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Table S1 –Published Tests of the Predictive Validity of Ideal-Partner Preference Matching

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Very weakinference | Weakinference |  | Strong inference |  |  |
| Article |  | Ideal-trait correlations | Pattern (raw) |  | Pattern (corrected) | Level |  | *N* |
| Murray et al. (1996) |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 242 |
| Botwin et al. (1997) |  | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓a |  | 216 |
| Fletcher et al. (1999, Study 5) |  | ✓ |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 83 |
| Fletcher et al. (1999, Study 6) |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 89 |
| Fletcher et al. (2000) |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 100 |
| Zentner (2005, Study 2) |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 98 |
| Todd et al. (2007) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 47 |
| Eastwick & Finkel (2008) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 163 |
| Eastwick (2009, Study 2) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 146 |
| Eastwick, Eagly, et al. (2011, Study 4) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 187 |
| Eastwick, Eagly, et al. (2011, Study 5) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 71 |
| Eastwick, Finkel, et al. (2011, Study 1) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 100 |
| Eastwick, Finkel, et al. (2011, Study 3) |  |  | ✓ |  | ✓b | ✓ |  | 502 |
| Murray et al. (2011) |  |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 386 |
| Eastwick & Neff (2012) |  |  | ✓ |  |  | ✓ |  | 338 |
| Li et al. (2013, Study 3) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 142 |
| Li et al. (2013, Study 4) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 93 |
| Lam et al. (2016, Study 4) |  |  |  |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | 472 |
| Campbell et al. (2016) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 76 |
| Conroy-Beam & Buss (2016, Study 1) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 214 |
| Conroy-Beam & Buss (2016, Study 2) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 259 |
| Conroy-Beam & Buss (2016, Study 3) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 294 |
| Conroy-Beam et al. (2016, Study 1) |  |  | ✓c |  |  |  |  | 259 |
| Conroy-Beam et al. (2016, Study 2) |  |  | ✓c |  |  |  |  | 300 |
| Conroy-Beam et al. (2016, Study 3) |  |  | ✓c |  |  |  |  | 301 |
| Buyukcan-Tetik et al. (2017) |  | ✓ | ✓ |  |  |  |  | 390 |
| Wu et al. (2018) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 198 |
| Gerlach et al. (2019) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 763 |
| Valentine et al. (2020, Study 1) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 216 |
| Valentine et al. (2020, Study 2) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 270 |
| Fletcher et al. (2020) |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | 394 |
| Mafra et al. (2021) |  | ✓ |  |  |  |  |  | 436 |
| Selterman & Gideon (2022) |  |  |  |  |  | ✓ |  | 793 |
| Eastwick, Joel et al. (2023) |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | 208 |
| Driebe et al. (in press) |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | ✓ | ✓ |  | 178 |

Note: ✓ indicates that the analytic strategy was reported. This table includes only studies that examined participants’ evaluations of targets whom they had at least met face-to-face. The current study will report all four analytic strategies in full.

a This study used a difference score with additional controls that is conceptually analogous to the level metric.

b This version of this test was reported in a subsequent article (Eastwick et al., 2019).

c This study used a “Euclidean distance” metric, which has the same flaws as the raw pattern metric (Rogers et al., 2018).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Ideal(raw) |  | Partner trait (raw) |  |  |  |  | Ideal (centered) |  | Partner trait (centered) |  |  |  |
| ID | Rom Eval. (DV) | Trait1 | Trait2 | Trait3 | Trait4 |  | Trait1 | Trait2 | Trait3 | Trait4 |  | Pattern Metric (raw) | z-Pattern Metric (raw) |  | Trait1 | Trait2 | Trait3 | Trait4 |  | Trait1 | Trait2 | Trait3 | Trait4 |  | Pattern Metric (corr.) | z-Pattern Metric (corr.) |
| 1 | 8.50 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 5 | 5 |  | .52 | .58 |  | 0.47 | 0.61 | -1.40 | -0.36 |  | 0.36 | -0.49 | -0.43 | -0.58 |  | .41 | .44 |
| 2 | 9.50 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 6 |  | 5 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  | -.33 | -.35 |  | -0.53 | -0.39 | -0.40 | -1.36 |  | -0.64 | 1.51 | 1.57 | 1.42 |  | -.14 | -.14 |
| 3 | 8.33 | 9 | 7 | 6 | 6 |  | 4 | 5 | 7 | 6 |  | -.91 | -1.54 |  | 1.47 | -0.39 | -1.40 | -1.36 |  | -1.64 | -0.49 | 1.57 | 0.42 |  | -.92 | -1.61 |
| 4 | 7.83 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 5 |  | 6 | 5 | 6 | 6 |  | -.52 | -.58 |  | -1.53 | -0.39 | -0.40 | -2.36 |  | 0.36 | -0.49 | 0.57 | 0.42 |  | -.42 | -.45 |
| 5 | 8.50 | 8 | 6 | 7 | 7 |  | 6 | 5 | 5 | 4 |  | .50 | .55 |  | 0.47 | -1.39 | -0.40 | -0.36 |  | 0.36 | -0.49 | -0.43 | -1.58 |  | .36 | .38 |
| 6 | 9.00 | 8 | 9 | 7 | 8 |  | 6 | 5 | 4 | 5 |  | .50 | .55 |  | 0.47 | 1.61 | -0.40 | 0.64 |  | 0.36 | -0.49 | -1.43 | -0.58 |  | .46 | .50 |
| 7 | 8.17 | 7 | 6 | 6 | 5 |  | 5 | 5 | 5 | 7 |  | -.82 | -1.15 |  | -0.53 | -1.39 | -1.40 | -2.36 |  | -0.64 | -0.49 | -0.43 | 1.42 |  | -.88 | -1.40 |
| 8 | 8.50 | 7 | 9 | 9 | 9 |  | 6 | 6 | 5 | 6 |  | -.33 | -.35 |  | -0.53 | 1.61 | 1.60 | 1.64 |  | 0.36 | 0.51 | -0.43 | 0.42 |  | -.20 | -.20 |
| 9 | 8.00 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 6 |  | 6 | 7 | 4 | 3 |  | .00 | .00 |  | -1.53 | -0.39 | 0.60 | -1.36 |  | 0.36 | 1.51 | -1.43 | -2.58 |  | .01 | .01 |
| 10 | 8.67 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 7 |  | 7 | 6 | 5 | 5 |  | .85 | 1.27 |  | 0.47 | -0.39 | -1.40 | -0.36 |  | 1.36 | 0.51 | -0.43 | -0.58 |  | .77 | 1.03 |
| 11 | 8.50 | 8 | 7 | 7 | 7 |  | 6 | 6 | 7 | 5 |  | .00 | .00 |  | 0.47 | -0.39 | -0.40 | -0.36 |  | 0.36 | 0.51 | 1.57 | -0.58 |  | -.13 | -.13 |
| 12 | 8.00 | 7 | 9 | 8 | 8 |  | 4 | 7 | 4 | 7 |  | .71 | .88 |  | -0.53 | 1.61 | 0.60 | 0.64 |  | -1.64 | 1.51 | -1.43 | 1.42 |  | .76 | .99 |
| 13 | 8.17 | 8 | 9 | 10 | 8 |  | 4 | 6 | 6 | 5 |  | .82 | 1.15 |  | 0.47 | 1.61 | 2.60 | 0.64 |  | -1.64 | 0.51 | 0.57 | -0.58 |  | .87 | 1.31 |
| 14 | 8.83 | 6 | 8 | 7 | 6 |  | 5 | 6 | 6 | 4 |  | .82 | 1.15 |  | -1.53 | 0.61 | -0.40 | -1.36 |  | -0.64 | 0.51 | 0.57 | -1.58 |  | .81 | 1.11 |
| 15 | 9.17 | 8 | 8 | 6 | 8 |  | 7 | 5 | 6 | 5 |  | -.17 | -.18 |  | 0.47 | 0.61 | -1.40 | 0.64 |  | 1.36 | -0.49 | 0.57 | -0.58 |  | -.33 | -.34 |
| 16 | 8.83 | 9 | 8 | 7 | 6 |  | 7 | 5 | 7 | 3 |  | .67 | .82 |  | 1.47 | 0.61 | -0.40 | -1.36 |  | 1.36 | -0.49 | 1.57 | -2.58 |  | .65 | .77 |
| 17 | 8.33 | 7 | 7 | 7 | 10 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 | 7 |  | .56 | .63 |  | -0.53 | -0.39 | -0.40 | 2.64 |  | 1.36 | -1.49 | -0.43 | 1.42 |  | .53 | .59 |
| 18 | 8.67 | 6 | 8 | 8 | 7 |  | 4 | 7 | 6 | 6 |  | .90 | 1.47 |  | -1.53 | 0.61 | 0.60 | -0.36 |  | -1.64 | 1.51 | 0.57 | 0.42 |  | .93 | 1.68 |
| 19 | 8.33 | 8 | 7 | 6 | 8 |  | 5 | 6 | 6 | 6 |  | -.52 | -.58 |  | 0.47 | -0.39 | -1.40 | 0.64 |  | -0.64 | 0.51 | 0.57 | 0.42 |  | -.53 | -.60 |
| 20 | 8.33 | 8 | 8 | 9 | 7 |  | 7 | 4 | 5 | 5 |  | .00 | .00 |  | 0.47 | 0.61 | 1.60 | -0.36 |  | 1.36 | -1.49 | -0.43 | -0.58 |  | -.04 | -.04 |

