
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	-.207[a]	0.420	0.622	-1.032	0.618
		Asian	-.458[a]	0.394	0.245	-1.232	0.315
		Latinx	-.924[a,*]	0.358	0.010	-1.626	-0.221
	Black	White	.207[c]	0.420	0.622	-0.618	1.032
		Asian	-.251[a,c]	0.469	0.593	-1.174	0.671
		Latinx	-.716[a,c]	0.440	0.104	-1.580	0.148
	Asian	White	.458[c]	0.394	0.245	-0.315	1.232
		Black	.251[a,c]	0.469	0.593	-0.671	1.174
		Latinx	-.465[a,c]	0.415	0.262	-1.280	0.350
	Latinx	White	.924[*,c]	0.358	0.010	0.221	1.626
		Black	.716[a,c]	0.440	0.104	-0.148	1.580
		Asian	.465[a,c]	0.415	0.262	-0.350	1.280
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.163[a]	0.415	0.694	-0.979	0.652
		Asian	-.248[a]	0.389	0.524	-1.013	0.517
		Latinx	-.493[a]	0.354	0.164	-1.187	0.202
	Black	White	.163[c]	0.415	0.694	-0.652	0.979
		Asian	-.085[a,c]	0.464	0.855	-0.997	0.827
		Latinx	-.329[a,c]	0.435	0.449	-1.184	0.525
	Asian	White	.248[c]	0.389	0.524	-0.517	1.013
		Black	.085[a,c]	0.464	0.855	-0.827	0.997
		Latinx	-.245[a,c]	0.410	0.551	-1.050	0.561

	Latinx	White	.493[c]	0.354	0.164	-0.202	1.187
		Black	.329[a,c]	0.435	0.449	-0.525	1.184
		Asian	.245[a,c]	0.410	0.551	-0.561	1.050
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.778[a]	0.413	0.060	-1.590	0.034
		Asian	-.984[a,*]	0.387	0.011	-1.745	-0.223
		Latinx	-1.019[a,*]	0.352	0.004	-1.711	-0.327
	Black	White	.778[c]	0.413	0.060	-0.034	1.590
		Asian	-.206[a,c]	0.462	0.656	-1.114	0.702
		Latinx	-.241[a,c]	0.433	0.578	-1.091	0.610
	Asian	White	.984[*,c]	0.387	0.011	0.223	1.745
		Black	.206[a,c]	0.462	0.656	-0.702	1.114
		Latinx	-.035[a,c]	0.408	0.932	-0.837	0.767
	Latinx	White	1.019[*,c]	0.352	0.004	0.327	1.711
		Black	.241[a,c]	0.433	0.578	-0.610	1.091
		Asian	.035[a,c]	0.408	0.932	-0.767	0.837
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.232[a]	0.415	0.576	-1.046	0.583
		Asian	-.299[a]	0.389	0.442	-1.063	0.464
		Latinx	-.544[a]	0.353	0.124	-1.238	0.150
	Black	White	.232[c]	0.415	0.576	-0.583	1.046
		Asian	-.068[a,c]	0.463	0.884	-0.978	0.843
		Latinx	-.312[a,c]	0.434	0.472	-1.165	0.541
	Asian	White	.299[c]	0.389	0.442	-0.464	1.063
		Black	.068[a,c]	0.463	0.884	-0.843	0.978
		Latinx	-.245[a,c]	0.409	0.550	-1.049	0.560
	Latinx	White	.544[c]	0.353	0.124	-0.150	1.238
		Black	.312[a,c]	0.434	0.472	-0.541	1.165
		Asian	.245[a,c]	0.409	0.550	-0.560	1.049
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.316[a]	0.413	0.445	-1.127	0.495
		Asian	-.492[a]	0.387	0.204	-1.252	0.268
		Latinx	-.696[a,*]	0.352	0.048	-1.387	-0.005
	Black	White	.316[c]	0.413	0.445	-0.495	1.127
		Asian	-.176[a,c]	0.461	0.703	-1.083	0.730
		Latinx	-.381[a,c]	0.432	0.379	-1.230	0.469
	Asian	White	.492[c]	0.387	0.204	-0.268	1.252
		Black	.176[a,c]	0.461	0.703	-0.730	1.083
		Latinx	-.204[a,c]	0.408	0.616	-1.005	0.597
	Latinx	White	.696[*,c]	0.352	0.048	0.005	1.387
		Black	.381[a,c]	0.432	0.379	-0.469	1.230
		Asian	.204[a,c]	0.408	0.616	-0.597	1.005
	White	Black	-.480[a]	0.427	0.261	-1.319	0.358

Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.		Asian	-1.327[a,*]	0.400	0.001	-2.113	-0.541
		Latinx	-1.116[a,*]	0.363	0.002	-1.830	-0.402
	Black	White	.480[c]	0.427	0.261	-0.358	1.319
		Asian	-.847[a,c]	0.477	0.076	-1.784	0.090
		Latinx	-.636[a,c]	0.447	0.155	-1.514	0.242
	Asian	White	1.327[*,c]	0.400	0.001	0.541	2.113
		Black	.847[a,c]	0.477	0.076	-0.090	1.784
		Latinx	.211[a,c]	0.421	0.617	-0.617	1.039
	Latinx	White	1.116[*,c]	0.363	0.002	0.402	1.830
		Black	.636[a,c]	0.447	0.155	-0.242	1.514
		Asian	-.211[a,c]	0.421	0.617	-1.039	0.617
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	-.261[a]	0.451	0.563	-1.148	0.626
		Asian	-1.335[a,*]	0.423	0.002	-2.167	-0.504
		Latinx	-1.023[a,*]	0.385	0.008	-1.779	-0.267
	Black	White	.261[c]	0.451	0.563	-0.626	1.148
		Asian	-1.074[a,*,c]	0.505	0.034	-2.066	-0.082
		Latinx	-.762[a,c]	0.473	0.108	-1.691	0.167
	Asian	White	1.335[*,c]	0.423	0.002	0.504	2.167
		Black	1.074[a,*,c]	0.505	0.034	0.082	2.066
		Latinx	.312[a,c]	0.446	0.484	-0.564	1.188
	Latinx	White	1.023[*,c]	0.385	0.008	0.267	1.779
		Black	.762[a,c]	0.473	0.108	-0.167	1.691
		Asian	-.312[a,c]	0.446	0.484	-1.188	0.564
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.044[a]	0.428	0.917	-0.886	0.797
		Asian	-.988[a,*]	0.401	0.014	-1.777	-0.200
		Latinx	-.807[a,*]	0.365	0.027	-1.523	-0.090
	Black	White	.044[c]	0.428	0.917	-0.797	0.886
		Asian	-.944[a,*,c]	0.479	0.049	-1.885	-0.003
		Latinx	-.762[a,c]	0.448	0.090	-1.643	0.119
	Asian	White	.988[*,c]	0.401	0.014	0.200	1.777
		Black	.944[a,*,c]	0.479	0.049	0.003	1.885
		Latinx	.182[a,c]	0.423	0.667	-0.649	1.013
	Latinx	White	.807[*,c]	0.365	0.027	0.090	1.523
		Black	.762[a,c]	0.448	0.090	-0.119	1.643
		Asian	-.182[a,c]	0.423	0.667	-1.013	0.649
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White	White	Black	-.537[a]	0.436	0.219	-1.393	0.320
		Asian	-1.136[a,*]	0.408	0.006	-1.938	-0.333
		Latinx	-1.179[a,*]	0.371	0.002	-1.909	-0.450
	Black	White	.537[c]	0.436	0.219	-0.320	1.393
		Asian	-.599[a,c]	0.487	0.219	-1.556	0.358

4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.		Latinx	-.643[a,c]	0.456	0.160	-1.539	0.254
	Asian	White	1.136[*,c]	0.408	0.006	0.333	1.938
		Black	.599[a,c]	0.487	0.219	-0.358	1.556
		Latinx	-.043[a,c]	0.430	0.920	-0.889	0.802
	Latinx	White	1.179[*,c]	0.371	0.002	0.450	1.909
		Black	.643[a,c]	0.456	0.160	-0.254	1.539
		Asian	.043[a,c]	0.430	0.920	-0.802	0.889
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.350[a]	0.443	0.429	-1.220	0.519
		Asian	-.688[a]	0.415	0.098	-1.504	0.127
		Latinx	-.802[a,*]	0.377	0.034	-1.543	-0.061
	Black	White	.350[c]	0.443	0.429	-0.519	1.220
		Asian	-.338[a,c]	0.495	0.495	-1.310	0.634
		Latinx	-.452[a,c]	0.463	0.330	-1.362	0.459
	Asian	White	.688[c]	0.415	0.098	-0.127	1.504
		Black	.338[a,c]	0.495	0.495	-0.634	1.310
		Latinx	-.114[a,c]	0.437	0.795	-0.972	0.745
	Latinx	White	.802[*,c]	0.377	0.034	0.061	1.543
		Black	.452[a,c]	0.463	0.330	-0.459	1.362
		Asian	.114[a,c]	0.437	0.795	-0.745	0.972
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.244[a]	0.428	0.570	-1.085	0.598
		Asian	-1.078[a,*]	0.401	0.008	-1.867	-0.289
		Latinx	-1.066[a,*]	0.365	0.004	-1.783	-0.349
	Black	White	.244[c]	0.428	0.570	-0.598	1.085
		Asian	-.834[a,c]	0.479	0.082	-1.775	0.107
		Latinx	-.822[a,c]	0.449	0.067	-1.704	0.059
	Asian	White	1.078[*,c]	0.401	0.008	0.289	1.867
		Black	.834[a,c]	0.479	0.082	-0.107	1.775
		Latinx	.012[a,c]	0.423	0.978	-0.819	0.843
	Latinx	White	1.066[*,c]	0.365	0.004	0.349	1.783
		Black	.822[a,c]	0.449	0.067	-0.059	1.704
		Asian	-.012[a,c]	0.423	0.978	-0.843	0.819
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.262[a]	0.385	0.497	-0.494	1.018
		Asian	.181[a]	0.361	0.615	-0.527	0.890
		Latinx	-.336[a]	0.328	0.305	-0.980	0.308
	Black	White	-.262[c]	0.385	0.497	-1.018	0.494
		Asian	-.080[a,c]	0.430	0.852	-0.925	0.765
		Latinx	-.598[a,c]	0.403	0.138	-1.390	0.194
	Asian	White	-.181[c]	0.361	0.615	-0.890	0.527
		Black	.080[a,c]	0.430	0.852	-0.765	0.925
		Latinx	-.518[a,c]	0.380	0.174	-1.264	0.229

	Latinx	White	.336[c]	0.328	0.305	-0.308	0.980
		Black	.598[a,c]	0.403	0.138	-0.194	1.390
		Asian	.518[a,c]	0.380	0.174	-0.229	1.264
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.481[a]	0.428	0.262	-0.360	1.322
		Asian	.153[a]	0.401	0.703	-0.635	0.942
		Latinx	-.173[a]	0.365	0.636	-0.889	0.544
	Black	White	-.481[c]	0.428	0.262	-1.322	0.360
		Asian	-.328[a,c]	0.479	0.493	-1.269	0.613
		Latinx	-.654[a,c]	0.448	0.145	-1.535	0.227
	Asian	White	-.153[c]	0.401	0.703	-0.942	0.635
		Black	.328[a,c]	0.479	0.493	-0.613	1.269
		Latinx	-.326[a,c]	0.423	0.441	-1.157	0.505
	Latinx	White	.173[c]	0.365	0.636	-0.544	0.889
		Black	.654[a,c]	0.448	0.145	-0.227	1.535
		Asian	.326[a,c]	0.423	0.441	-0.505	1.157
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.454[a]	0.439	0.301	-0.408	1.316
		Asian	-.073[a]	0.411	0.858	-0.881	0.734
		Latinx	-.257[a]	0.374	0.491	-0.991	0.477
	Black	White	-.454[c]	0.439	0.301	-1.316	0.408
		Asian	-.528[a,c]	0.490	0.283	-1.491	0.436
		Latinx	-.711[a,c]	0.459	0.122	-1.614	0.191
	Asian	White	.073[c]	0.411	0.858	-0.734	0.881
		Black	.528[a,c]	0.490	0.283	-0.436	1.491
		Latinx	-.184[a,c]	0.433	0.671	-1.035	0.667
	Latinx	White	.257[c]	0.374	0.491	-0.477	0.991
		Black	.711[a,c]	0.459	0.122	-0.191	1.614
		Asian	.184[a,c]	0.433	0.671	-0.667	1.035
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.164[a]	0.438	0.708	-0.696	1.024
		Asian	-.165[a]	0.410	0.688	-0.971	0.641
		Latinx	-.527[a]	0.373	0.158	-1.260	0.205
	Black	White	-.164[c]	0.438	0.708	-1.024	0.696
		Asian	-.329[a,c]	0.489	0.502	-1.290	0.632
		Latinx	-.691[a,c]	0.458	0.132	-1.591	0.209
	Asian	White	.165[c]	0.410	0.688	-0.641	0.971
		Black	.329[a,c]	0.489	0.502	-0.632	1.290
		Latinx	-.362[a,c]	0.432	0.402	-1.211	0.487
	Latinx	White	.527[c]	0.373	0.158	-0.205	1.260
		Black	.691[a,c]	0.458	0.132	-0.209	1.591
		Asian	.362[a,c]	0.432	0.402	-0.487	1.211
	White	Black	.075[a]	0.450	0.868	-0.809	0.958

High Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.		Asian	-.325[a]	0.421	0.441	-1.153	0.503
		Latinx	-.456[a]	0.383	0.234	-1.209	0.296
	Black	White	-.075[c]	0.450	0.868	-0.958	0.809
		Asian	-.400[a,c]	0.503	0.427	-1.387	0.588
		Latinx	-.531[a,c]	0.471	0.260	-1.456	0.394
	Asian	White	.325[c]	0.421	0.441	-0.503	1.153
		Black	.400[a,c]	0.503	0.427	-0.588	1.387
		Latinx	-.131[a,c]	0.444	0.767	-1.004	0.741
	Latinx	White	.456[c]	0.383	0.234	-0.296	1.209
		Black	.531[a,c]	0.471	0.260	-0.394	1.456
		Asian	.131[a,c]	0.444	0.767	-0.741	1.004
High Attractiveness, High Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	.044[a]	0.454	0.923	-0.848	0.935
		Asian	-.276[a]	0.425	0.517	-1.112	0.560
		Latinx	-.642[a]	0.386	0.097	-1.401	0.118
	Black	White	-.044[c]	0.454	0.923	-0.935	0.848
		Asian	-.320[a,c]	0.507	0.529	-1.316	0.677
		Latinx	-.686[a,c]	0.475	0.150	-1.619	0.248
	Asian	White	.276[c]	0.425	0.517	-0.560	1.112
		Black	.320[a,c]	0.507	0.529	-0.677	1.316
		Latinx	-.366[a,c]	0.448	0.415	-1.246	0.515
	Latinx	White	.642[c]	0.386	0.097	-0.118	1.401
		Black	.686[a,c]	0.475	0.150	-0.248	1.619
		Asian	.366[a,c]	0.448	0.415	-0.515	1.246
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.377[a]	0.459	0.411	-0.524	1.278
		Asian	-.590[a]	0.430	0.170	-1.435	0.254
		Latinx	-.291[a]	0.391	0.457	-1.059	0.477
	Black	White	-.377[c]	0.459	0.411	-1.278	0.524
		Asian	-.967[a,c]	0.513	0.060	-1.975	0.040
		Latinx	-.668[a,c]	0.480	0.165	-1.612	0.276
	Asian	White	.590[c]	0.430	0.170	-0.254	1.435
		Black	.967[a,c]	0.513	0.060	-0.040	1.975
		Latinx	.299[a,c]	0.453	0.509	-0.591	1.189
	Latinx	White	.291[c]	0.391	0.457	-0.477	1.059
		Black	.668[a,c]	0.480	0.165	-0.276	1.612
		Asian	-.299[a,c]	0.453	0.509	-1.189	0.591
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White	White	Black	.621[a]	0.441	0.160	-0.245	1.486
		Asian	-.292[a]	0.413	0.480	-1.104	0.520
		Latinx	-.191[a]	0.375	0.611	-0.928	0.547
	Black	White	-.621[c]	0.441	0.160	-1.486	0.245
		Asian	-.913[a,c]	0.493	0.065	-1.880	0.055