Table S2 – Creating the Raw and Corrected Pattern Metric and Conducting Analyses 1a-1d

Equation # of Analyses

1a. PartnerTrait = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *u0* + *u1*Ideal + *ε* 1 for each ideal-trait pair

1b. Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*PatternMetric(raw) + *u0* + *u1*PatternMetric(raw) + *ε*  1

1c. Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*PatternMetric(corrected) + *u0* + *u1*PatternMetric(corrected) + *ε* 1

1d. Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *β2*PartnerTrait + *β3*Ideal × PartnerTrait + 1 for each ideal- trait pair

 *u0* + *u1*PartnerTrait + *ε*

*Note*: Pattern Metric (raw) is the correlation between the two matrices outlined in blue. Pattern Metric (corrected) is the correlation between the two matrices outlined in red. Both Pattern Metric variables are then Fisher *z* transformed for analysis 1b and 1c. Colors in equations correspond to dotted-line colors around the relevant column of data. *u0*= random intercept (across samples); *u1* = random slope (across samples); *ε* = residual error. If models do not converge, *u1* terms were dropped first, followed by *u0* terms.

Table S3 – Participating Labs and Sample Sizes

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Institution** | **Country** | **Language** |  **N** |
| Adam Mickiewicz University | Poland | Polish | 293 |
| Beijing Normal University | China | Chinese | 57 |
| Bilkent University | Turkey | Turkish | 174 |
| Christ University | India | English | 49 |
| Chulalongkorn University | Thailand | Thai | 67 |
| Duke University | Chile | Spanish | 116 |
| Eotvos Lorand University | Hungary | Hungarian | 403 |
| Franklin & Marshall College | El Salvador | Spanish | 67 |
| HSE University | Russia | Russian | 353 |
| HSE University | Ghana | English | 68 |
| Instituto Universitario de Lisboa | Portugal | Portuguese | 144 |
| Ithaca College | United States | English | 153 |
| Kyushu University  | Japan | Japanese | 721 |
| Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts | North Macedonia | Macedonian | 198 |
| Macquarie University | Australia | English | 168 |
| MIT Sloan School of Management | China | Chinese | 60 |
| Palacky University Olomouc | Czech Republic | Czech | 178 |
| Redeemer's University | Nigeria | English | 55 |
| Sabanci University | Turkey | Turkish | 102 |
| Sabanci University | Turkey | Turkish | 120 |
| Singapore Institute of Technology  | Malaysia | Malay | 32 |
| SWPS University | Greece | Greek | 234 |
| Teesside University | England | English | 112 |
| The University of Queensland | Australia | English | 71 |
| Toronto Metropolitan University | Canada | English | 81 |
| Tunku Abdul Rahman University of Management and Technology | Malaysia | English | 47 |
| UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta | Indonesia | Indonesian | 96 |
| United Arab Emirates University | United Arab Emirates | English | 39 |
| Universidad de Sonora | Mexico | Spanish | 72 |
| Universidade Federal de Sergipe | Brazil | Portuguese | 69 |
| Universitas Indonesia | Indonesia | Indonesian | 107 |
| Université de Paris | France | French | 308 |
| University of Belgrade | Serbia | Serbian | 180 |
| University of California, Davis | United States | English | 287 |
| University of Chester | England | English | 123 |
| University of Colorado - Colorado Springs | Lebanon | English | 34 |
| University of Edinburgh | Scotland | English | 106 |
| University of Granada | Spain | Spanish | 326 |
| University of Hong Kong | Hong Kong SAR, China | English | 88 |
| University of Ibadan | Nigeria | English | 45 |
| University of Kansas | Brazil | Portuguese | 55 |
| University of Kansas | China | Chinese | 202 |
| University of Kansas | United States | English | 162 |
| University of Presov | Slovenia | Slovak | 240 |
| University of the Philippines at Diliman | The Philippines | English | 93 |
| University of Turku | Finland | Finnish | 175 |
| University of Utah | United States | English | 57 |
| University of Wroclaw | Poland | Polish | 416 |
| University of Wroclaw | Argentina | Spanish | 184 |
| University of Wroclaw | Colombia | Spanish | 172 |
| University of Wroclaw | Dominican Republic | Spanish | 172 |
| University of Wroclaw | Ecuador | Spanish | 153 |
| University of Wroclaw | Guatemala | Spanish | 187 |
| University of Zadar | Croatia | Croatian | 382 |
| University of Zadar | Bosnia and Herzegovina | Croatian | 609 |
| Uskudar University | Turkey | Turkish | 267 |
| Witten/Herdecke University | Germany | German | 87 |
| Yonsei University | South Korea | Korean | 98 |
| York University | Canada | English | 356 |
| York University | Canada | English | 288 |
| **Totals: k = 60 samples** | N = 43 | N = 22 | 10,358 |