2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.		Latinx	-.811[a,c]	0.461	0.079	-1.718	0.095
	Asian	White	.292[c]	0.413	0.480	-0.520	1.104
		Black	.913[a,c]	0.493	0.065	-0.055	1.880
		Latinx	.101[a,c]	0.435	0.816	-0.754	0.956
	Latinx	White	.191[c]	0.375	0.611	-0.547	0.928
		Black	.811[a,c]	0.461	0.079	-0.095	1.718
		Asian	-.101[a,c]	0.435	0.816	-0.956	0.754
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.014[a]	0.428	0.974	-0.827	0.854
		Asian	.025[a]	0.401	0.950	-0.763	0.813
		Latinx	-.192[a]	0.364	0.598	-0.908	0.524
	Black	White	-.014[c]	0.428	0.974	-0.854	0.827
		Asian	.011[a,c]	0.478	0.981	-0.928	0.951
		Latinx	-.206[a,c]	0.448	0.646	-1.086	0.674
	Asian	White	-.025[c]	0.401	0.950	-0.813	0.763
		Black	-.011[a,c]	0.478	0.981	-0.951	0.928
		Latinx	-.217[a,c]	0.422	0.607	-1.047	0.613
	Latinx	White	.192[c]	0.364	0.598	-0.524	0.908
		Black	.206[a,c]	0.448	0.646	-0.674	1.086
		Asian	.217[a,c]	0.422	0.607	-0.613	1.047
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.134[a]	0.434	0.758	-0.720	0.987
		Asian	.053[a]	0.407	0.896	-0.747	0.853
		Latinx	-.029[a]	0.370	0.938	-0.756	0.698
	Black	White	-.134[c]	0.434	0.758	-0.987	0.720
		Asian	-.081[a,c]	0.486	0.868	-1.035	0.874
		Latinx	-.163[a,c]	0.455	0.721	-1.057	0.731
	Asian	White	-.053[c]	0.407	0.896	-0.853	0.747
		Black	.081[a,c]	0.486	0.868	-0.874	1.035
		Latinx	-.082[a,c]	0.429	0.848	-0.925	0.761
	Latinx	White	.029[c]	0.370	0.938	-0.698	0.756
		Black	.163[a,c]	0.455	0.721	-0.731	1.057
		Asian	.082[a,c]	0.429	0.848	-0.761	0.925
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.142[a]	0.423	0.738	-0.689	0.973
		Asian	.388[a]	0.396	0.329	-0.391	1.167
		Latinx	-.002[a]	0.360	0.995	-0.710	0.706
	Black	White	-.142[c]	0.423	0.738	-0.973	0.689
		Asian	.246[a,c]	0.473	0.603	-0.683	1.175
		Latinx	-.144[a,c]	0.443	0.745	-1.014	0.726
	Asian	White	-.388[c]	0.396	0.329	-1.167	0.391
		Black	-.246[a,c]	0.473	0.603	-1.175	0.683
		Latinx	-.390[a,c]	0.418	0.351	-1.211	0.431

	Latinx	White	.002[c]	0.360	0.995	-0.706	0.710
		Black	.144[a,c]	0.443	0.745	-0.726	1.014
		Asian	.390[a,c]	0.418	0.351	-0.431	1.211
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: White 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	.155[a]	0.422	0.713	-0.674	0.984
		Asian	-.013[a]	0.396	0.975	-0.790	0.765
		Latinx	-.072[a]	0.359	0.841	-0.779	0.634
	Black	White	-.155[c]	0.422	0.713	-0.984	0.674
		Asian	-.168[a,c]	0.472	0.722	-1.095	0.759
		Latinx	-.227[a,c]	0.442	0.607	-1.096	0.641
	Asian	White	.013[c]	0.396	0.975	-0.765	0.790
		Black	.168[a,c]	0.472	0.722	-0.759	1.095
		Latinx	-.060[a,c]	0.417	0.886	-0.879	0.759
	Latinx	White	.072[c]	0.359	0.841	-0.634	0.779
		Black	.227[a,c]	0.442	0.607	-0.641	1.096
		Asian	.060[a,c]	0.417	0.886	-0.759	0.879
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	**-.015[a]**	**0.417**	**0.971**	**-0.834**	**0.804**
		Asian	-.391[a]	0.390	0.317	-1.158	0.376
		Latinx	-.723[a,*]	0.355	0.042	-1.420	-0.026
	Black	White	.015[c]	0.417	0.971	-0.804	0.834
		Asian	-.376[a,c]	0.466	0.420	-1.291	0.539
		Latinx	-.708[a,c]	0.436	0.105	-1.565	0.149
	Asian	White	.391[c]	0.390	0.317	-0.376	1.158
		Black	.376[a,c]	0.466	0.420	-0.539	1.291
		Latinx	-.332[a,c]	0.411	0.420	-1.141	0.476
	Latinx	White	.723[*,c]	0.355	0.042	0.026	1.420
		Black	.708[a,c]	0.436	0.105	-0.149	1.565
		Asian	.332[a,c]	0.411	0.420	-0.476	1.141
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.035[a]	0.428	0.935	-0.806	0.876
		Asian	-.191[a]	0.401	0.634	-0.980	0.597
		Latinx	-.740[a,*]	0.365	0.043	-1.457	-0.024
	Black	White	-.035[c]	0.428	0.935	-0.876	0.806
		Asian	-.226[a,c]	0.479	0.637	-1.166	0.714
		Latinx	-.775[a,c]	0.448	0.085	-1.656	0.106
	Asian	White	.191[c]	0.401	0.634	-0.597	0.980
		Black	.226[a,c]	0.479	0.637	-0.714	1.166
		Latinx	-.549[a,c]	0.423	0.195	-1.380	0.282
	Latinx	White	.740[*,c]	0.365	0.043	0.024	1.457
		Black	.775[a,c]	0.448	0.085	-0.106	1.656
		Asian	.549[a,c]	0.423	0.195	-0.282	1.380
	White	Black	.275[a]	0.431	0.523	-0.572	1.122

High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.		Asian	-.075[a]	0.404	0.852	-0.869	0.719
		Latinx	-.555[a]	0.367	0.131	-1.277	0.167
	Black	White	-.275[c]	0.431	0.523	-1.122	0.572
		Asian	-.350[a,c]	0.482	0.467	-1.297	0.597
		Latinx	-.830[a,c]	0.451	0.067	-1.717	0.057
	Asian	White	.075[c]	0.404	0.852	-0.719	0.869
		Black	.350[a,c]	0.482	0.467	-0.597	1.297
		Latinx	-.480[a,c]	0.426	0.260	-1.316	0.357
	Latinx	White	.555[c]	0.367	0.131	-0.167	1.277
		Black	.830[a,c]	0.451	0.067	-0.057	1.717
		Asian	.480[a,c]	0.426	0.260	-0.357	1.316
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.532[a]	0.425	0.211	-1.366	0.303
		Asian	-.330[a]	0.398	0.408	-1.112	0.452
		Latinx	-.873[a,*]	0.362	0.016	-1.584	-0.162
	Black	White	.532[c]	0.425	0.211	-0.303	1.366
		Asian	.202[a,c]	0.475	0.671	-0.731	1.135
		Latinx	-.341[a,c]	0.445	0.443	-1.215	0.532
	Asian	White	.330[c]	0.398	0.408	-0.452	1.112
		Black	-.202[a,c]	0.475	0.671	-1.135	0.731
		Latinx	-.543[a,c]	0.419	0.196	-1.367	0.280
	Latinx	White	.873[*,c]	0.362	0.016	0.162	1.584
		Black	.341[a,c]	0.445	0.443	-0.532	1.215
		Asian	.543[a,c]	0.419	0.196	-0.280	1.367
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.151[a]	0.438	0.730	-1.012	0.710
		Asian	.244[a]	0.411	0.552	-0.563	1.051
		Latinx	-.412[a]	0.373	0.270	-1.146	0.321
	Black	White	.151[c]	0.438	0.730	-0.710	1.012
		Asian	.395[a,c]	0.490	0.420	-0.567	1.358
		Latinx	-.261[a,c]	0.459	0.570	-1.163	0.641
	Asian	White	-.244[c]	0.411	0.552	-1.051	0.563
		Black	-.395[a,c]	0.490	0.420	-1.358	0.567
		Latinx	-.656[a,c]	0.433	0.130	-1.507	0.194
	Latinx	White	.412[c]	0.373	0.270	-0.321	1.146
		Black	.261[a,c]	0.459	0.570	-0.641	1.163
		Asian	.656[a,c]	0.433	0.130	-0.194	1.507
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian	White	Black	-.181[a]	0.428	0.673	-1.023	0.661
		Asian	-.010[a]	0.402	0.981	-0.799	0.779
		Latinx	-.487[a]	0.365	0.182	-1.204	0.230
	Black	White	.181[c]	0.428	0.673	-0.661	1.023
		Asian	.171[a,c]	0.479	0.721	-0.770	1.112

6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.		Latinx	-.306[a,c]	0.449	0.495	-1.188	0.575
	Asian	White	.010[c]	0.402	0.981	-0.779	0.799
		Black	-.171[a,c]	0.479	0.721	-1.112	0.770
		Latinx	-.478[a,c]	0.423	0.259	-1.309	0.354
	Latinx	White	.487[c]	0.365	0.182	-0.230	1.204
		Black	.306[a,c]	0.449	0.495	-0.575	1.188
		Asian	.478[a,c]	0.423	0.259	-0.354	1.309
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	-.092[a]	0.456	0.841	-0.989	0.805
		Asian	-.313[a]	0.428	0.465	-1.153	0.528
		Latinx	-.631[a]	0.389	0.105	-1.395	0.132
	Black	White	.092[c]	0.456	0.841	-0.805	0.989
		Asian	-.221[a,c]	0.510	0.665	-1.224	0.781
		Latinx	-.540[a,c]	0.478	0.259	-1.479	0.399
	Asian	White	.313[c]	0.428	0.465	-0.528	1.153
		Black	.221[a,c]	0.510	0.665	-0.781	1.224
		Latinx	-.319[a,c]	0.451	0.480	-1.204	0.567
	Latinx	White	.631[c]	0.389	0.105	-0.132	1.395
		Black	.540[a,c]	0.478	0.259	-0.399	1.479
		Asian	.319[a,c]	0.451	0.480	-0.567	1.204
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	-.020[a]	0.449	0.965	-0.902	0.863
		Asian	-.615[a]	0.421	0.145	-1.443	0.212
		Latinx	-.591[a]	0.383	0.123	-1.343	0.161
	Black	White	.020[c]	0.449	0.965	-0.863	0.902
		Asian	-.595[a,c]	0.502	0.236	-1.582	0.391
		Latinx	-.571[a,c]	0.470	0.225	-1.495	0.353
	Asian	White	.615[c]	0.421	0.145	-0.212	1.443
		Black	.595[a,c]	0.502	0.236	-0.391	1.582
		Latinx	.024[a,c]	0.444	0.956	-0.847	0.896
	Latinx	White	.591[c]	0.383	0.123	-0.161	1.343
		Black	.571[a,c]	0.470	0.225	-0.353	1.495
		Asian	-.024[a,c]	0.444	0.956	-0.896	0.847
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.296[a]	0.434	0.495	-1.148	0.556
		Asian	-.304[a]	0.406	0.455	-1.102	0.495
		Latinx	-.420[a]	0.369	0.256	-1.146	0.306
	Black	White	.296[c]	0.434	0.495	-0.556	1.148
		Asian	-.007[a,c]	0.485	0.988	-0.960	0.945
		Latinx	-.124[a,c]	0.454	0.785	-1.016	0.768
	Asian	White	.304[c]	0.406	0.455	-0.495	1.102
		Black	.007[a,c]	0.485	0.988	-0.945	0.960
		Latinx	-.116[a,c]	0.428	0.786	-0.958	0.725

	Latinx	White	.420[c]	0.369	0.256	-0.306	1.146
		Black	.124[a,c]	0.454	0.785	-0.768	1.016
		Asian	.116[a,c]	0.428	0.786	-0.725	0.958
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.410[a]	0.428	0.338	-1.250	0.431
		Asian	-.226[a]	0.401	0.573	-1.014	0.562
		Latinx	-.691[a]	0.364	0.058	-1.407	0.025
	Black	White	.410[c]	0.428	0.338	-0.431	1.250
		Asian	.184[a,c]	0.478	0.701	-0.755	1.123
		Latinx	-.281[a,c]	0.448	0.530	-1.161	0.599
	Asian	White	.226[c]	0.401	0.573	-0.562	1.014
		Black	-.184[a,c]	0.478	0.701	-1.123	0.755
		Latinx	-.465[a,c]	0.422	0.271	-1.295	0.365
	Latinx	White	.691[c]	0.364	0.058	-0.025	1.407
		Black	.281[a,c]	0.448	0.530	-0.599	1.161
		Asian	.465[a,c]	0.422	0.271	-0.365	1.295
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.471[a]	0.426	0.270	-1.307	0.366
		Asian	-.252[a]	0.399	0.528	-1.036	0.532
		Latinx	-.535[a]	0.363	0.141	-1.247	0.178
	Black	White	.471[c]	0.426	0.270	-0.366	1.307
		Asian	.218[a,c]	0.476	0.646	-0.717	1.154
		Latinx	-.064[a,c]	0.446	0.886	-0.940	0.812
	Asian	White	.252[c]	0.399	0.528	-0.532	1.036
		Black	-.218[a,c]	0.476	0.646	-1.154	0.717
		Latinx	-.282[a,c]	0.420	0.502	-1.109	0.544
	Latinx	White	.535[c]	0.363	0.141	-0.178	1.247
		Black	.064[a,c]	0.446	0.886	-0.812	0.940
		Asian	.282[a,c]	0.420	0.502	-0.544	1.109
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.378[a]	0.421	0.370	-1.205	0.449
		Asian	-.005[a]	0.394	0.990	-0.780	0.770
		Latinx	-.611[a]	0.359	0.089	-1.316	0.093
	Black	White	.378[c]	0.421	0.370	-0.449	1.205
		Asian	.373[a,c]	0.470	0.429	-0.552	1.297
		Latinx	-.234[a,c]	0.441	0.596	-1.100	0.633
	Asian	White	.005[c]	0.394	0.990	-0.770	0.780
		Black	-.373[a,c]	0.470	0.429	-1.297	0.552
		Latinx	-.606[a,c]	0.416	0.145	-1.423	0.210
	Latinx	White	.611[c]	0.359	0.089	-0.093	1.316
		Black	.234[a,c]	0.441	0.596	-0.633	1.100
		Asian	.606[a,c]	0.416	0.145	-0.210	1.423
	White	Black	-.295[a]	0.442	0.504	-1.163	0.573

High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.		Asian	-.662[a]	0.414	0.111	-1.475	0.152
		Latinx	-.970[a,*]	0.376	0.010	-1.709	-0.230
	Black	White	.295[c]	0.442	0.504	-0.573	1.163
		Asian	-.366[a,c]	0.494	0.459	-1.337	0.604
		Latinx	-.674[a,c]	0.463	0.146	-1.583	0.235
	Asian	White	.662[c]	0.414	0.111	-0.152	1.475
		Black	.366[a,c]	0.494	0.459	-0.604	1.337
		Latinx	-.308[a,c]	0.436	0.480	-1.165	0.549
	Latinx	White	.970[*,c]	0.376	0.010	0.230	1.709
		Black	.674[a,c]	0.463	0.146	-0.235	1.583
		Asian	.308[a,c]	0.436	0.480	-0.549	1.165
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.131[a]	0.443	0.768	-0.740	1.002
		Asian	.123[a]	0.416	0.768	-0.694	0.939
		Latinx	-.776[a,*]	0.378	0.040	-1.518	-0.034
	Black	White	-.131[c]	0.443	0.768	-1.002	0.740
		Asian	-.008[a,c]	0.496	0.986	-0.982	0.966
		Latinx	-.907[a,c]	0.464	0.051	-1.820	0.005
	Asian	White	-.123[c]	0.416	0.768	-0.939	0.694
		Black	.008[a,c]	0.496	0.986	-0.966	0.982
		Latinx	-.899[a,*,c]	0.438	0.041	-1.759	-0.038
	Latinx	White	.776[*,c]	0.378	0.040	0.034	1.518
		Black	.907[a,c]	0.464	0.051	-0.005	1.820
		Asian	.899[a,*,c]	0.438	0.041	0.038	1.759
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.254[a]	0.430	0.556	-0.592	1.100
		Asian	-.249[a]	0.403	0.537	-1.042	0.543
		Latinx	-.419[a]	0.367	0.254	-1.140	0.301
	Black	White	-.254[c]	0.430	0.556	-1.100	0.592
		Asian	-.503[a,c]	0.481	0.296	-1.449	0.442
		Latinx	-.673[a,c]	0.451	0.136	-1.559	0.213
	Asian	White	.249[c]	0.403	0.537	-0.543	1.042
		Black	.503[a,c]	0.481	0.296	-0.442	1.449
		Latinx	-.170[a,c]	0.425	0.690	-1.005	0.665
	Latinx	White	.419[c]	0.367	0.254	-0.301	1.140
		Black	.673[a,c]	0.451	0.136	-0.213	1.559
		Asian	.170[a,c]	0.425	0.690	-0.665	1.005
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian	White	Black	.122[a]	0.442	0.782	-0.745	0.990
		Asian	-.176[a]	0.414	0.671	-0.989	0.637
		Latinx	-.633[a]	0.376	0.093	-1.372	0.106
	Black	White	-.122[c]	0.442	0.782	-0.990	0.745
		Asian	-.298[a,c]	0.494	0.546	-1.268	0.672

4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.		Latinx	-.755[a,c]	0.462	0.103	-1.664	0.153
	Asian	White	.176[c]	0.414	0.671	-0.637	0.989
		Black	.298[a,c]	0.494	0.546	-0.672	1.268
		Latinx	-.457[a,c]	0.436	0.295	-1.314	0.399
	Latinx	White	.633[c]	0.376	0.093	-0.106	1.372
		Black	.755[a,c]	0.462	0.103	-0.153	1.664
		Asian	.457[a,c]	0.436	0.295	-0.399	1.314
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.214[a]	0.432	0.620	-0.634	1.063
		Asian	-.157[a]	0.405	0.698	-0.952	0.638
		Latinx	-.320[a]	0.368	0.385	-1.042	0.403
	Black	White	-.214[c]	0.432	0.620	-1.063	0.634
		Asian	-.372[a,c]	0.483	0.442	-1.320	0.577
		Latinx	-.534[a,c]	0.452	0.238	-1.423	0.354
	Asian	White	.157[c]	0.405	0.698	-0.638	0.952
		Black	.372[a,c]	0.483	0.442	-0.577	1.320
		Latinx	-.163[a,c]	0.426	0.703	-1.000	0.675
	Latinx	White	.320[c]	0.368	0.385	-0.403	1.042
		Black	.534[a,c]	0.452	0.238	-0.354	1.423
		Asian	.163[a,c]	0.426	0.703	-0.675	1.000
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Asian 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	.235[a]	0.426	0.582	-0.602	1.071
		Asian	-.174[a]	0.399	0.662	-0.959	0.610
		Latinx	-.532[a]	0.363	0.143	-1.245	0.180
	Black	White	-.235[c]	0.426	0.582	-1.071	0.602
		Asian	-.409[a,c]	0.476	0.390	-1.344	0.526
		Latinx	-.767[a,c]	0.446	0.086	-1.643	0.109
	Asian	White	.174[c]	0.399	0.662	-0.610	0.959
		Black	.409[a,c]	0.476	0.390	-0.526	1.344
		Latinx	-.358[a,c]	0.420	0.395	-1.184	0.468
	Latinx	White	.532[c]	0.363	0.143	-0.180	1.245
		Black	.767[a,c]	0.446	0.086	-0.109	1.643
		Asian	.358[a,c]	0.420	0.395	-0.468	1.184
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	-.035[a]	0.452	0.938	-0.923	0.853
		Asian	-1.006[a,*]	0.423	0.018	-1.838	-0.174
		Latinx	-.416[a]	0.385	0.280	-1.172	0.340
	Black	White	.035[c]	0.452	0.938	-0.853	0.923
		Asian	-.971[a,c]	0.505	0.055	-1.963	0.021
		Latinx	-.381[a,c]	0.473	0.421	-1.311	0.549
	Asian	White	1.006[*,c]	0.423	0.018	0.174	1.838
		Black	.971[a,c]	0.505	0.055	-0.021	1.963
		Latinx	.590[a,c]	0.446	0.187	-0.287	1.467

	Latinx	White	.416[c]	0.385	0.280	-0.340	1.172
		Black	.381[a,c]	0.473	0.421	-0.549	1.311
		Asian	-.590[a,c]	0.446	0.187	-1.467	0.287
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.298[a]	0.441	0.499	-0.568	1.164
		Asian	-.633[a]	0.413	0.126	-1.445	0.179
		Latinx	-.567[a]	0.376	0.132	-1.305	0.171
	Black	White	-.298[c]	0.441	0.499	-1.164	0.568
		Asian	-.931[a,c]	0.493	0.059	-1.900	0.037
		Latinx	-.865[a,c]	0.462	0.062	-1.772	0.042
	Asian	White	.633[c]	0.413	0.126	-0.179	1.445
		Black	.931[a,c]	0.493	0.059	-0.037	1.900
		Latinx	.066[a,c]	0.435	0.880	-0.789	0.921
	Latinx	White	.567[c]	0.376	0.132	-0.171	1.305
		Black	.865[a,c]	0.462	0.062	-0.042	1.772
		Asian	-.066[a,c]	0.435	0.880	-0.921	0.789
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.289[a]	0.444	0.515	-1.161	0.583
		Asian	-.522[a]	0.416	0.210	-1.339	0.295
		Latinx	-.292[a]	0.378	0.440	-1.035	0.451
	Black	White	.289[c]	0.444	0.515	-0.583	1.161
		Asian	-.233[a,c]	0.496	0.639	-1.208	0.742
		Latinx	-.003[a,c]	0.465	0.995	-0.916	0.910
	Asian	White	.522[c]	0.416	0.210	-0.295	1.339
		Black	.233[a,c]	0.496	0.639	-0.742	1.208
		Latinx	.230[a,c]	0.438	0.600	-0.631	1.091
	Latinx	White	.292[c]	0.378	0.440	-0.451	1.035
		Black	.003[a,c]	0.465	0.995	-0.910	0.916
		Asian	-.230[a,c]	0.438	0.600	-1.091	0.631
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.080[a]	0.430	0.852	-0.926	0.765
		Asian	-.578[a]	0.403	0.152	-1.371	0.214
		Latinx	-.431[a]	0.367	0.241	-1.151	0.289
	Black	White	.080[c]	0.430	0.852	-0.765	0.926
		Asian	-.498[a,c]	0.481	0.301	-1.443	0.447
		Latinx	-.351[a,c]	0.451	0.437	-1.236	0.535
	Asian	White	.578[c]	0.403	0.152	-0.214	1.371
		Black	.498[a,c]	0.481	0.301	-0.447	1.443
		Latinx	.147[a,c]	0.425	0.729	-0.687	0.982
	Latinx	White	.431[c]	0.367	0.241	-0.289	1.151
		Black	.351[a,c]	0.451	0.437	-0.535	1.236
		Asian	-.147[a,c]	0.425	0.729	-0.982	0.687
	White	Black	-.060[a]	0.431	0.889	-0.907	0.787

Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.		Asian	-.337[a]	0.404	0.405	-1.131	0.457
		Latinx	-.349[a]	0.367	0.343	-1.070	0.373
	Black	White	.060[c]	0.431	0.889	-0.787	0.907
		Asian	-.277[a,c]	0.482	0.566	-1.224	0.670
		Latinx	-.289[a,c]	0.452	0.523	-1.176	0.599
	Asian	White	.337[c]	0.404	0.405	-0.457	1.131
		Black	.277[a,c]	0.482	0.566	-0.670	1.224
		Latinx	-.011[a,c]	0.426	0.979	-0.848	0.825
	Latinx	White	.349[c]	0.367	0.343	-0.373	1.070
		Black	.289[a,c]	0.452	0.523	-0.599	1.176
		Asian	.011[a,c]	0.426	0.979	-0.825	0.848
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Asian 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.068[a]	0.411	0.869	-0.875	0.739
		Asian	-.520[a]	0.385	0.177	-1.277	0.236
		Latinx	-.498[a]	0.350	0.155	-1.185	0.189
	Black	White	.068[c]	0.411	0.869	-0.739	0.875
		Asian	-.453[a,c]	0.459	0.325	-1.355	0.449
		Latinx	-.430[a,c]	0.430	0.318	-1.275	0.415
	Asian	White	.520[c]	0.385	0.177	-0.236	1.277
		Black	.453[a,c]	0.459	0.325	-0.449	1.355
		Latinx	.022[a,c]	0.406	0.956	-0.774	0.819
	Latinx	White	.498[c]	0.350	0.155	-0.189	1.185
		Black	.430[a,c]	0.430	0.318	-0.415	1.275
		Asian	-.022[a,c]	0.406	0.956	-0.819	0.774
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	**.243[a]**	**0.411**	**0.555**	**-0.565**	**1.050**
		Asian	-.428[a]	0.385	0.267	-1.185	0.329
		Latinx	-.615[a]	0.350	0.080	-1.303	0.073
	Black	White	-.243[c]	0.411	0.555	-1.050	0.565
		Asian	-.671[a,c]	0.459	0.145	-1.573	0.232
		Latinx	-.858[a,*,c]	0.430	0.047	-1.703	-0.012
	Asian	White	.428[c]	0.385	0.267	-0.329	1.185
		Black	.671[a,c]	0.459	0.145	-0.232	1.573
		Latinx	-.187[a,c]	0.406	0.645	-0.985	0.611
	Latinx	White	.615[c]	0.350	0.080	-0.073	1.303
		Black	.858[a,*,c]	0.430	0.047	0.012	1.703
		Asian	.187[a,c]	0.406	0.645	-0.611	0.985
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	White	Black	.079[a]	0.446	0.859	-0.797	0.955
		Asian	-.082[a]	0.418	0.844	-0.903	0.739
		Latinx	-.531[a]	0.380	0.163	-1.277	0.216
	Black	White	-.079[c]	0.446	0.859	-0.955	0.797
		Asian	-.162[a,c]	0.498	0.746	-1.141	0.818

2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.		Latinx	-.610[a,c]	0.467	0.192	-1.527	0.308
	Asian	White	.082[c]	0.418	0.844	-0.739	0.903
		Black	.162[a,c]	0.498	0.746	-0.818	1.141
		Latinx	-.448[a,c]	0.440	0.309	-1.313	0.417
	Latinx	White	.531[c]	0.380	0.163	-0.216	1.277
		Black	.610[a,c]	0.467	0.192	-0.308	1.527
		Asian	.448[a,c]	0.440	0.309	-0.417	1.313
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.149[a]	0.449	0.740	-1.032	0.733
		Asian	-.193[a]	0.421	0.646	-1.021	0.634
		Latinx	-.704[a]	0.383	0.066	-1.456	0.048
	Black	White	.149[c]	0.449	0.740	-0.733	1.032
		Asian	-.044[a,c]	0.502	0.930	-1.031	0.942
		Latinx	-.555[a,c]	0.470	0.239	-1.479	0.369
	Asian	White	.193[c]	0.421	0.646	-0.634	1.021
		Black	.044[a,c]	0.502	0.930	-0.942	1.031
		Latinx	-.511[a,c]	0.444	0.250	-1.382	0.361
	Latinx	White	.704[c]	0.383	0.066	-0.048	1.456
		Black	.555[a,c]	0.470	0.239	-0.369	1.479
		Asian	.511[a,c]	0.444	0.250	-0.361	1.382
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.491[a]	0.447	0.273	-0.388	1.369
		Asian	-.097[a]	0.419	0.818	-0.921	0.727
		Latinx	-.514[a]	0.381	0.178	-1.263	0.235
	Black	White	-.491[c]	0.447	0.273	-1.369	0.388
		Asian	-.587[a,c]	0.500	0.241	-1.570	0.395
		Latinx	-1.005[a,*,c]	0.468	0.032	-1.925	-0.084
	Asian	White	.097[c]	0.419	0.818	-0.727	0.921
		Black	.587[a,c]	0.500	0.241	-0.395	1.570
		Latinx	-.417[a,c]	0.442	0.345	-1.285	0.451
	Latinx	White	.514[c]	0.381	0.178	-0.235	1.263
		Black	1.005[a,*,c]	0.468	0.032	0.084	1.925
		Asian	.417[a,c]	0.442	0.345	-0.451	1.285
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.650[a]	0.450	0.149	-0.235	1.536
		Asian	-.026[a]	0.422	0.952	-0.855	0.804
		Latinx	-.426[a]	0.384	0.268	-1.180	0.328
	Black	White	-.650[c]	0.450	0.149	-1.536	0.235
		Asian	-.676[a,c]	0.504	0.180	-1.665	0.313
		Latinx	-1.076[a,*,c]	0.472	0.023	-2.003	-0.149
	Asian	White	.026[c]	0.422	0.952	-0.804	0.855
		Black	.676[a,c]	0.504	0.180	-0.313	1.665
		Latinx	-.400[a,c]	0.445	0.369	-1.274	0.474