Note: Institutions are listed on multiple rows if researchers at that institution administered the survey in more than one language or to more than one population (e.g., students vs. community). Note that the university is not always located in the associated country because the researcher at the university had the contacts and resources to conduct data collection in a different country.

Table S4 – Ideal Partner Preference Attributes Assessed

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Attribute |  | Source |  | Importance Ranking |
|  |  |  |  |  | Fletcher (out of 79) | Sparks (out of 93) |
| 1 | Attractive |  | Fletcher (V/A scale) |  | 1 | 4 |
| 2 | Intelligent |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 2 | 2 |
| 3 | Humorous |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 3 | 1 |
| 4 | Considerate |  | Fletcher (W/T scale) |  | 4 | 12 |
| 5 | Honest |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 8 | 3 |
| 6 | Understanding |  | Fletcher (W/T scale) |  | 9 | 6 |
| 7 | Ambitious |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 12 | 7 |
| 8 | Sporty and Athletic |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 15 | 30 |
| 9 | Fun |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 24 | 13 |
| 10 | Sensitive |  | Fletcher (W/T scale) |  | 25 | 32 |
| 11 | A good lover |  | Fletcher (V/A scale) |  | 35 | 51 |
| 12 | Nice body |  | Fletcher (V/A scale) |  | 36 | 20 |
| 13 | Confident |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 43 | 19 |
| 14 | Sexy |  | Fletcher (V/A scale) |  | 47 | 38 |
| 15 | Financially secure |  | Fletcher (S/R scale) |  | 54 | 41 |
| 16 | Supportive |  | Fletcher (W/T scale) |  | 58 | 35 |
| 17 | Dresses well |  | Fletcher (S/R scale) |  | 60 | 65 |
| 18 | A good listener |  | Fletcher (W/T scale) |  | 65 | 55 |
| 19 | Loyal |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 66 | 8 |
| 20 | Successful |  | Fletcher (S/R scale) |  | 69 | 58 |
| 21 | Adventurous |  | Fletcher (V/A scale) |  | 72 | 21 |
| 22 | Good job |  | Fletcher (S/R scale) |  | 76 | 73 |
| 23 | Religious |  | Sparks (top 30) |  | 78 | 25 |
| 24 | Patient |  | Sparks (top 30) |  |  | 15 |
| 25 | Extraverted, enthusiastic |  | Big Five (Extraversion) |  |  |  |
| 26 | Critical, quarrelsome |  | Big Five (Agreeableness) |  |  |  |
| 27 | Dependable, self-disciplined |  | Big Five (Conscientiousness) |  |  |  |
| 28 | Anxious, easily upset |  | Big Five (Emotional Stability) |  |  |  |
| 29 | Open to new experiences, complex |  | Big Five (Openness) |  |  |  |
| 30 | Reserved, quiet |  | Big Five (Extraversion) |  |  |  |
| 31 | Sympathetic, warm |  | Big Five (Agreeableness) |  |  |  |
| 32 | Disorganized, careless |  | Big Five (Conscientiousness) |  |  |  |
| 33 | Calm, emotionally stable |  | Big Five (Emotional Stability) |  |  |  |
| 34 | Conventional, uncreative |  | Big Five (Openness) |  |  |  |
| 35 | Smells good |  | Roberts |  |  |  |

Note: Source column indicates whether the item was selected because it is (a) included in the popular Fletcher et al. (1999) warmth/trustworthiness (W/T), vitality/attractiveness (V/A), or status/resources (S/R) scales, (b) among the top 30 most important traits in Sparks et al. (2020), (c) the Big Five (Gosling et al., 2003), or (d) highlighted by Roberts et al. (2020) as potentially crucial for cross-cultural investigations. Importance ranking refers to the popularity of the trait according to the “rate of mention” by participants in Fletcher et al. (1999, Tables 1 and 2) or in Sparks et al. (2020, Table S1); the importance ranking columns correlate highly (*r* = .69).

**Dependent Measure Scale-Derivation**

RQ2 tests whether the ideal-partner preference matching hypothesis receives more support for participants who are reporting on a current relationship partner (i.e., partnered) vs. a desired relationship partner (i.e., single). This comparison requires that we use a romantic evaluation dependent measure that is applicable to both single and partnered participants. Not all romantic evaluation measures are appropriate to both types of participants. For example, relationship satisfaction is one of the most commonly assessed romantic evaluation measures (Le, Dove, Agnew, Korn, & Mutso, 2010), but these items (e.g., “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ is close to ideal,” “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_makes me very happy”) are ambiguous for single people reporting on a peer who may not (yet) reciprocate their affections. Here, we describe the process we used to select a set of dependent measure items that should have similar construct validity for participants reporting on either a current or desired relationship partner.

Only two published studies have compared romantic evaluation measures across single and partnered participants to the best of our knowledge: Eastwick et al. (2011, Study 3) and Sparks et al. (2020). The ten items used collectively across these studies are included in Table S5; all of these items have reasonable face validity for single participants reporting on a desired romantic partner. But, among participants reporting on a current romantic partner, it is unknown which of these items come closest to assessing relationship satisfaction—the “gold-standard” dependent measure used by most prior ideal partner-preference matching studies examining established relationships.