	Latinx	White	.426[c]	0.384	0.268	-0.328	1.180
		Black	1.076[a,*,c]	0.472	0.023	0.149	2.003
		Asian	.400[a,c]	0.445	0.369	-0.474	1.274
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	.681[a]	0.435	0.118	-0.173	1.535
		Asian	-.046[a]	0.407	0.910	-0.846	0.754
		Latinx	-.457[a]	0.370	0.217	-1.185	0.270
	Black	White	-.681[c]	0.435	0.118	-1.535	0.173
		Asian	-.727[a,c]	0.486	0.135	-1.681	0.228
		Latinx	-1.138[a,*,c]	0.455	0.013	-2.033	-0.244
	Asian	White	.046[c]	0.407	0.910	-0.754	0.846
		Black	.727[a,c]	0.486	0.135	-0.228	1.681
		Latinx	-.411[a,c]	0.429	0.338	-1.255	0.432
	Latinx	White	.457[c]	0.370	0.217	-0.270	1.185
		Black	1.138[a,*,c]	0.455	0.013	0.244	2.033
		Asian	.411[a,c]	0.429	0.338	-0.432	1.255
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.290[a]	0.461	0.529	-0.615	1.196
		Asian	-.888[a,*]	0.432	0.040	-1.737	-0.039
		Latinx	-.548[a]	0.393	0.164	-1.320	0.224
	Black	White	-.290[c]	0.461	0.529	-1.196	0.615
		Asian	-1.179[a,*,c]	0.515	0.023	-2.191	-0.166
		Latinx	-.838[a,c]	0.483	0.083	-1.787	0.110
	Asian	White	.888[*,c]	0.432	0.040	0.039	1.737
		Black	1.179[a,*,c]	0.515	0.023	0.166	2.191
		Latinx	.340[a,c]	0.455	0.455	-0.554	1.235
	Latinx	White	.548[c]	0.393	0.164	-0.224	1.320
		Black	.838[a,c]	0.483	0.083	-0.110	1.787
		Asian	-.340[a,c]	0.455	0.455	-1.235	0.554
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.074[a]	0.437	0.866	-0.785	0.933
		Asian	-.394[a]	0.410	0.337	-1.199	0.412
		Latinx	-.421[a]	0.372	0.259	-1.153	0.311
	Black	White	-.074[c]	0.437	0.866	-0.933	0.785
		Asian	-.468[a,c]	0.489	0.339	-1.428	0.493
		Latinx	-.495[a,c]	0.458	0.280	-1.395	0.404
	Asian	White	.394[c]	0.410	0.337	-0.412	1.199
		Black	.468[a,c]	0.489	0.339	-0.493	1.428
		Latinx	-.028[a,c]	0.432	0.949	-0.876	0.821
	Latinx	White	.421[c]	0.372	0.259	-0.311	1.153
		Black	.495[a,c]	0.458	0.280	-0.404	1.395
		Asian	.028[a,c]	0.432	0.949	-0.821	0.876
	White	Black	-.317[a]	0.427	0.458	-1.156	0.522

Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.		Asian	-.251[a]	0.400	0.530	-1.037	0.535
		Latinx	-.378[a]	0.364	0.298	-1.093	0.336
	Black	White	.317[c]	0.427	0.458	-0.522	1.156
		Asian	.066[a,c]	0.477	0.891	-0.872	1.003
		Latinx	-.062[a,c]	0.447	0.891	-0.940	0.817
	Asian	White	.251[c]	0.400	0.530	-0.535	1.037
		Black	-.066[a,c]	0.477	0.891	-1.003	0.872
		Latinx	-.127[a,c]	0.421	0.763	-0.955	0.701
	Latinx	White	.378[c]	0.364	0.298	-0.336	1.093
		Black	.062[a,c]	0.447	0.891	-0.817	0.940
		Asian	.127[a,c]	0.421	0.763	-0.701	0.955
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.138[a]	0.433	0.751	-0.713	0.988
		Asian	-.075[a]	0.406	0.854	-0.872	0.723
		Latinx	-.332[a]	0.369	0.368	-1.057	0.392
	Black	White	-.138[c]	0.433	0.751	-0.988	0.713
		Asian	-.212[a,c]	0.484	0.661	-1.163	0.738
		Latinx	-.470[a,c]	0.453	0.300	-1.361	0.421
	Asian	White	.075[c]	0.406	0.854	-0.723	0.872
		Black	.212[a,c]	0.484	0.661	-0.738	1.163
		Latinx	-.258[a,c]	0.427	0.547	-1.098	0.582
	Latinx	White	.332[c]	0.369	0.368	-0.392	1.057
		Black	.470[a,c]	0.453	0.300	-0.421	1.361
		Asian	.258[a,c]	0.427	0.547	-0.582	1.098
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.114[a]	0.435	0.794	-0.741	0.969
		Asian	-.457[a]	0.408	0.264	-1.258	0.345
		Latinx	-.459[a]	0.371	0.216	-1.188	0.269
	Black	White	-.114[c]	0.435	0.794	-0.969	0.741
		Asian	-.570[a,c]	0.487	0.242	-1.526	0.385
		Latinx	-.573[a,c]	0.456	0.209	-1.469	0.322
	Asian	White	.457[c]	0.408	0.264	-0.345	1.258
		Black	.570[a,c]	0.487	0.242	-0.385	1.526
		Latinx	-.003[a,c]	0.430	0.995	-0.847	0.842
	Latinx	White	.459[c]	0.371	0.216	-0.269	1.188
		Black	.573[a,c]	0.456	0.209	-0.322	1.469
		Asian	.003[a,c]	0.430	0.995	-0.842	0.847
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Black	White	Black	.197[a]	0.425	0.643	-0.638	1.033
		Asian	-.352[a]	0.398	0.378	-1.134	0.431
		Latinx	-.397[a]	0.362	0.273	-1.109	0.314
	Black	White	-.197[c]	0.425	0.643	-1.033	0.638
		Asian	-.549[a,c]	0.475	0.249	-1.483	0.385

6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.		Latinx	-.594[a,c]	0.445	0.182	-1.469	0.280
	Asian	White	.352[c]	0.398	0.378	-0.431	1.134
		Black	.549[a,c]	0.475	0.249	-0.385	1.483
		Latinx	-.045[a,c]	0.420	0.914	-0.870	0.779
	Latinx	White	.397[c]	0.362	0.273	-0.314	1.109
		Black	.594[a,c]	0.445	0.182	-0.280	1.469
		Asian	.045[a,c]	0.420	0.914	-0.779	0.870
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.123[a]	0.424	0.773	-0.711	0.956
		Asian	-.575[a]	0.397	0.149	-1.356	0.206
		Latinx	-.526[a]	0.361	0.146	-1.236	0.184
	Black	White	-.123[c]	0.424	0.773	-0.956	0.711
		Asian	-.697[a,c]	0.474	0.142	-1.629	0.234
		Latinx	-.648[a,c]	0.444	0.145	-1.521	0.224
	Asian	White	.575[c]	0.397	0.149	-0.206	1.356
		Black	.697[a,c]	0.474	0.142	-0.234	1.629
		Latinx	.049[a,c]	0.419	0.907	-0.774	0.872
	Latinx	White	.526[c]	0.361	0.146	-0.184	1.236
		Black	.648[a,c]	0.444	0.145	-0.224	1.521
		Asian	-.049[a,c]	0.419	0.907	-0.872	0.774
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.166[a]	0.446	0.709	-0.709	1.042
		Asian	-.624[a]	0.418	0.136	-1.445	0.196
		Latinx	-.812[a,*]	0.380	0.033	-1.558	-0.066
	Black	White	-.166[c]	0.446	0.709	-1.042	0.709
		Asian	-.791[a,c]	0.498	0.113	-1.770	0.188
		Latinx	-.978[a,*,c]	0.467	0.037	-1.895	-0.061
	Asian	White	.624[c]	0.418	0.136	-0.196	1.445
		Black	.791[a,c]	0.498	0.113	-0.188	1.770
		Latinx	-.187[a,c]	0.440	0.671	-1.052	0.678
	Latinx	White	.812[*,c]	0.380	0.033	0.066	1.558
		Black	.978[a,*,c]	0.467	0.037	0.061	1.895
		Asian	.187[a,c]	0.440	0.671	-0.678	1.052
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.320[a]	0.438	0.466	-0.542	1.182
		Asian	-.275[a]	0.411	0.504	-1.082	0.533
		Latinx	-.471[a]	0.373	0.208	-1.205	0.263
	Black	White	-.320[c]	0.438	0.466	-1.182	0.542
		Asian	-.595[a,c]	0.490	0.225	-1.558	0.368
		Latinx	-.791[a,c]	0.459	0.086	-1.693	0.111
	Asian	White	.275[c]	0.411	0.504	-0.533	1.082
		Black	.595[a,c]	0.490	0.225	-0.368	1.558
		Latinx	-.196[a,c]	0.433	0.651	-1.047	0.655

	Latinx	White	.471[c]	0.373	0.208	-0.263	1.205
		Black	.791[a,c]	0.459	0.086	-0.111	1.693
		Asian	.196[a,c]	0.433	0.651	-0.655	1.047
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.075[a]	0.444	0.866	-0.797	0.948
		Asian	-.346[a]	0.416	0.407	-1.163	0.472
		Latinx	-.668[a]	0.378	0.078	-1.411	0.075
	Black	White	-.075[c]	0.444	0.866	-0.948	0.797
		Asian	-.421[a,c]	0.496	0.397	-1.396	0.554
		Latinx	-.743[a,c]	0.465	0.111	-1.657	0.171
	Asian	White	.346[c]	0.416	0.407	-0.472	1.163
		Black	.421[a,c]	0.496	0.397	-0.554	1.396
		Latinx	-.322[a,c]	0.439	0.463	-1.184	0.540
	Latinx	White	.668[c]	0.378	0.078	-0.075	1.411
		Black	.743[a,c]	0.465	0.111	-0.171	1.657
		Asian	.322[a,c]	0.439	0.463	-0.540	1.184
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.320[a]	0.440	0.467	-0.544	1.185
		Asian	.029[a]	0.412	0.943	-0.781	0.840
		Latinx	-.435[a]	0.375	0.247	-1.171	0.302
	Black	White	-.320[c]	0.440	0.467	-1.185	0.544
		Asian	-.291[a,c]	0.492	0.555	-1.257	0.676
		Latinx	-.755[a,c]	0.461	0.102	-1.660	0.151
	Asian	White	-.029[c]	0.412	0.943	-0.840	0.781
		Black	.291[a,c]	0.492	0.555	-0.676	1.257
		Latinx	-.464[a,c]	0.435	0.286	-1.318	0.390
	Latinx	White	.435[c]	0.375	0.247	-0.302	1.171
		Black	.755[a,c]	0.461	0.102	-0.151	1.660
		Asian	.464[a,c]	0.435	0.286	-0.390	1.318
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Black 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	.424[a]	0.446	0.341	-0.451	1.300
		Asian	-.415[a]	0.418	0.321	-1.236	0.406
		Latinx	-.394[a]	0.380	0.300	-1.140	0.352
	Black	White	-.424[c]	0.446	0.341	-1.300	0.451
		Asian	-.840[a,c]	0.498	0.093	-1.819	0.140
		Latinx	-.819[a,c]	0.467	0.080	-1.736	0.098
	Asian	White	.415[c]	0.418	0.321	-0.406	1.236
		Black	.840[a,c]	0.498	0.093	-0.140	1.819
		Latinx	.021[a,c]	0.440	0.962	-0.844	0.886
	Latinx	White	.394[c]	0.380	0.300	-0.352	1.140
		Black	.819[a,c]	0.467	0.080	-0.098	1.736
		Asian	-.021[a,c]	0.440	0.962	-0.886	0.844
	White	Black	.162[a]	0.465	0.727	-0.751	1.075

Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.		Asian	-.786[a]	0.436	0.072	-1.641	0.070
		Latinx	-.382[a]	0.396	0.335	-1.160	0.396
	Black	White	-.162[c]	0.465	0.727	-1.075	0.751
		Asian	-.948[a,c]	0.519	0.069	-1.969	0.073
		Latinx	-.544[a,c]	0.487	0.264	-1.501	0.412
	Asian	White	.786[c]	0.436	0.072	-0.070	1.641
		Black	.948[a,c]	0.519	0.069	-0.073	1.969
		Latinx	.403[a,c]	0.459	0.380	-0.498	1.305
	Latinx	White	.382[c]	0.396	0.335	-0.396	1.160
		Black	.544[a,c]	0.487	0.264	-0.412	1.501
		Asian	-.403[a,c]	0.459	0.380	-1.305	0.498
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.124[a]	0.444	0.780	-0.749	0.997
		Asian	-.580[a]	0.416	0.164	-1.398	0.238
		Latinx	-.642[a]	0.378	0.090	-1.386	0.101
	Black	White	-.124[c]	0.444	0.780	-0.997	0.749
		Asian	-.704[a,c]	0.497	0.157	-1.680	0.272
		Latinx	-.766[a,c]	0.465	0.100	-1.680	0.148
	Asian	White	.580[c]	0.416	0.164	-0.238	1.398
		Black	.704[a,c]	0.497	0.157	-0.272	1.680
		Latinx	-.062[a,c]	0.439	0.888	-0.924	0.800
	Latinx	White	.642[c]	0.378	0.090	-0.101	1.386
		Black	.766[a,c]	0.465	0.100	-0.148	1.680
		Asian	.062[a,c]	0.439	0.888	-0.800	0.924
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.001[a]	0.414	0.998	-0.812	0.814
		Asian	-.170[a]	0.388	0.661	-0.933	0.592
		Latinx	-.428[a]	0.353	0.226	-1.121	0.265
	Black	White	-.001[c]	0.414	0.998	-0.814	0.812
		Asian	-.171[a,c]	0.463	0.711	-1.081	0.738
		Latinx	-.429[a,c]	0.434	0.323	-1.281	0.423
	Asian	White	.170[c]	0.388	0.661	-0.592	0.933
		Black	.171[a,c]	0.463	0.711	-0.738	1.081
		Latinx	-.257[a,c]	0.409	0.529	-1.061	0.546
	Latinx	White	.428[c]	0.353	0.226	-0.265	1.121
		Black	.429[a,c]	0.434	0.323	-0.423	1.281
		Asian	.257[a,c]	0.409	0.529	-0.546	1.061
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black	White	Black	.012[a]	0.433	0.978	-0.838	0.862
		Asian	-.402[a]	0.405	0.322	-1.199	0.394
		Latinx	-.333[a]	0.368	0.366	-1.058	0.391
	Black	White	-.012[c]	0.433	0.978	-0.862	0.838
		Asian	-.414[a,c]	0.484	0.392	-1.364	0.536