 To determine which of these items best capture relationship satisfaction among partnered participants, we asked a sample of Mechanical Turk workers to complete the 10 *context independent* items in Table S5 plus the following 5 *relationship satisfaction* items from the Rusbult, Martz, & Agnew (1998) scale: “I feel satisfied with my relationship with \_\_\_\_\_,” “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ is much better than others' relationships,” “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_ is close to ideal,” “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_makes me very happy,” and “My relationship with \_\_\_\_\_does a good job of fulfilling my needs for intimacy, companionship, etc.” These *N* = 418 participants were all currently involved in a romantic relationship and passed the attention check described in the main text; data and code are available [here](https://osf.io/b29vu/?view_only=35a15592f8b04cdfb9ab32f45c73f3c6). The five satisfaction items correlated with each other highly as expected, average *r* = .76, α = .94.

 To create a measure that approximates relationship satisfaction among partnered participants, we wanted to select items from the 10 context independent items that *correlated as highly as possible with the satisfaction items*. The average of the five correlations between the satisfaction items and each of the 10 context independent items are presented in Table S5. The top 6 items (bolded)[[1]](#footnote-1) correlate at an average of *r* = .67 with the satisfaction items. They correlate at *r* = .66 with each other (α = .92), and eliminating any of the six items reduced reliability (to α = .91 or lower). Thus, we retained these 6 items for the dependent measure described in the main text. In summary, we believe that these items collectively tap the same construct as relationship satisfaction in this sample of partnered participants—while retaining face validity for single participants—and they form a dependent measure with strong reliability.[[2]](#footnote-2)

 We also addressed this issue with confirmatory factor analysis. Using *R*’s *lavaan* package (Rosseel, 2012), we fitted four different models: (a) a model with a single 6-item DV factor (i.e., the 6 items we retained), (b) a model with the same 6-item DV factor as well as a second correlated 5-item satisfaction factor, (c) a model with a single 5-item DV factor (i.e., dropping Item #6 in Table S5), and (d) a model with the same 5-item DV factor as well as a second correlated 5-item satisfaction factor. A small number of missing data values (< 1.7% for any DV item) were replaced using the *mice* package (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011). The results of these models are presented in Table S6. Generally speaking, these models performed modestly well (especially given that methodological artifacts alone frequently cause unidimensional models to misfit; Hopwood & Donnellan, 2010), although the 5-item DV models tended to perform a bit better (e.g., on the BIC) than the 6-item DV models. Importantly, for both models (b) and (d), the correlation between the DV factor and the satisfaction factor was exceptionally high (*r* = .98 in both cases), suggesting that we achieved our goal of creating a dependent measure that (a) mimics relationship satisfaction in established relationships yet (b) still applies to other non-partner targets.

Table S5 – Quantifying the Extent to Which Ten Romantic Evaluation Items Assess Relationship Satisfaction

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Item |  | *r*  with relationship satisfaction |
| 1 |  **\_\_\_\_\_ is very much my ideal romantic partner** |  | .79 |
| 2 | **I am romantically interested in \_\_\_\_\_** |  | .68 |
| 3 | **\_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is the first person that I would turn to if I had a problem.** |  | .67 |
| 4 | **It is important to me to see or talk with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ regularly.**  |  | .64 |
| 5 |  **\_\_\_\_\_ is the only person I want to be romantically involved with** |  | .63 |
| 6 |  **If I achieved something good, \_\_\_\_\_\_\_ is the person that I would tell first.** |  | .62 |
| 7 | \_\_\_\_\_ always seems to be on my mind |  | .62 |
| 8 |  \_\_\_\_\_ and I have a lot in common |  | .60 |
| 9 | I feel a great deal of sexual desire for \_\_\_\_\_ |  | .58 |
| 10 | When I am away from \_\_\_\_\_\_\_, I feel down. |  | .36 |

Note: These 10 items were used in comparisons involving single and partnered participants in Eastwick et al. (2011, Study 3) and Sparks et al. (2020). Bolded items (1-6) are selected for inclusion in the current study.

Table S6– Fit Indices for Confirmatory Factor Analytic Models of the Possible Dependent Measures

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Model | $$χ^{2}$$ | df | *p* | TLI | CFI | RMSEA | RMSEA lower | RMSEA upper | RMSEA *p* | SRMR | BIC |
| a. | 6-item DV | 212.74 | 9 | < .001 | 0.81 | 0.89 | 0.23 | 0.21 | 0.26 | < .001 | 0.06 | 9093.07 |
| b. | 6-item DV + satisfaction | 453.10 | 43 | < .001 | 0.88 | 0.91 | 0.15 | 0.14 | 0.16 | < .001 | 0.05 | 15770.10 |
| c. | 5-item DV | 47.70 | 5 | < .001 | 0.94 | 0.97 | 0.14 | 0.11 | 0.18 | < .001 | 0.03 | 7638.57 |
| d. | 5-item DV + satisfaction | 257.99 | 34 | < .001 | 0.93 | 0.94 | 0.13 | 0.11 | 0.14 | < .001 | 0.03 | 14301.62 |

Note. TLI = Tucker Lewis index; CFI = comparative fit index; RMSEA = root-mean-square error of approximation; SRMR = (standardized) root mean square residual; BIC = Bayesian information criterion. Models b and d included satisfaction as a (5-item) factor that correlated with the DV.

**Additional Methodological Details**

These methodological components are not referenced in the current analysis plan but were collected as part of this project.

**Direct-estimation items.** Some studies ask participants to compare a target’s attributes to their ideals directly, essentially merging the trait and ideal assessment into a single “direct-estimation” item (e.g., “Does \_\_\_\_\_\_ exceed your standards for attractiveness?” Fletcher, et al., 2014). Studies using this approach are included in Table S7, and they all document significant (moderate-to-large) associations between this construct and romantic evaluation outcomes. There are no generalizability or replicability concerns with this approach, and so we do not propose to examine them in this registered report. Nevertheless, we collected these data for future construct validity efforts: For the first target only, participants rated each target on the 35 attributes on a scale from 1 (*does not match my ideal at all*) to 11 (*completely matches my ideal*; Overall et al., 2006).

**Individual-difference measures.** Participants completed a set of 43 items assessing psychological constructs that are central in the cross-cultural literature, not just individualism/collectivism (Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) and relational mobility (Thomson et al., 2018), but also: residential mobility (Oishi & Schimmack, 2010), tightness/looseness (Gelfand et al., 2011), machismo (Arceniega et al., 2008), and attitudes towards sex roles (Larsen & Long, 1988). Only individualism/collectivism and relational mobility were included in the current analysis plan, but the remaining individual differences will likely inform future projects by enabling high-powered tests of the possibility that ideal partner preference-matching effects are (for example) stronger when people perceive that their culture is tight, they cannot move easily, or they have traditional attitudes.

**Demographic and other information.** The two relationship status variables are included in the analysis plan; the remaining variables were collected for exploratory purposes and to ensure that we can comprehensively describe the composition of our samples. Participants provided information about their age, gender, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, native language, country of residence, and relationship status. They also indicated the nature of their relationship with each of the four targets using the following (mutually exclusive) categories: spouse or fiancé, boyfriend/girlfriend/committed romantic partner, casual romantic/sexual partner, friend, colleague or co-worker, acquaintance, stranger. They also rated each target on two items “I am interested in a short-term romantic relationship (e.g., a one-night stand, fling, brief affair) with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_” and “I am interested in a long-term, committed romantic relationship with \_\_\_\_\_\_\_,” and they indicated how long they have known each of the four targets. At the end of the study, participants were asked “In this survey, were all your responses sincere and true, to your knowledge? (Note: your response to this question will have no influence on payment or course credit.)”

Table S7 – Other Studies of Ideal Partner Preference-Matching

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Article |  | Direct-estimation Items | Rare Ideals Measure  | Rare Measure Description |
| Ruvolo & Veroff (1997) |  |  | x | Ideals tailored to the partner |
| Campbell et al. (2001, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Campbell et al. (2001, Study 2) |  | x |  |  |
| Knee et al. (2001, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Overall et al. (2006, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Overall et al. (2006, Study 2) |  | x |  |  |
| Kurzban & Weeden (2007) |  |  | x | Advertised ideals |
| Burriss et al. (2011) |  |  | x | Choice-based measure of ideals |
| Eastwick, Eagly et al. (2011, Study 4) |  |  | x | Go/No-Go measure of ideals |
| Eastwick, Eagly et al. (2011, Study 5) |  |  | x | Go/No-Go measure of ideals |
| Lackenbauer & Campbell (2012, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Lackenbauer & Campbell (2012, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Strauss et al. (2012, Study 1) |  |  | x | Attachment ideals |
| Strauss et al. (2012, Study 1) |  |  | x | Attachment ideals |
| Campbell et al. (2013, Study 1) |  | x |  |  |
| Campbell et al. (2013, Study 2) |  | x |  |  |
| Hammond & Overall (2014) |  | x |  |  |
| Fletcher et al. (2014) |  | x |  |  |
| Rodriguez et al. (2015) |  | x |  |  |
| Sparks et al. (2020) |  |  | x | Nominated ideals (yoked design) |
| Balzarini et al. (2021) |  | x | x | Sexual ideals |

Note: These studies differ from the studies in Table S1 in that (a) they assessed ideals and traits as a “direct-estimation” item, or (b) they used a rare conceptualization of ideal partner preferences. All studies examined participants’ evaluations of targets whom they had at least met face-to-face.

**A Priori Power Analysis Plan**

(This section was unchanged from the original Stage I registered report submission.)

**Calculating Effective Sample Size**

If every laboratory reaches their minimum target *N*, we will recruit 5720 participants, if every laboratory reaches their maximum target *N*, we will recruit 11580 participants, and if every laboratory recruits the average of their minimum and maximum target *N*, we will recruit 8650 participants. Thus, *N* = 8650 is a reasonable estimate for what we will be able to recruit. However, there will likely be some cost to statistical power due to nesting of participants within sample. Therefore, the power analysis reported in Table 1 was calculated using the following approach that accounts for the nesting of participant within the 52 samples.

1. We first calculated the average of the minimum and maximum anticipated *N* for each sample in Table S3 (*M* = 166 participants per sample).
2. We then calculated the effective sample size using the formula from Snijders and Bosker (2012):

Effective sample size = *Nk*/(1 + (*k* – 1)\**ICC*) (1)

In this formula, *N* is the number of higher-level units (in this case, the **52** samples), and *k* is the average number of observations within each unit (in this case, **166** participants). The intraclass correlation (ICC) refers to the extent to which effect sizes exhibit random variability across the *N* unit (sample); this value is also reflected in the *u1* terms in the equations described in Tables 2, 3, and S2.

The ICC is difficult to estimate precisely, but our best guess comes from the Cheung et al. (2016) registered replication report (RRR) of Finkel et al. (2002), which is the only RRR to use measures similar to those that we use here (i.e., participants reporting evaluative measures about a romantic partner). This RRR collected data on the association of four target-specific variables (i.e., exit, voice, loyalty, and neglect) with participants’ subjective ratings of commitment. Across the 16 samples in Cheung et al. (2016), three of the four associations revealed ICCs of 0.0 (i.e., the correlation of commitment with exit, voice, and loyalty exhibited no random variability across samples). One (the commitment-neglect association) exhibited an ICC of .0013, so we conservatively use this value in our calculation here.[[3]](#footnote-3)

Thus, equation 1 provides an effective sample size estimate of (52 × 166)/(1 + (166– 1)\**.*0013) = 7107. This estimate (rather than 8650) is used in the power calculations reported below.