4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.		Latinx	-.345[a,c]	0.453	0.446	-1.235	0.545
	Asian	White	.402[c]	0.405	0.322	-0.394	1.199
		Black	.414[a,c]	0.484	0.392	-0.536	1.364
		Latinx	.069[a,c]	0.427	0.872	-0.770	0.908
	Latinx	White	.333[c]	0.368	0.366	-0.391	1.058
		Black	.345[a,c]	0.453	0.446	-0.545	1.235
		Asian	-.069[a,c]	0.427	0.872	-0.908	0.770
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.128[a]	0.416	0.759	-0.946	0.691
		Asian	-.295[a]	0.390	0.450	-1.062	0.472
		Latinx	-.418[a]	0.355	0.239	-1.115	0.279
	Black	White	.128[c]	0.416	0.759	-0.691	0.946
		Asian	-.167[a,c]	0.465	0.720	-1.082	0.748
		Latinx	-.290[a,c]	0.436	0.506	-1.147	0.566
	Asian	White	.295[c]	0.390	0.450	-0.472	1.062
		Black	.167[a,c]	0.465	0.720	-0.748	1.082
		Latinx	-.123[a,c]	0.411	0.764	-0.931	0.685
	Latinx	White	.418[c]	0.355	0.239	-0.279	1.115
		Black	.290[a,c]	0.436	0.506	-0.566	1.147
		Asian	.123[a,c]	0.411	0.764	-0.685	0.931
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Black 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.178[a]	0.418	0.670	-0.999	0.643
		Asian	-.430[a]	0.392	0.273	-1.199	0.340
		Latinx	-.479[a]	0.356	0.179	-1.178	0.220
	Black	White	.178[c]	0.418	0.670	-0.643	0.999
		Asian	-.252[a,c]	0.467	0.590	-1.169	0.666
		Latinx	-.301[a,c]	0.438	0.492	-1.161	0.559
	Asian	White	.430[c]	0.392	0.273	-0.340	1.199
		Black	.252[a,c]	0.467	0.590	-0.666	1.169
		Latinx	-.049[a,c]	0.413	0.905	-0.860	0.761
	Latinx	White	.479[c]	0.356	0.179	-0.220	1.178
		Black	.301[a,c]	0.438	0.492	-0.559	1.161
		Asian	.049[a,c]	0.413	0.905	-0.761	0.860
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	-.061[a]	0.432	0.888	-0.910	0.788
		Asian	-.396[a]	0.405	0.329	-1.192	0.400
		Latinx	-.273[a]	0.368	0.459	-0.996	0.450
	Black	White	.061[c]	0.432	0.888	-0.788	0.910
		Asian	-.335[a,c]	0.483	0.489	-1.284	0.614
		Latinx	-.212[a,c]	0.453	0.639	-1.101	0.677
	Asian	White	.396[c]	0.405	0.329	-0.400	1.192
		Black	.335[a,c]	0.483	0.489	-0.614	1.284
		Latinx	.123[a,c]	0.427	0.774	-0.716	0.961

	Latinx	White	.273[c]	0.368	0.459	-0.450	0.996
		Black	.212[a,c]	0.453	0.639	-0.677	1.101
		Asian	-.123[a,c]	0.427	0.774	-0.961	0.716
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	-.013[a]	0.434	0.976	-0.867	0.841
		Asian	-.605[a]	0.407	0.138	-1.405	0.195
		Latinx	-.269[a]	0.370	0.468	-0.996	0.459
	Black	White	.013[c]	0.434	0.976	-0.841	0.867
		Asian	-.592[a,c]	0.486	0.223	-1.547	0.362
		Latinx	-.256[a,c]	0.455	0.574	-1.150	0.638
	Asian	White	.605[c]	0.407	0.138	-0.195	1.405
		Black	.592[a,c]	0.486	0.223	-0.362	1.547
		Latinx	.337[a,c]	0.429	0.433	-0.506	1.180
	Latinx	White	.269[c]	0.370	0.468	-0.459	0.996
		Black	.256[a,c]	0.455	0.574	-0.638	1.150
		Asian	-.337[a,c]	0.429	0.433	-1.180	0.506
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.145[a]	0.418	0.729	-0.966	0.677
		Asian	-.592[a]	0.392	0.132	-1.362	0.178
		Latinx	-.450[a]	0.356	0.207	-1.150	0.249
	Black	White	.145[c]	0.418	0.729	-0.677	0.966
		Asian	-.447[a,c]	0.467	0.339	-1.365	0.471
		Latinx	-.305[a,c]	0.438	0.486	-1.165	0.555
	Asian	White	.592[c]	0.392	0.132	-0.178	1.362
		Black	.447[a,c]	0.467	0.339	-0.471	1.365
		Latinx	.142[a,c]	0.413	0.732	-0.669	0.953
	Latinx	White	.450[c]	0.356	0.207	-0.249	1.150
		Black	.305[a,c]	0.438	0.486	-0.555	1.165
		Asian	-.142[a,c]	0.413	0.732	-0.953	0.669
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.524[a]	0.422	0.215	-1.353	0.305
		Asian	-.191[a]	0.395	0.629	-0.968	0.586
		Latinx	-.566[a]	0.359	0.116	-1.272	0.140
	Black	White	.524[c]	0.422	0.215	-0.305	1.353
		Asian	.333[a,c]	0.472	0.480	-0.593	1.260
		Latinx	-.042[a,c]	0.442	0.925	-0.910	0.826
	Asian	White	.191[c]	0.395	0.629	-0.586	0.968
		Black	-.333[a,c]	0.472	0.480	-1.260	0.593
		Latinx	-.375[a,c]	0.417	0.369	-1.193	0.444
	Latinx	White	.566[c]	0.359	0.116	-0.140	1.272
		Black	.042[a,c]	0.442	0.925	-0.826	0.910
		Asian	.375[a,c]	0.417	0.369	-0.444	1.193
	White	Black	-.462[a]	0.418	0.269	-1.283	0.359

High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.		Asian	-.380[a]	0.392	0.332	-1.149	0.389
		Latinx	-.470[a]	0.356	0.187	-1.169	0.229
	Black	White	.462[c]	0.418	0.269	-0.359	1.283
		Asian	.082[a,c]	0.467	0.860	-0.835	1.000
		Latinx	-.008[a,c]	0.438	0.986	-0.867	0.852
	Asian	White	.380[c]	0.392	0.332	-0.389	1.149
		Black	-.082[a,c]	0.467	0.860	-1.000	0.835
		Latinx	-.090[a,c]	0.413	0.828	-0.901	0.721
	Latinx	White	.470[c]	0.356	0.187	-0.229	1.169
		Black	.008[a,c]	0.438	0.986	-0.852	0.867
		Asian	.090[a,c]	0.413	0.828	-0.721	0.901
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.363[a]	0.418	0.385	-1.184	0.457
		Asian	-.274[a]	0.391	0.484	-1.043	0.495
		Latinx	-.448[a]	0.356	0.208	-1.147	0.250
	Black	White	.363[c]	0.418	0.385	-0.457	1.184
		Asian	.090[a,c]	0.467	0.848	-0.828	1.007
		Latinx	-.085[a,c]	0.437	0.846	-0.944	0.774
	Asian	White	.274[c]	0.391	0.484	-0.495	1.043
		Black	-.090[a,c]	0.467	0.848	-1.007	0.828
		Latinx	-.175[a,c]	0.412	0.672	-0.985	0.636
	Latinx	White	.448[c]	0.356	0.208	-0.250	1.147
		Black	.085[a,c]	0.437	0.846	-0.774	0.944
		Asian	.175[a,c]	0.412	0.672	-0.636	0.985
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.064[a]	0.465	0.891	-0.850	0.977
		Asian	-1.125[a,*]	0.436	0.010	-1.981	-0.269
		Latinx	-.387[a]	0.396	0.329	-1.165	0.391
	Black	White	-.064[c]	0.465	0.891	-0.977	0.850
		Asian	-1.189[a,*,c]	0.520	0.023	-2.210	-0.167
		Latinx	-.451[a,c]	0.487	0.355	-1.408	0.506
	Asian	White	1.125[*,c]	0.436	0.010	0.269	1.981
		Black	1.189[a,*,c]	0.520	0.023	0.167	2.210
		Latinx	.737[a,c]	0.459	0.109	-0.165	1.640
	Latinx	White	.387[c]	0.396	0.329	-0.391	1.165
		Black	.451[a,c]	0.487	0.355	-0.506	1.408
		Asian	-.737[a,c]	0.459	0.109	-1.640	0.165
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	White	Black	.327[a]	0.445	0.463	-0.547	1.201
		Asian	-.657[a]	0.417	0.116	-1.476	0.163
		Latinx	-.386[a]	0.379	0.310	-1.130	0.359
	Black	White	-.327[c]	0.445	0.463	-1.201	0.547
		Asian	-.984[a,*,c]	0.497	0.049	-1.961	-0.006

2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.		Latinx	-.712[a,c]	0.466	0.127	-1.628	0.203
	Asian	White	.657[c]	0.417	0.116	-0.163	1.476
		Black	.984[a,*,c]	0.497	0.049	0.006	1.961
		Latinx	.271[a,c]	0.439	0.537	-0.592	1.135
	Latinx	White	.386[c]	0.379	0.310	-0.359	1.130
		Black	.712[a,c]	0.466	0.127	-0.203	1.628
		Asian	-.271[a,c]	0.439	0.537	-1.135	0.592
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	-.220[a]	0.435	0.613	-1.075	0.634
		Asian	-.437[a]	0.408	0.284	-1.238	0.364
		Latinx	-.319[a]	0.370	0.390	-1.047	0.409
	Black	White	.220[c]	0.435	0.613	-0.634	1.075
		Asian	-.216[a,c]	0.486	0.656	-1.172	0.739
		Latinx	-.099[a,c]	0.455	0.829	-0.993	0.796
	Asian	White	.437[c]	0.408	0.284	-0.364	1.238
		Black	.216[a,c]	0.486	0.656	-0.739	1.172
		Latinx	.118[a,c]	0.429	0.784	-0.726	0.962
	Latinx	White	.319[c]	0.370	0.390	-0.409	1.047
		Black	.099[a,c]	0.455	0.829	-0.796	0.993
		Asian	-.118[a,c]	0.429	0.784	-0.962	0.726
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.311[a]	0.425	0.465	-1.146	0.524
		Asian	-.595[a]	0.398	0.136	-1.377	0.188
		Latinx	-.476[a]	0.362	0.189	-1.188	0.235
	Black	White	.311[c]	0.425	0.465	-0.524	1.146
		Asian	-.284[a,c]	0.475	0.550	-1.217	0.649
		Latinx	-.166[a,c]	0.445	0.710	-1.040	0.709
	Asian	White	.595[c]	0.398	0.136	-0.188	1.377
		Black	.284[a,c]	0.475	0.550	-0.649	1.217
		Latinx	.118[a,c]	0.420	0.778	-0.706	0.943
	Latinx	White	.476[c]	0.362	0.189	-0.235	1.188
		Black	.166[a,c]	0.445	0.710	-0.709	1.040
		Asian	-.118[a,c]	0.420	0.778	-0.943	0.706
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.097[a]	0.426	0.819	-0.935	0.740
		Asian	-.269[a]	0.400	0.501	-1.055	0.516
		Latinx	-.144[a]	0.363	0.692	-0.858	0.570
	Black	White	.097[c]	0.426	0.819	-0.740	0.935
		Asian	-.172[a,c]	0.477	0.718	-1.109	0.765
		Latinx	-.047[a,c]	0.447	0.917	-0.924	0.831
	Asian	White	.269[c]	0.400	0.501	-0.516	1.055
		Black	.172[a,c]	0.477	0.718	-0.765	1.109
		Latinx	.125[a,c]	0.421	0.766	-0.702	0.953

	Latinx	White	.144[c]	0.363	0.692	-0.570	0.858
		Black	.047[a,c]	0.447	0.917	-0.831	0.924
		Asian	-.125[a,c]	0.421	0.766	-0.953	0.702
Low Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.241[a]	0.422	0.568	-1.071	0.589
		Asian	-.347[a]	0.396	0.380	-1.125	0.430
		Latinx	-.182[a]	0.360	0.613	-0.889	0.525
	Black	White	.241[c]	0.422	0.568	-0.589	1.071
		Asian	-.106[a,c]	0.472	0.822	-1.034	0.821
		Latinx	.059[a,c]	0.442	0.894	-0.810	0.928
	Asian	White	.347[c]	0.396	0.380	-0.430	1.125
		Black	.106[a,c]	0.472	0.822	-0.821	1.034
		Latinx	.165[a,c]	0.417	0.692	-0.654	0.985
	Latinx	White	.182[c]	0.360	0.613	-0.525	0.889
		Black	-.059[a,c]	0.442	0.894	-0.928	0.810
		Asian	-.165[a,c]	0.417	0.692	-0.985	0.654
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	-.404[a]	0.446	0.366	-1.281	0.473
		Asian	-.676[a]	0.418	0.106	-1.498	0.145
		Latinx	-.614[a]	0.380	0.107	-1.361	0.133
	Black	White	.404[c]	0.446	0.366	-0.473	1.281
		Asian	-.272[a,c]	0.499	0.585	-1.253	0.708
		Latinx	-.210[a,c]	0.467	0.653	-1.128	0.708
	Asian	White	.676[c]	0.418	0.106	-0.145	1.498
		Black	.272[a,c]	0.499	0.585	-0.708	1.253
		Latinx	.062[a,c]	0.441	0.888	-0.803	0.928
	Latinx	White	.614[c]	0.380	0.107	-0.133	1.361
		Black	.210[a,c]	0.467	0.653	-0.708	1.128
		Asian	-.062[a,c]	0.441	0.888	-0.928	0.803
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.064[a]	0.444	0.886	-0.809	0.937
		Asian	-.365[a]	0.417	0.381	-1.184	0.453
		Latinx	-.468[a]	0.379	0.217	-1.212	0.276
	Black	White	-.064[c]	0.444	0.886	-0.937	0.809
		Asian	-.429[a,c]	0.497	0.388	-1.406	0.547
		Latinx	-.532[a,c]	0.465	0.254	-1.447	0.382
	Asian	White	.365[c]	0.417	0.381	-0.453	1.184
		Black	.429[a,c]	0.497	0.388	-0.547	1.406
		Latinx	-.103[a,c]	0.439	0.815	-0.965	0.760
	Latinx	White	.468[c]	0.379	0.217	-0.276	1.212
		Black	.532[a,c]	0.465	0.254	-0.382	1.447
		Asian	.103[a,c]	0.439	0.815	-0.760	0.965
	White	Black	.079[a]	0.440	0.858	-0.785	0.942