**Calculating Power for Table 1 with *N* = 7107**

1. **Power for hypothesis 1.**
	1. In G\*Power, a sensitivity power analysis for a correlation with sample size *N* = 7107, power = 95%, two-tailed, and alpha = .05 yields an effect size estimate *r* = .043. This *r* = .043 value appears in rows 1a-1c in Table 1.
	2. To calculate power for the level metric interaction tests, we used the InteractionPoweR package in R (Baranger et al., 2023). The statistical power of the interaction in the romantic evaluation = ideal × attribute tests depends on (a) the size of the main effect of ideal, (b) the size of the main effect of the attribute, and (c) the correlation between the ideal and the attribute. Averaging across 14 level metric tests reported by Eastwick, Joel et al. (2023), our best estimate of these three values is (a) βideals = -.012, (b) βattributes = .152, and (c) βideal-attribute = .198. With these estimates, according to InteractionPoweR, *N* = 7107 provides 95% power to detect level metric β = .042, which is a “28% attenuation” interaction (i.e., the interaction β is approximately 1/4 as large as the main effect β). This value appears in row 1d in Table 1.
2. **Power for hypotheses 2 and 3**. For the singles and partnered subsample analyses, we assume that we acquire a sample that is half single (*N* = 7107 ÷ 2 = 3554) and half partnered (*N* = 3554); this assumption follows from our informal prior observations that undergraduate samples tend to have (slightly) more single than partnered individuals, and community/online samples tend to have (many) more partnered than single individuals. In G\*Power, a sensitivity power analysis for a correlation with sample size *N* = 3554, power = 95%, two-tailed, and alpha = .05 yields an effect size estimate *r* = .060. This *r* = .060 value appears in rows 2a-2c and 3a-3c in Table 1. According to InteractionPoweR, *N* = 3554 provides 95% power to detect level metric β = .061, which is a “40% attenuation” interaction (i.e., the interaction β is approximately 2/5 as large as the main effect β). This value appears in rows 2d and 3d in Table 1.
3. **Power for hypothesis 4.** When attempting to test the difference between the single and partnered subsample, we again assume that we acquire a sample that is half single (*N* = 7107 ÷ 2 = 3554) and half partnered (*N* = 3554). In G\*Power, a sensitivity power analysis for a difference between two independent Pearson *r*swith sample size *N* = 3554 in each group, power = 95%, two-tailed, and alpha = .05 yields an effect size estimate *q* = .086. This *q* = .086 value appears in rows 4a-4d in Table 1.

**A note about power when using Holm-Bonferroni**

One could argue that our use of the Holm-Bonferroni (Holm, 1979) correction provides 95% power to detect the *smallest* estimate out of 35 (which will be deemed significant if *p* ≤ .05), but power should be calculated using α = .0014 (given that the largest estimate out of 35 will be deemed significant only if *p* ≤ .0014). This shift to α = .0014 would have the following implications for hypotheses 1-4: (1a) we have 95% power to detect *r* of .053 instead of .043; (1b) we have 95% power to detect level metric *β* of .053 instead of .042; (2) we have 95% power to detect *r* of .081 instead of .060, and we have 95% power to detect level metric *β* of .076 instead of .061; (3) we have 95% power to detect *q* of .115 instead of .086. In short, the loss of power due to our use of the Holm (1979) procedure for some hypotheses is not especially severe (see also Olejnik et al., 1997).

**Missing Data Analysis**

Even though our percentage of missing data was low (less than 1% for all variables), we tested the possible impact of missing data on our conclusions using the mice package for R (van Buuren & Groothuis-Oudshoorn, 2011). Specifically, we used predictive mean matching (30 iterations) to create a new dataset that “filled in” the missing data for the ideals, partner perception, uncorrected pattern metric, and corrected pattern metric variables. We then reran the analyses for that produced Tables 2 and 3 on this complete dataset. Results are presented in Table S8 and S9 below. Generally speaking, the findings were extremely similar. Of the 129 effect size estimates in Table 2, 111 (86%) were identical, and 18 (14%) differed by only .01 between Table 2 and Table S8. Of the 135 effect sizes estimates in Table 3, 110 (81%) were identical, and 25 (19%) differed by only .01 or .02 between Table 3 and Table S9. In short, this missing data analysis produced identical conclusions, which is consistent with the fact that our overall level of missingness was extremely low. (To clarify, this missing data analysis applies to the participants who made it to the final screen of the survey; it is unclear how the participants who closed the survey part-way through would have responded.)

Table S8 –Ideal-Trait Correlations (Analysis Plan 1a through 4a) with imputed Missing Data

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | Ideal-Trait Correlations |
|  | Attribute |  | Overall |  | Partnered | Single | *t* for comparison |
|  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Attractive (V/A) |  | .29\*\*\* |  | .28\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | 2.41 |
| 2 | Intelligent |  | .35\*\*\* |  | .38\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -4.45\*\*\* |
| 3 | Humorous |  | .38\*\*\* |  | .40\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | -3.92\*\*\* |
| 4 | Considerate (W/T) |  | .31\*\*\* |  | .30\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | -1.08 |
| 5 | Honest |  | .29\*\*\* |  | .33\*\*\* | .25\*\*\* | -5.15\*\*\* |
| 6 | Understanding (W/T) |  | .31\*\*\* |  | .31\*\*\* | .30\*\*\* | -0.86 |
| 7 | Ambitious |  | .41\*\*\* |  | .45\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | -6.37\*\*\* |
| 8 | Sporty and Athletic |  | .38\*\*\* |  | .41\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | -3.17\*\* |
| 9 | Fun |  | .37\*\*\* |  | .35\*\*\* | .39\*\*\* | -0.48 |
| 10 | Sensitive (W/T) |  | .36\*\*\* |  | .36\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | -1.77 |
| 11 | A good lover (V/A) |  | .34\*\*\* |  | .33\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | -4.01\*\*\* |
| 12 | Nice body (V/A) |  | .29\*\*\* |  | .27\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | 2.62 |
| 13 | Confident |  | .33\*\*\* |  | .34\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -2.85 |
| 14 | Sexy (V/A) |  | .36\*\*\* |  | .34\*\*\* | .41\*\*\* | 2.05 |
| 15 | Financially secure (S/R) |  | .24\*\*\* |  | .25\*\*\* | .24\*\*\* | -0.68 |
| 16 | Supportive (W/T) |  | .32\*\*\* |  | .31\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | -1.91 |
| 17 | Dresses well (S/R) |  | .33\*\*\* |  | .34\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -2.90 |
| 18 | A good listener (W/T) |  | .28\*\*\* |  | .26\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | -2.43 |
| 19 | Loyal |  | .27\*\*\* |  | .33\*\*\* | .21\*\*\* | -8.29\*\*\* |
| 20 | Successful (S/R) |  | .29\*\*\* |  | .30\*\*\* | .28\*\*\* | -3.60\*\*\* |
| 21 | Adventurous (V/A) |  | .38\*\*\* |  | .39\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | -4.00\*\*\* |
| 22 | Good job (S/R) |  | .28\*\*\* |  | .30\*\*\* | .27\*\*\* | -1.94 |
| 23 | Religious |  | .57\*\*\* |  | .63\*\*\* | .52\*\*\* | -9.12\*\*\* |
| 24 | Patient |  | .26\*\*\* |  | .28\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | -1.90 |
| 25 | Extraverted, enthusiastic (Ext) |  | .37\*\*\* |  | .40\*\*\* | .34\*\*\* | -4.05\*\*\* |
| 26 | Critical, quarrelsome (Agr) |  | .39\*\*\* |  | .38\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | -0.11 |
| 27 | Dependable, self-disciplined (Con) |  | .31\*\*\* |  | .33\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | -3.55\*\*\* |
| 28 | Anxious, easily upset (Emo) |  | .27\*\*\* |  | .28\*\*\* | .27\*\*\* | -0.87 |
| 29 | Open to new experiences, complex (Opn) |  | .35\*\*\* |  | .37\*\*\* | .34\*\*\* | -3.50\*\*\* |
| 30 | Reserved, quiet (Ext) |  | .35\*\*\* |  | .39\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -4.34\*\*\* |
| 31 | Sympathetic, warm (Agr) |  | .32\*\*\* |  | .32\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -1.76 |
| 32 | Disorganized, careless (Con) |  | .24\*\*\* |  | .24\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | -0.25 |
| 33 | Calm, emotionally stable (Emo) |  | .27\*\*\* |  | .29\*\*\* | .25\*\*\* | -3.80\*\*\* |
| 34 | Conventional, uncreative (Opn) |  | .34\*\*\* |  | .35\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | -3.10\*\* |
| 35 | Smells good |  | .38\*\*\* |  | .34\*\*\* | .42\*\*\* | -0.29 |
|  | W/T average |  | .41\*\*\* |  | .40\*\*\* | .39\*\*\* | -2.92\*\* |
|  | V/A average |  | .40\*\*\* |  | .37\*\*\* | .43\*\*\* | -0.71 |
|  | S/R average |  | .34\*\*\* |  | .34\*\*\* | .34\*\*\* | -2.01\* |
|  | Ext average |  | .36\*\*\* |  | .42\*\*\* | .31\*\*\* | -5.82\*\*\* |
|  | Agr average |  | .37\*\*\* |  | .36\*\*\* | .38\*\*\* | 0.45 |
|  | Con average |  | .29\*\*\* |  | .29\*\*\* | .29\*\*\* | -1.93 |
|  | Emo average |  | .27\*\*\* |  | .27\*\*\* | .26\*\*\* | -1.81 |
|  | Opn average |  | .36\*\*\* |  | .37\*\*\* | .36\*\*\* | -3.74\*\*\* |

Note: W/T: warmth/trustworthiness; V/A: vitality/attractiveness; S/R: status/resources; Ext: Extraversion; Agr: Agreeableness; Con: Conscientiousness; Emo: Emotional Stability; Opn: Openness to Experience. In the Big Five averages, Items 26, 28, 30, 32, and 24 were reverse scored. Values are the regression estimated betas (*β1*’s) from the following equation: Partner attribute = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *u0* + *u1*Ideal + *ε .* The random slope (*u1*) for sampleis omitted when models do not converge. *t* for comparison refers to the *β3* estimate in the following model, which tests the difference between the partnered and single columns: Partner attribute = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *β2*RelStatus + *β3*Ideal×RelStatus + *u0* + *u1*Ideal + *ε* \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001. Asterisks are omitted for estimates that fail a Holm-Bonferroni test (Holm, 1979) within each column of 35 traits.

Table S9 – Effect Sizes for Tests of Ideal Partner Preference-Matching (Analysis Plan 2b-4b, 2c-4c, 2d-4d) with imputed Missing Data

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Analysis |  | Overall |  | Partnered | Single | *t* for comparison |
|  |  |  |
| **Pattern metric** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Raw |  | .37\*\*\* |  | .38\*\*\* | .32\*\*\* | 2.91\*\* |
|  Corrected |  | .19\*\*\* |  | .19\*\*\* | .19\*\*\* | 3.27\*\* |
| **Level Metric** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1 | Attractive (V/A) |  | .02 |  | .00 | .04\*\*\* | 2.68 |
| 2 | Intelligent |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .00 | .03 | 3.42\*\*\* |
| 3 | Humorous |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .01 | .05\*\*\* | 4.12\*\*\* |
| 4 | Considerate (W/T) |  | .00 |  | -.04\*\*\* | .04\*\* | 5.62\*\*\* |
| 5 | Honest |  | .02 |  | -.01 | .02 | 2.73 |
| 6 | Understanding (W/T) |  | .02 |  | -.01 | .04\*\* | 4.44\*\*\* |
| 7 | Ambitious |  | .07\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .08\*\*\* | 3.69\*\*\* |
| 8 | Sporty and Athletic |  | .07\*\*\* |  | .06\*\*\* | .07\*\*\* | 2.30 |
| 9 | Fun |  | .01 |  | -.03\*\* | .05\*\*\* | 6.13\*\*\* |
| 10 | Sensitive (W/T) |  | .06\*\*\* |  | .06\*\*\* | .06\*\*\* | 0.57 |
| 11 | A good lover (V/A) |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .02 | .05\*\*\* | 1.35 |
| 12 | Nice body (V/A) |  | .02 |  | .01 | .06\*\*\* | 3.84\*\*\* |
| 13 | Confident |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .01 | .04 | 3.48\*\*\* |
| 14 | Sexy (V/A) |  | .02\*\* |  | .02 | .04\*\* | 2.55 |
| 15 | Financially secure (S/R) |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .04\*\*\* | .06\*\*\* | 2.57 |
| 16 | Supportive (W/T) |  | .00 |  | -.01 | .02 | 3.25\*\* |
| 17 | Dresses well (S/R) |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .03 | .04\*\* | 1.99 |
| 18 | A good listener (W/T) |  | .01 |  | -.02 | .04\*\* | 5.28\*\*\* |
| 19 | Loyal |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .03\*\* | .02 | 0.14 |
| 20 | Successful (S/R) |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .03 | .06\*\*\* | 3.98\*\*\* |
| 21 | Adventurous (V/A) |  | .05\*\*\* |  | .07\*\*\* | .07\*\*\* | 3.28\*\* |
| 22 | Good job (S/R) |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .06\*\*\* | 2.11 |
| 23 | Religious |  | .14\*\*\* |  | .10\*\*\* | .07\*\*\* | 0.00 |
| 24 | Patient |  | .01 |  | -.02 | .03 | 3.54\*\*\* |
| 25 | Extraverted, enthusiastic (Ext) |  | .06\*\*\* |  | .09\*\*\* | .03 | -1.73 |
| 26 | Critical, quarrelsome (Agr) |  | .08\*\*\* |  | .10\*\*\* | .08\*\*\* | 1.30 |
| 27 | Dependable, self-disciplined (Con) |  | .03\*\*\* |  | -.01 | .05\*\*\* | 5.05\*\*\* |
| 28 | Anxious, easily upset (Emo) |  | .07\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .08\*\*\* | 3.15\*\* |
| 29 | Open to new experiences, complex (Opn) |  | .06\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .07\*\*\* | 3.97\*\*\* |
| 30 | Reserved, quiet (Ext) |  | .09\*\*\* |  | .09\*\*\* | .07\*\*\* | 0.37 |
| 31 | Sympathetic, warm (Agr) |  | .02\*\* |  | -.01 | .05\*\*\* | 4.67\*\*\* |
| 32 | Disorganized, careless (Con) |  | .04\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .05\*\*\* | 1.88 |
| 33 | Calm, emotionally stable (Emo) |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .01 | .03 | 2.07 |
| 34 | Conventional, uncreative (Opn) |  | .07\*\*\* |  | .09\*\*\* | .05\*\*\* | -0.06 |
| 35 | Smells good |  | .01 |  | .02 | .02 | 0.99 |
|  | W/T average |  | .00 |  | -.03\*\*\* | .02 | 4.53\*\*\* |
|  | V/A average |  | .00 |  | -.02\* | .05\*\*\* | 5.13\*\*\* |
|  | S/R average |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .03\* | .07\*\*\* | 4.18\*\*\* |
|  | Ext average |  | .07\*\*\* |  | .08\*\*\* | .04\*\* | -1.39 |
|  | Agr average |  | .03\*\*\* |  | .04\*\*\* | .05\*\*\* | 1.30 |
|  | Con average |  | .03\*\* |  | .01 | .06\*\*\* | 4.60\*\*\* |
|  | Emo average |  | .05\*\*\* |  | .01 | .06\*\*\* | 3.66\*\*\* |
|  | Opn average |  | .05\*\*\* |  | .05\*\*\* | .04\*\* | 2.03\* |