High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.		Asian	-.541[a]	0.412	0.189	-1.351	0.268
		Latinx	-.595[a]	0.374	0.112	-1.331	0.140
	Black	White	-.079[c]	0.440	0.858	-0.942	0.785
		Asian	-.620[a,c]	0.491	0.208	-1.585	0.345
		Latinx	-.674[a,c]	0.460	0.144	-1.578	0.230
	Asian	White	.541[c]	0.412	0.189	-0.268	1.351
		Black	.620[a,c]	0.491	0.208	-0.345	1.585
		Latinx	-.054[a,c]	0.434	0.901	-0.907	0.799
	Latinx	White	.595[c]	0.374	0.112	-0.140	1.331
		Black	.674[a,c]	0.460	0.144	-0.230	1.578
		Asian	.054[a,c]	0.434	0.901	-0.799	0.907
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	.012[a]	0.430	0.977	-0.834	0.858
		Asian	-.476[a]	0.403	0.239	-1.269	0.317
		Latinx	-.769[a,*]	0.367	0.036	-1.490	-0.049
	Black	White	-.012[c]	0.430	0.977	-0.858	0.834
		Asian	-.488[a,c]	0.481	0.311	-1.434	0.457
		Latinx	-.782[a,c]	0.451	0.084	-1.667	0.104
	Asian	White	.476[c]	0.403	0.239	-0.317	1.269
		Black	.488[a,c]	0.481	0.311	-0.457	1.434
		Latinx	-.293[a,c]	0.425	0.491	-1.128	0.542
	Latinx	White	.769[*,c]	0.367	0.036	0.049	1.490
		Black	.782[a,c]	0.451	0.084	-0.104	1.667
		Asian	.293[a,c]	0.425	0.491	-0.542	1.128
High Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	.043[a]	0.441	0.922	-0.824	0.911
		Asian	-.350[a]	0.414	0.398	-1.162	0.463
		Latinx	-.691[a]	0.376	0.067	-1.429	0.048
	Black	White	-.043[c]	0.441	0.922	-0.911	0.824
		Asian	-.393[a,c]	0.493	0.426	-1.362	0.576
		Latinx	-.734[a,c]	0.462	0.113	-1.642	0.174
	Asian	White	.350[c]	0.414	0.398	-0.463	1.162
		Black	.393[a,c]	0.493	0.426	-0.576	1.362
		Latinx	-.341[a,c]	0.436	0.434	-1.197	0.515
	Latinx	White	.691[c]	0.376	0.067	-0.048	1.429
		Black	.734[a,c]	0.462	0.113	-0.174	1.642
		Asian	.341[a,c]	0.436	0.434	-0.515	1.197
High Attractiveness, High Salary: Latinx	White	Black	.145[a]	0.425	0.733	-0.690	0.981
		Asian	-.376[a]	0.398	0.346	-1.158	0.407
		Latinx	-.659[a]	0.362	0.069	-1.371	0.052
	Black	White	-.145[c]	0.425	0.733	-0.981	0.690
		Asian	-.521[a,c]	0.475	0.274	-1.455	0.413

6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.		Latinx	-.805[a,c]	0.445	0.071	-1.679	0.070
	Asian	White	.376[c]	0.398	0.346	-0.407	1.158
		Black	.521[a,c]	0.475	0.274	-0.413	1.455
		Latinx	-.284[a,c]	0.420	0.499	-1.109	0.541
	Latinx	White	.659[c]	0.362	0.069	-0.052	1.371
		Black	.805[a,c]	0.445	0.071	-0.070	1.679
		Asian	.284[a,c]	0.420	0.499	-0.541	1.109
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this.	White	Black	.082[a]	0.457	0.858	-0.816	0.980
		Asian	-.815[a]	0.428	0.058	-1.657	0.026
		Latinx	-.608[a]	0.389	0.119	-1.373	0.157
	Black	White	-.082[c]	0.457	0.858	-0.980	0.816
		Asian	-.897[a,c]	0.511	0.080	-1.901	0.107
		Latinx	-.690[a,c]	0.479	0.150	-1.630	0.251
	Asian	White	.815[c]	0.428	0.058	-0.026	1.657
		Black	.897[a,c]	0.511	0.080	-0.107	1.901
		Latinx	.207[a,c]	0.451	0.646	-0.680	1.094
	Latinx	White	.608[c]	0.389	0.119	-0.157	1.373
		Black	.690[a,c]	0.479	0.150	-0.251	1.630
		Asian	-.207[a,c]	0.451	0.646	-1.094	0.680
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this.	White	Black	.252[a]	0.449	0.574	-0.629	1.134
		Asian	-.408[a]	0.420	0.333	-1.234	0.418
		Latinx	-.483[a]	0.382	0.207	-1.234	0.268
	Black	White	-.252[c]	0.449	0.574	-1.134	0.629
		Asian	-.660[a,c]	0.501	0.189	-1.645	0.325
		Latinx	-.735[a,c]	0.470	0.118	-1.658	0.188
	Asian	White	.408[c]	0.420	0.333	-0.418	1.234
		Black	.660[a,c]	0.501	0.189	-0.325	1.645
		Latinx	-.076[a,c]	0.443	0.865	-0.946	0.795
	Latinx	White	.483[c]	0.382	0.207	-0.268	1.234
		Black	.735[a,c]	0.470	0.118	-0.188	1.658
		Asian	.076[a,c]	0.443	0.865	-0.795	0.946
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this.	White	Black	.072[a]	0.424	0.866	-0.762	0.905
		Asian	-.033[a]	0.398	0.933	-0.815	0.748
		Latinx	-.262[a]	0.361	0.468	-0.972	0.448
	Black	White	-.072[c]	0.424	0.866	-0.905	0.762
		Asian	-.105[a,c]	0.474	0.824	-1.037	0.826
		Latinx	-.334[a,c]	0.444	0.453	-1.207	0.539
	Asian	White	.033[c]	0.398	0.933	-0.748	0.815
		Black	.105[a,c]	0.474	0.824	-0.826	1.037
		Latinx	-.229[a,c]	0.419	0.585	-1.052	0.594

	Latinx	White	.262[c]	0.361	0.468	-0.448	0.972
		Black	.334[a,c]	0.444	0.453	-0.539	1.207
		Asian	.229[a,c]	0.419	0.585	-0.594	1.052
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage.	White	Black	-.305[a]	0.433	0.481	-1.155	0.545
		Asian	-.528[a]	0.406	0.193	-1.325	0.268
		Latinx	-.470[a]	0.369	0.203	-1.194	0.254
	Black	White	.305[c]	0.433	0.481	-0.545	1.155
		Asian	-.224[a,c]	0.484	0.644	-1.174	0.727
		Latinx	-.165[a,c]	0.453	0.716	-1.055	0.725
	Asian	White	.528[c]	0.406	0.193	-0.268	1.325
		Black	.224[a,c]	0.484	0.644	-0.727	1.174
		Latinx	.058[a,c]	0.427	0.891	-0.781	0.898
	Latinx	White	.470[c]	0.369	0.203	-0.254	1.194
		Black	.165[a,c]	0.453	0.716	-0.725	1.055
		Asian	-.058[a,c]	0.427	0.891	-0.898	0.781
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this.	White	Black	-.115[a]	0.420	0.785	-0.941	0.711
		Asian	-.236[a]	0.394	0.550	-1.010	0.538
		Latinx	-.539[a]	0.358	0.133	-1.243	0.164
	Black	White	.115[c]	0.420	0.785	-0.711	0.941
		Asian	-.121[a,c]	0.470	0.797	-1.044	0.802
		Latinx	-.424[a,c]	0.440	0.336	-1.289	0.441
	Asian	White	.236[c]	0.394	0.550	-0.538	1.010
		Black	.121[a,c]	0.470	0.797	-0.802	1.044
		Latinx	-.303[a,c]	0.415	0.465	-1.119	0.512
	Latinx	White	.539[c]	0.358	0.133	-0.164	1.243
		Black	.424[a,c]	0.440	0.336	-0.441	1.289
		Asian	.303[a,c]	0.415	0.465	-0.512	1.119
Low Attractiveness, Low Salary: Latinx 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this.	White	Black	-.331[a]	0.416	0.427	-1.148	0.486
		Asian	-.686[a]	0.390	0.079	-1.451	0.080
		Latinx	-.823[a,*]	0.354	0.021	-1.519	-0.127
	Black	White	.331[c]	0.416	0.427	-0.486	1.148
		Asian	-.355[a,c]	0.465	0.445	-1.268	0.558
		Latinx	-.492[a,c]	0.435	0.259	-1.347	0.363
	Asian	White	.686[c]	0.390	0.079	-0.080	1.451
		Black	.355[a,c]	0.465	0.445	-0.558	1.268
		Latinx	-.137[a,c]	0.410	0.739	-0.943	0.670
	Latinx	White	.823[*,c]	0.354	0.021	0.127	1.519
		Black	.492[a,c]	0.435	0.259	-0.363	1.347
		Asian	.137[a,c]	0.410	0.739	-0.670	0.943

Based on estimated marginal means

*. The mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

a. An estimate of the modified population marginal mean (J).

c. An estimate of the modified population marginal mean (I).

d. Adjustment for multiple comparisons: Least Significant Difference (equivalent to no adjustments).

Table 5

Parameter Estimates for Relationship Willingness

Dependent Variable		B	Std. Error	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval		Partial Eta Squared
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
(HWLS_1,2)	Intercept	1.500	0.808	1.856	0.064	-0.088	3.088	0.007
	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.400	2.500	0.013	0.750	6.250	0.013
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.143	0.437	0.662	-1.746	2.746	0.000
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.400	1.072	0.284	-1.250	4.250	0.002
	[Race=3]	-2.915	1.961	-1.487	0.138	-6.768	0.938	0.005
	[Race=4]							
(HWLS_2,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.844	4.147	0.000	1.842	5.158	0.035
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.462	1.026	0.305	-1.373	4.373	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.194	0.838	0.403	-1.345	3.345	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.462	-0.342	0.732	-3.373	2.373	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.044	2.048	-0.998	0.319	-6.068	1.980	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(HWLS_3,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.834	4.794	0.000	2.360	5.640	0.046
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.445	0.692	0.489	-1.840	3.840	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.398E-13	1.180	0.000	1.000	-2.319	2.319	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.445	-0.692	0.489	-3.840	1.840	0.001
	[Race=3]	0.877	2.025	0.433	0.665	-3.101	4.855	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.831	4.815	0.000	2.368	5.632	0.046

	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.439	0.695	0.487	-1.827	3.827	0.001
(HWLS_4,2)	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.175	-0.426	0.671	-2.809	1.809	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.439	-0.695	0.487	-3.827	1.827	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.292	2.016	-0.145	0.885	-4.253	3.668	0.000
	Intercept	4.000	0.833	4.800	0.000	2.363	5.637	0.046
(HWLS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.443	0.693	0.489	-1.836	3.836	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.236E-13	1.178	0.000	1.000	-2.316	2.316	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.443	-0.693	0.489	-3.836	1.836	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.785	2.022	-0.388	0.698	-4.757	3.188	0.000
	Intercept	4.000	0.830	4.821	0.000	2.370	5.630	0.046
(HWLS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.437	0.696	0.487	-1.824	3.824	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.173	-0.426	0.670	-2.806	1.806	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.437	-0.696	0.487	-3.824	1.824	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.862	2.013	-0.428	0.669	-4.817	3.094	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	2.250	0.858	2.624	0.009	0.565	3.935	0.014
(LWHS_1,2)	[Sex=1]	2.750	1.485	1.851	0.065	-0.169	5.669	0.007
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.213	0.206	0.837	-2.133	2.633	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.750	1.485	0.505	0.614	-2.169	3.669	0.001
	[Race=3]	0.803	2.081	0.386	0.700	-3.286	4.891	0.000
	[Race=4]							

(LWHS_2,2)	Intercept	3.750	0.907	4.132	0.000	1.967	5.533	0.034
	[Sex=1]	1.250	1.572	0.795	0.427	-1.838	4.338	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.283	0.195	0.846	-2.272	2.772	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.750	1.572	-0.477	0.633	-3.838	2.338	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.267	2.202	-0.121	0.904	-4.593	4.060	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LWHS_3,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.861	4.066	0.000	1.809	5.191	0.033
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.491	1.006	0.315	-1.429	4.429	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.217	0.411	0.681	-1.892	2.892	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.491	-0.335	0.737	-3.429	2.429	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.333	2.089	-0.160	0.873	-4.437	3.770	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LWHS_4,2)	Intercept	4.500	0.876	5.138	0.000	2.779	6.221	0.052
	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.517	0.330	0.742	-2.481	3.481	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.239	-0.807	0.420	-3.434	1.434	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.517	-0.989	0.323	-4.481	1.481	0.002
	[Race=3]	0.062	2.125	0.029	0.977	-4.114	4.237	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LWHS_5,2)	Intercept	3.250	0.890	3.653	0.000	1.502	4.998	0.027
	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.541	1.136	0.257	-1.278	4.778	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.258	0.596	0.551	-1.722	3.222	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.541	-0.162	0.871	-3.278	2.778	0.000

	[Race=3]	-0.010	2.158	-0.005	0.996	-4.252	4.231	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LWHS_6,2)	Intercept	4.250	0.861	4.937	0.000	2.558	5.942	0.048
	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.491	0.503	0.615	-2.180	3.680	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.250	1.217	-0.205	0.837	-2.642	2.142	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.491	-0.838	0.402	-4.180	1.680	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.851	2.089	-0.408	0.684	-4.956	3.253	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_1,2)	Intercept	1.750	0.773	2.263	0.024	0.231	3.269	0.011
	[Sex=1]	3.250	1.339	2.427	0.016	0.618	5.882	0.012
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.094	0.686	0.493	-1.399	2.899	0.001
	[Race=2]	1.250	1.339	0.933	0.351	-1.382	3.882	0.002
	[Race=3]	-3.474	1.876	-1.852	0.065	-7.161	0.212	0.007
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_2,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.861	4.067	0.000	1.809	5.191	0.033
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.491	1.006	0.315	-1.429	4.429	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.217	0.411	0.681	-1.892	2.892	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.491	-0.335	0.737	-3.429	2.429	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.679	2.088	-0.804	0.422	-5.783	2.424	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_3,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.882	3.970	0.000	1.768	5.232	0.032
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.527	0.982	0.326	-1.500	4.500	0.002
	[Sex=2]							

	[Race=1]	2.334E-14	1.247	0.000	1.000	-2.450	2.450	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.527	-0.327	0.743	-3.500	2.500	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.128	2.139	-0.527	0.598	-5.331	3.075	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_4,2)	Intercept	4.250	0.879	4.833	0.000	2.522	5.978	0.046
	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.523	0.492	0.623	-2.243	3.743	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.250	1.244	-0.201	0.841	-2.694	2.194	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.523	-0.821	0.412	-4.243	1.743	0.001
	[Race=3]	0.154	2.134	0.072	0.943	-4.039	4.347	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_5,2)	Intercept	3.250	0.904	3.597	0.000	1.474	5.026	0.026
	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.565	1.118	0.264	-1.325	4.825	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.278	0.587	0.558	-1.761	3.261	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.565	-0.160	0.873	-3.325	2.825	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.300	2.193	-0.593	0.554	-5.608	3.008	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(HWHS_6,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.912	4.386	0.000	2.208	5.792	0.039
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.580	0.633	0.527	-2.104	4.104	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.290	-0.388	0.698	-3.034	2.034	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.580	-0.633	0.527	-4.104	2.104	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.182	2.213	-0.534	0.593	-5.530	3.166	0.001
	[Race=4]							

	Intercept	2.250	0.922	2.441	0.015	0.439	4.061	0.012
(LWLS_1,2)	[Sex=1]	2.750	1.597	1.722	0.086	-0.387	5.887	0.006
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.304	0.192	0.848	-2.312	2.812	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.750	1.597	0.470	0.639	-2.387	3.887	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.374	2.237	-0.614	0.539	-5.769	3.021	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.886	4.516	0.000	2.260	5.740	0.041
(LWLS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.534	0.652	0.515	-2.015	4.015	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.253	-0.399	0.690	-2.961	1.961	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.534	-0.652	0.515	-4.015	2.015	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.323	2.149	-0.616	0.538	-5.546	2.900	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.250	0.860	4.942	0.000	2.560	5.940	0.049
(LWLS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.489	0.504	0.615	-2.177	3.677	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.750	1.216	-0.617	0.538	-3.140	1.640	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.489	-0.839	0.402	-4.177	1.677	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.692	2.086	-1.290	0.198	-6.792	1.407	0.003
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.500	0.873	5.154	0.000	2.784	6.216	0.053
(LWLS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.512	0.331	0.741	-2.472	3.472	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	4.886E-14	1.235	0.000	1.000	-2.426	2.426	0.000

	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.512	-0.992	0.322	-4.472	1.472	0.002
	[Race=3]	-0.628	2.119	-0.297	0.767	-4.791	3.535	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.250	0.850	4.999	0.000	2.580	5.920	0.050
(LWLS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.472	0.509	0.611	-2.143	3.643	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.250	1.202	-0.208	0.835	-2.612	2.112	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.472	-0.849	0.396	-4.143	1.643	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.879	2.063	-0.911	0.363	-5.933	2.174	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.250	0.848	5.011	0.000	2.583	5.917	0.050
(LWLS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.469	0.511	0.610	-2.137	3.637	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.199	0.208	0.835	-2.107	2.607	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.469	-0.851	0.395	-4.137	1.637	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.549	2.058	-0.753	0.452	-5.592	2.495	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	1.750	0.837	2.090	0.037	0.105	3.395	0.009
(HALS_1,2)	[Sex=1]	3.250	1.450	2.241	0.026	0.400	6.100	0.010
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.250	1.184	1.056	0.292	-1.077	3.577	0.002
	[Race=2]	1.250	1.450	0.862	0.389	-1.600	4.100	0.002
	[Race=3]	-2.905	2.032	-1.430	0.153	-6.898	1.087	0.004
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.861	4.067	0.000	1.809	5.191	0.033
(HALS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.491	1.006	0.315	-1.429	4.429	0.002

	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.217	0.411	0.681	-1.891	2.891	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.491	-0.335	0.737	-3.429	2.429	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.941	2.088	-1.408	0.160	-7.044	1.162	0.004
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.250	0.867	3.750	0.000	1.547	4.953	0.029
(HALS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.501	1.166	0.244	-1.199	4.699	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.225	0.204	0.838	-2.158	2.658	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.501	-0.167	0.868	-3.199	2.699	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.651	2.103	-1.261	0.208	-6.783	1.480	0.003
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.853	4.101	0.000	1.823	5.177	0.034
(HALS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.478	1.015	0.311	-1.405	4.405	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.207	-0.414	0.679	-2.872	1.872	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.478	-0.338	0.735	-3.405	2.405	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.159	2.071	-1.043	0.298	-6.228	1.910	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.250	0.881	3.690	0.000	1.520	4.980	0.028
(HALS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.525	1.147	0.252	-1.247	4.747	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.250	1.245	1.004	0.316	-1.197	3.697	0.002
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.525	-0.164	0.870	-3.247	2.747	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.344	2.137	-1.097	0.273	-6.542	1.855	0.003

	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.861	4.065	0.000	1.808	5.192	0.033
(HALS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.491	1.006	0.315	-1.431	4.431	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.218	0.411	0.682	-1.893	2.893	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.491	-0.335	0.738	-3.431	2.431	0.000
	[Race=3]	-3.228	2.089	-1.545	0.123	-7.334	0.877	0.005
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	2.500	0.917	2.725	0.007	0.698	4.302	0.015
(LAHS_1,2)	[Sex=1]	2.500	1.589	1.573	0.116	-0.622	5.622	0.005
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.297	0.385	0.700	-2.049	3.049	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.500	1.589	0.315	0.753	-2.622	3.622	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.064	2.226	-0.927	0.354	-6.438	2.309	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.750	0.903	4.153	0.000	1.976	5.524	0.035
(LAHS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.250	1.564	0.799	0.425	-1.823	4.323	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.277	0.587	0.557	-1.759	3.259	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.750	1.564	-0.480	0.632	-3.823	2.323	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.687	2.191	-1.227	0.221	-6.992	1.618	0.003
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.250	0.872	3.729	0.000	1.538	4.962	0.028
(LAHS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.510	1.159	0.247	-1.216	4.716	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.233	0.609	0.543	-1.672	3.172	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.510	-0.166	0.869	-3.216	2.716	0.000

	[Race=3]	-2.059	2.115	-0.974	0.331	-6.214	2.096	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(LAHS_4,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.860	4.653	0.000	2.311	5.689	0.043
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.489	0.672	0.502	-1.926	3.926	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-5.135E-14	1.216	0.000	1.000	-2.389	2.389	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.489	-0.672	0.502	-3.926	1.926	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.282	2.086	-0.615	0.539	-5.381	2.816	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LAHS_5,2)	Intercept	3.250	0.856	3.798	0.000	1.569	4.931	0.029
	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.482	1.181	0.238	-1.162	4.662	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.210	0.207	0.836	-2.128	2.628	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.482	-0.169	0.866	-3.162	2.662	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.487	2.076	-1.198	0.232	-6.567	1.593	0.003
	[Race=4]							
(LAHS_6,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.846	4.728	0.000	2.338	5.662	0.045
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.465	0.682	0.495	-1.879	3.879	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.196	0.418	0.676	-1.851	2.851	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.465	-0.682	0.495	-3.879	1.879	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.628	2.053	-0.306	0.760	-4.661	3.405	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HAHS_1,2)	Intercept	2.000	0.888	2.253	0.025	0.255	3.745	0.010
	[Sex=1]	3.000	1.538	1.951	0.052	-0.022	6.022	0.008

	[Sex=2]						
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.256	0.398	0.691	-1.967	2.967	0.000
	[Race=2]	1.000	1.538	0.650	0.516	-2.022	4.022	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.646	2.154	-1.228	0.220	-6.879	1.587	0.003
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.891	4.488	0.000	2.249	5.751	0.040
(HAHS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.544	0.648	0.517	-2.033	4.033	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.260	-0.397	0.692	-2.977	1.977	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.544	-0.648	0.517	-4.033	2.033	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.877	2.163	-0.868	0.386	-6.126	2.372	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.000	0.865	3.467	0.001	1.300	4.700	0.024
(HAHS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.499	1.335	0.183	-0.945	4.945	0.004
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.224	0.817	0.414	-1.404	3.404	0.001
	[Race=2]	-2.286E-14	1.499	0.000	1.000	-2.945	2.945	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.526	2.099	-0.250	0.802	-4.651	3.599	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.887	4.507	0.000	2.256	5.744	0.041
(HAHS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.537	0.651	0.516	-2.020	4.020	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.255	-0.398	0.691	-2.966	1.966	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.537	-0.651	0.516	-4.020	2.020	0.001

	[Race=3]	-0.964	2.153	-0.448	0.655	-5.195	3.267	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HAHS_5,2)	Intercept	3.250	0.868	3.745	0.000	1.545	4.955	0.028
	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.503	1.164	0.245	-1.204	4.704	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.227	0.611	0.541	-1.662	3.162	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.503	-0.166	0.868	-3.204	2.704	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.305	2.106	-0.620	0.536	-5.443	2.832	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(HAHS_6,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.856	4.674	0.000	2.318	5.682	0.044
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.482	0.675	0.500	-1.913	3.913	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.210	-0.413	0.680	-2.878	1.878	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.482	-0.675	0.500	-3.913	1.913	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.354	2.077	-0.652	0.515	-5.434	2.726	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LALS_1,2)	Intercept	1.750	0.908	1.927	0.055	-0.034	3.534	0.008
	[Sex=1]	3.250	1.573	2.066	0.039	0.160	6.340	0.009
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.750	1.284	0.584	0.559	-1.773	3.273	0.001
	[Race=2]	1.250	1.573	0.795	0.427	-1.840	4.340	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.695	2.203	-0.769	0.442	-6.024	2.634	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LALS_2,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.886	4.514	0.000	2.259	5.741	0.041
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.535	0.652	0.515	-2.016	4.016	0.001
	[Sex=2]							

	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.253	-0.399	0.690	-2.962	1.962	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.535	-0.652	0.515	-4.016	2.016	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.172	2.150	-0.545	0.586	-5.396	3.053	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.250	0.892	3.643	0.000	1.497	5.003	0.027
(LALS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.750	1.545	1.133	0.258	-1.286	4.786	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.250	1.262	-0.198	0.843	-2.729	2.229	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.250	1.545	-0.162	0.872	-3.286	2.786	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.318	2.165	-0.609	0.543	-5.571	2.935	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.750	0.865	4.336	0.000	2.051	5.449	0.038
(LALS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.250	1.498	0.834	0.404	-1.693	4.193	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.250	1.223	0.204	0.838	-2.153	2.653	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.750	1.498	-0.501	0.617	-3.693	2.193	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.182	2.098	-0.563	0.573	-5.305	2.941	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.750	0.867	4.327	0.000	2.047	5.453	0.038
(LALS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.250	1.501	0.833	0.405	-1.700	4.200	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.750	1.226	-0.612	0.541	-3.158	1.658	0.001
	[Race=2]	-0.750	1.501	-0.500	0.618	-3.700	2.200	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.515	2.103	-0.245	0.807	-4.648	3.617	0.000

	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.250	0.825	5.149	0.000	2.628	5.872	0.052
(LALS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	0.750	1.430	0.525	0.600	-2.059	3.559	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.750	1.167	-0.642	0.521	-3.044	1.544	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.250	1.430	-0.874	0.382	-4.059	1.559	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.613	2.003	-0.805	0.421	-5.548	2.322	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	2.500	0.826	3.026	0.003	0.877	4.123	0.019
(HBLS_1,2)	[Sex=1]	2.500	1.431	1.747	0.081	-0.312	5.312	0.006
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.168	0.428	0.669	-1.796	2.796	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.500	1.431	0.349	0.727	-2.312	3.312	0.000
	[Race=3]	-4.164	2.004	-2.077	0.038	-8.103	-0.225	0.009
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.896	4.463	0.000	2.239	5.761	0.040
(HBLS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.552	0.644	0.520	-2.050	4.050	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.267	-0.395	0.693	-2.990	1.990	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.552	-0.644	0.520	-4.050	2.050	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.503	2.174	-1.151	0.250	-6.775	1.770	0.003
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.903	4.431	0.000	2.226	5.774	0.039
(HBLS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.564	0.640	0.523	-2.073	4.073	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.277	-0.783	0.434	-3.509	1.509	0.001

	[Race=2]	2.078E-13	1.564	0.000	1.000	-3.073	3.073	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.508	2.191	-0.688	0.492	-5.812	2.797	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.899	4.449	0.000	2.233	5.767	0.040
(HBLS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.557	0.642	0.521	-2.060	4.060	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	4.897E-14	1.271	0.000	1.000	-2.498	2.498	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.557	-0.642	0.521	-4.060	2.060	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.618	2.181	-0.742	0.459	-5.904	2.668	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.905	4.418	0.000	2.221	5.779	0.039
(HBLS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.568	0.638	0.524	-2.081	4.081	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.280	-0.391	0.696	-3.016	2.016	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.568	-0.638	0.524	-4.081	2.081	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.262	2.197	-1.029	0.304	-6.578	2.055	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.873	4.580	0.000	2.284	5.716	0.042
(HBLS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.513	0.661	0.509	-1.973	3.973	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.235	0.405	0.686	-1.927	2.927	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.513	-0.661	0.509	-3.973	1.973	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.121	2.119	-1.001	0.318	-6.285	2.044	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	2.500	0.927	2.698	0.007	0.679	4.321	0.015

	[Sex=1]	2.500	1.605	1.558	0.120	-0.653	5.653	0.005
(LBHS_1,2)	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.310	-0.382	0.703	-3.075	2.075	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.500	1.605	0.312	0.756	-2.653	3.653	0.000
	[Race=3]	0.587	2.248	0.261	0.794	-3.830	5.005	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.879	4.552	0.000	2.273	5.727	0.041
(LBHS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.522	0.657	0.511	-1.990	3.990	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.243	-0.402	0.688	-2.942	1.942	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.522	-0.657	0.511	-3.990	1.990	0.001
	[Race=3]	0.121	2.132	0.057	0.955	-4.069	4.310	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.858	4.663	0.000	2.314	5.686	0.043
(LBHS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.486	0.673	0.501	-1.920	3.920	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.213	-0.824	0.410	-3.384	1.384	0.001
	[Race=2]	1.000	1.486	0.673	0.501	-1.920	3.920	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.769	2.082	-0.370	0.712	-4.859	3.321	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.870	4.597	0.000	2.290	5.710	0.042
(LBHS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.507	0.664	0.507	-1.961	3.961	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.123E-13	1.230	0.000	1.000	-2.418	2.418	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.507	-0.664	0.507	-3.961	1.961	0.001

	[Race=3]	-0.015	2.111	-0.007	0.994	-4.164	4.133	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LBHS_5,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.875	4.573	0.000	2.281	5.719	0.042
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.515	0.660	0.510	-1.977	3.977	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.237	-0.404	0.686	-2.931	1.931	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.515	-0.660	0.510	-3.977	1.977	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.605	2.123	-0.285	0.776	-4.776	3.565	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LBHS_6,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.854	4.682	0.000	2.321	5.679	0.044
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.480	0.676	0.500	-1.908	3.908	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.584E-13	1.208	0.000	1.000	-2.374	2.374	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.480	-0.676	0.500	-3.908	1.908	0.001
	[Race=3]	-1.072	2.073	-0.517	0.605	-5.145	3.002	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(HBHS_1,2)	Intercept	1.500	0.852	1.760	0.079	-0.175	3.175	0.006
	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.476	2.371	0.018	0.599	6.401	0.012
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.500	1.205	1.244	0.214	-0.869	3.869	0.003
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.476	1.016	0.310	-1.401	4.401	0.002
	[Race=3]	-0.410	2.068	-0.198	0.843	-4.474	3.653	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HBHS_2,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.896	4.466	0.000	2.240	5.760	0.040
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.551	0.645	0.520	-2.048	4.048	0.001
	[Sex=2]							

	[Race=1]	2.246E-13	1.267	0.000	1.000	-2.489	2.489	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.551	-0.645	0.520	-4.048	2.048	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.841	2.173	-0.387	0.699	-5.111	3.429	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.881	3.971	0.000	1.768	5.232	0.032
(HBHS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.526	0.983	0.326	-1.499	4.499	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	7.892E-14	1.246	0.000	1.000	-2.449	2.449	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.526	-0.328	0.743	-3.499	2.499	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.759	2.138	-0.355	0.723	-4.961	3.443	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.893	3.921	0.000	1.746	5.254	0.031
(HBHS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.546	0.970	0.332	-1.538	4.538	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.262	-0.396	0.692	-2.980	1.980	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.546	-0.323	0.747	-3.538	2.538	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.741	2.166	-0.342	0.732	-4.996	3.514	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.000	0.884	4.523	0.000	2.262	5.738	0.041
(HBHS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.532	0.653	0.514	-2.010	4.010	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.251	0.400	0.690	-1.958	2.958	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.532	-0.653	0.514	-4.010	2.010	0.001
	[Race=3]	0.738	2.146	0.344	0.731	-3.478	4.955	0.000
	[Race=4]							

(HBHS_6,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.896	3.348	0.001	1.239	4.761	0.023
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.552	1.289	0.198	-1.050	5.050	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.267	0.395	0.693	-1.990	2.990	0.000
	[Race=2]	1.988E-15	1.552	0.000	1.000	-3.050	3.050	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.449	2.174	-0.206	0.837	-4.721	3.823	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LBLS_1,2)	Intercept	1.500	0.934	1.606	0.109	-0.335	3.335	0.005
	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.618	2.163	0.031	0.321	6.679	0.010
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.321	0.379	0.705	-2.096	3.096	0.000
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.618	0.927	0.354	-1.679	4.679	0.002
	[Race=3]	-0.941	2.266	-0.415	0.678	-5.394	3.512	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LBLS_2,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.893	3.920	0.000	1.746	5.254	0.031
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.546	0.970	0.333	-1.539	4.539	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-5.827E-14	1.263	0.000	1.000	-2.481	2.481	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.546	-0.323	0.747	-3.539	2.539	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.838	2.166	-0.387	0.699	-5.095	3.418	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LBLS_3,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.832	4.807	0.000	2.365	5.635	0.046
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.441	0.694	0.488	-1.832	3.832	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	2.752E-15	1.177	0.000	1.000	-2.312	2.312	0.000

	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.441	-0.694	0.488	-3.832	1.832	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.790	2.019	-0.391	0.696	-4.757	3.177	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.000	0.870	3.450	0.001	1.291	4.709	0.024
(LBLS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.506	1.328	0.185	-0.959	4.959	0.004
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.230	0.407	0.684	-1.916	2.916	0.000
	[Race=2]	-8.206E-14	1.506	0.000	1.000	-2.959	2.959	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.897	2.110	-0.425	0.671	-5.043	3.248	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.837	4.182	0.000	1.855	5.145	0.035
(LBLS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.450	1.035	0.301	-1.348	4.348	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.184	0.422	0.673	-1.826	2.826	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.450	-0.345	0.730	-3.348	2.348	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.741	2.031	-0.857	0.392	-5.731	2.249	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.840	4.168	0.000	1.850	5.150	0.035
(LBLS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.454	1.031	0.303	-1.358	4.358	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	7.988E-14	1.188	0.000	1.000	-2.333	2.333	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.454	-0.344	0.731	-3.358	2.358	0.000
	[Race=3]	0.274	2.037	0.135	0.893	-3.729	4.278	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	1.500	0.869	1.727	0.085	-0.207	3.207	0.006

	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.504	2.327	0.020	0.544	6.456	0.011
(HLLS_1,2)	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.500	1.228	1.221	0.223	-0.914	3.914	0.003
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.504	0.997	0.319	-1.456	4.456	0.002
	[Race=3]	-2.754	2.107	-1.307	0.192	-6.895	1.387	0.004
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.000	0.873	3.435	0.001	1.284	4.716	0.024
(HLLS_2,2)	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.513	1.322	0.187	-0.972	4.972	0.004
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.235	0.810	0.418	-1.427	3.427	0.001
	[Race=2]	-7.563E-14	1.513	0.000	1.000	-2.972	2.972	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.795	2.119	-1.319	0.188	-6.958	1.369	0.004
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	3.500	0.840	4.166	0.000	1.849	5.151	0.035
(HLLS_3,2)	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.455	1.031	0.303	-1.359	4.359	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.161E-13	1.188	0.000	1.000	-2.335	2.335	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.455	-0.344	0.731	-3.359	2.359	0.000
	[Race=3]	-2.069	2.038	-1.015	0.311	-6.075	1.936	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.500	0.848	5.308	0.000	2.834	6.166	0.056
(HLLS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.469	0.340	0.734	-2.386	3.386	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.199	-0.834	0.405	-3.356	1.356	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.469	-1.021	0.308	-4.386	1.386	0.002

	[Race=3]	-2.403	2.057	-1.168	0.243	-6.445	1.640	0.003
	[Race=4]							
(HLLS_5,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.840	4.763	0.000	2.350	5.650	0.045
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.454	0.688	0.492	-1.858	3.858	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.188	-0.842	0.400	-3.333	1.333	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.454	-0.688	0.492	-3.858	1.858	0.001
	[Race=3]	-2.800	2.037	-1.374	0.170	-6.804	1.204	0.004
	[Race=4]							
(HLLS_6,2)	Intercept	4.500	0.839	5.362	0.000	2.851	6.149	0.057
	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.454	0.344	0.731	-2.356	3.356	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.187	-0.843	0.400	-3.332	1.332	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.454	-1.032	0.303	-4.356	1.356	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.767	2.036	-0.868	0.386	-5.768	2.235	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_1,2)	Intercept	1.500	0.934	1.605	0.109	-0.336	3.336	0.005
	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.618	2.163	0.031	0.320	6.680	0.010
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.321	0.757	0.450	-1.596	3.596	0.001
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.618	0.927	0.354	-1.680	4.680	0.002
	[Race=3]	-2.374	2.267	-1.047	0.295	-6.829	2.080	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_2,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.894	3.913	0.000	1.743	5.257	0.031
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.549	0.968	0.333	-1.544	4.544	0.002
	[Sex=2]							

	[Race=1]	1.368E-13	1.265	0.000	1.000	-2.485	2.485	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.549	-0.323	0.747	-3.544	2.544	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.162	2.170	-0.535	0.593	-5.425	3.102	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_3,2)	Intercept	3.500	0.874	4.004	0.000	1.783	5.217	0.032
	[Sex=1]	1.500	1.514	0.991	0.322	-1.475	4.475	0.002
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.236	-0.404	0.686	-2.929	1.929	0.000
	[Race=2]	-0.500	1.514	-0.330	0.741	-3.475	2.475	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.051	2.121	-0.496	0.620	-5.219	3.116	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_4,2)	Intercept	4.500	0.854	5.269	0.000	2.822	6.178	0.055
	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.479	0.338	0.736	-2.407	3.407	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.208	-0.414	0.679	-2.873	1.873	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.479	-1.014	0.311	-4.407	1.407	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.038	2.072	-0.501	0.617	-5.110	3.034	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_5,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.857	4.667	0.000	2.316	5.684	0.043
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.484	0.674	0.501	-1.917	3.917	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.100E-13	1.212	0.000	1.000	-2.382	2.382	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.484	-0.674	0.501	-3.917	1.917	0.001

	[Race=3]	-0.905	2.080	-0.435	0.664	-4.991	3.181	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LLHS_6,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.849	3.535	0.000	1.333	4.667	0.025
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.470	1.361	0.174	-0.888	4.888	0.004
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.200	0.833	0.405	-1.358	3.358	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.186E-13	1.470	0.000	1.000	-2.888	2.888	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.349	2.059	-0.169	0.866	-4.395	3.697	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(HLHS_1,2)	Intercept	1.500	0.897	1.673	0.095	-0.262	3.262	0.006
	[Sex=1]	3.500	1.553	2.253	0.025	0.448	6.552	0.010
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.268	0.788	0.431	-1.492	3.492	0.001
	[Race=2]	1.500	1.553	0.966	0.335	-1.552	4.552	0.002
	[Race=3]	-2.374	2.176	-1.091	0.276	-6.650	1.901	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(HLHS_2,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.893	3.358	0.001	1.245	4.755	0.023
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.547	1.293	0.197	-1.040	5.040	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.000	1.263	0.792	0.429	-1.482	3.482	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.332E-13	1.547	0.000	1.000	-3.040	3.040	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.879	2.167	-0.867	0.386	-6.138	2.379	0.002
	[Race=4]							
(HLHS_3,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.883	3.396	0.001	1.264	4.736	0.024
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.530	1.307	0.192	-1.006	5.006	0.004
	[Sex=2]							

	[Race=1]	1.251E-13	1.249	0.000	1.000	-2.455	2.455	0.000
	[Race=2]	1.010E-13	1.530	0.000	1.000	-3.006	3.006	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.246	2.143	-0.581	0.561	-5.458	2.965	0.001
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.500	0.865	5.202	0.000	2.800	6.200	0.053
(HLHS_4,2)	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.498	0.334	0.739	-2.444	3.444	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.000	1.223	-0.817	0.414	-3.404	1.404	0.001
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.498	-1.001	0.317	-4.444	1.444	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.964	2.099	-0.936	0.350	-6.089	2.160	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	4.500	0.887	5.073	0.000	2.757	6.243	0.051
(HLHS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	0.500	1.536	0.325	0.745	-2.519	3.519	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.500	1.254	-1.196	0.232	-3.965	0.965	0.003
	[Race=2]	-1.500	1.536	-0.976	0.329	-4.519	1.519	0.002
	[Race=3]	-1.854	2.152	-0.861	0.389	-6.083	2.375	0.002
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	5.000	0.854	5.852	0.000	3.321	6.679	0.067
(HLHS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	2.592E-13	1.480	0.000	1.000	-2.908	2.908	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.208	-0.414	0.679	-2.874	1.874	0.000
	[Race=2]	-2.000	1.480	-1.351	0.177	-4.908	0.908	0.004

	[Race=3]	-1.526	2.073	-0.736	0.462	-5.599	2.548	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LLLS_1,2)	Intercept	2.500	0.919	2.722	0.007	0.695	4.305	0.015
	[Sex=1]	2.500	1.591	1.571	0.117	-0.626	5.626	0.005
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.299	-0.385	0.700	-3.052	2.052	0.000
	[Race=2]	0.500	1.591	0.314	0.753	-2.626	3.626	0.000
	[Race=3]	-1.208	2.229	-0.542	0.588	-5.587	3.172	0.001
	[Race=4]							
(LLLS_2,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.902	3.327	0.001	1.228	4.772	0.023
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.562	1.281	0.201	-1.068	5.068	0.003
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	0.500	1.275	0.392	0.695	-2.005	3.005	0.000
	[Race=2]	-8.593E-14	1.562	0.000	1.000	-3.068	3.068	0.000
	[Race=3]	-0.144	2.188	-0.066	0.948	-4.442	4.155	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LLLS_3,2)	Intercept	4.000	0.852	4.692	0.000	2.325	5.675	0.044
	[Sex=1]	1.000	1.476	0.677	0.499	-1.901	3.901	0.001
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-6.617E-14	1.206	0.000	1.000	-2.369	2.369	0.000
	[Race=2]	-1.000	1.476	-0.677	0.499	-3.901	1.901	0.001
	[Race=3]	-0.341	2.068	-0.165	0.869	-4.405	3.723	0.000
	[Race=4]							
(LLLS_4,2)	Intercept	3.000	0.870	3.450	0.001	1.291	4.709	0.024
	[Sex=1]	2.000	1.506	1.328	0.185	-0.960	4.960	0.004

	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	1.733E-14	1.230	0.000	1.000	-2.416	2.416	0.000
	[Race=2]	4.545E-14	1.506	0.000	1.000	-2.960	2.960	0.000
	[Race=3]	0.051	2.110	0.024	0.981	-4.095	4.197	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	5.000	0.845	5.919	0.000	3.340	6.660	0.068
(LLLS_5,2)	[Sex=1]	2.276E-13	1.463	0.000	1.000	-2.875	2.875	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-0.500	1.195	-0.419	0.676	-2.847	1.847	0.000
	[Race=2]	-2.000	1.463	-1.367	0.172	-4.875	0.875	0.004
	[Race=3]	-0.208	2.050	-0.101	0.919	-4.235	3.820	0.000
	[Race=4]							
	Intercept	5.000	0.835	5.985	0.000	3.358	6.642	0.070
(LLLS_6,2)	[Sex=1]	3.522E-13	1.447	0.000	1.000	-2.843	2.843	0.000
	[Sex=2]							
	[Race=1]	-1.500	1.181	-1.270	0.205	-3.822	0.822	0.003
	[Race=2]	-2.000	1.447	-1.382	0.168	-4.843	0.843	0.004
	[Race=3]	-1.131	2.027	-0.558	0.577	-5.114	2.852	0.001
	[Race=4]							

a. This parameter is set to zero because it is redundant.

b. Computed using alpha = .05

*First letter in coding sequences refers to level of physical attractiveness (i.e., H = High Attractiveness, L = Low Attractiveness)

**Second letter in coding sequences refers to race (i.e., W = White, B = Black, A = Asian, L = Latinx/Hispanic)

***Third and fourth letters in coding sequences refer to salary level (i.e., HS = High Salary, LS = Low Salary)

****Numbers in the coding sequence refer to item numbers of survey questions (i.e., 1. I would be willing to have a cup of coffee and casual conversation with a person like this; 2. I would be willing to go on a date with a person like this; 3. I would be willing to have sex with a person like this; 4. I would be willing to have a serious relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage; 5. I would be willing to have a serious sexual relationship with a person like this, that could lead to marriage; 6. I would be willing to marry a person like this)

*****Coding for biological sex is 1=male 2=female
******Coding for race/ethnicity is 1 = White, 2 = Black, 3 = Asian, 4 = Latinx

Table 6

Comparison Between Original Study and Extension

Original Study	Replication and Extension
Sample: Unmarried, college students ages 18-21 Race/Ethnicity not reported	Sample: American adults who are single (never married) from four racial/ethnic groups: White, Black, Asian, Latinx/Hispanic/of Spanish descent
Instruments: Original Six Questions Classroom Projector Six black and white photos	Instruments: Original six questions Internet access for participants 32 color photos that feature four racial/ethnic groups
Procedure: Participants answer questions in large classroom with a group of 30-50 same-sex individuals	Procedure: Participants answer questions independently via the internet platform, CloudResearch
Data Analysis: Two-way ANOVA	Data Analysis Repeated Measures ANOVA

Data Coding: Biological Sex, Age	Data Coding: Biological Sex, Gender, Age, Sexual Orientation, Race, Ethnicity