Note: W/T: warmth/trustworthiness; V/A: vitality/attractiveness; S/R: status/resources. Ext: Extraversion; Agr: Agreeableness; Con: Conscientiousness; Emo: Emotional Stability; Opn: Openness to Experience. In the Big Five averages, Items 26, 28, 30, 32, and 24 were reverse scored. Values for pattern metric (raw) and pattern metric (corrected) are the regression estimated beta (*β1*) from the following equation: Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*PatternMetric + *u0* + *u1*PatternMetric + *ε.* Values for the level metric are the ideal × trait interaction estimated beta’s (*β3*’s) from the following equation: Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *β2*PartnerAttribute + *β3*Ideal×PartnerAttribute + *u0* + *u1*PartnerAttribute + *ε.* In all cases, the random slope (*u1*) for sampleis omitted when models do not converge. “*t* for comparison” for the pattern metric tests refers to the *β3* estimate in the following model: Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*PatternMetric + *β2*RelStatus + *β3*PatternMetric×RelStatus + *u0* + *u1*PatternMetric + *ε.* “*t* for comparison” for the level metric tests refers to the *β7* estimate in the following model: Romantic evaluation = *β0* + *β1*Ideal + *β2*PartnerAttribute + *β3*Ideal×PartnerAttribute + *β4*RelStatus + *β5*Ideal×RelStatus *+ β6*PartnerAttribute×RelStatus + *β7*Ideal×PartnerAttribute×RelStatus + *u0* + *u1*PartnerAttribute + *ε* . \* *p* < .05, \*\* *p* < .01, \*\*\* *p* < .001. Asterisks are omitted for estimates that fail a Holm-Bonferroni test (Holm, 1979) within each column of 35 traits.

**Relationship Formation Hypothesis Recruitment Details**

We recruited this sample with the assistance of the Cloud Research Managed Research team, see Figure S1 for a recruitment flow chart.

 At Time 1, 7,987 participants (*N* = 5,554 single participants and *N* = 2,433 partnered participants) completed a short survey about their ideal partner preferences as well as demographic information. These participants were all paid US$1. We deliberately oversampled single participants with the help of the Cloud Research Managed Research team, who maintain a database of demographics on the “Cloud Research Approved List” MTurk workers; Cloud Research made the study available to many more single than partnered participants because we knew that “Single at Time 1, Partnered at Time 2” (i.e., newly partnered) participants would be uncommon.

 Time 2 recruitment invites were sent out by Cloud Research 11-17 weeks after Time 1 to participants who had given “sincere and true” responses to the Time 1 survey. Participants were paid US$5 to complete the full Time 2 survey. To save funds and recruit as many newly partnered participants as possible, we implemented two cost-saving measures:

1. Once a sufficient number of participants who were partnered at Time 1 completed the Time 2 survey, we stopped inviting participants who were partnered at Time 1. In contrast, all participants who were single at Time 1 were invited to begin the Time 2 survey.
2. Once a sufficient number of participants who were single at Time 1 and single at Time 2 completed the Time 2 survey, we implemented a branching logic that sent participants who were single at Time 2 directly to the end of the survey and paid them only US$1.

This entire recruitment process took place in two separate segments: Segment 1 took place between February 2023 and June 2023, and Segment 2 took place between June 2023 and September 2023. The February to June recruitment netted only about half of the Time 2 participants that we had been hoping for, so we started the Time 1 recruitment process again in June with the goal of recruiting 1,500 total participants by September. Other than the attention check and relationship status questions, no data were analyzed on the Segment 1 participants until the full sample had been collected.

The *N* = 1,585 participants who comprised the final usable sample (*N* = 709 steadily partnered, *N* = 687 steadily single, *N* = 189 newly partnered) were *M* = 39.6 years old (*SD* = 12.4). In terms of gender, *N* = 761 (48.0%) were women, *N* = 812 (51.2%) were men, and *N* = 12 (0.8%) preferred to self-describe their gender. In terms of sexual orientation, *N* = 1,326 (83.6%) were straight/heterosexual, *N* = 157 (9.9%) were bisexual, *N* = 42 (2.6%) were gay, *N* = 36 (2.3%) were lesbian, *N =* 23 (1.5%) preferred to self-describe, and *N* = 1 (0.1%) provided no response. In terms of education, *N* = 11 (0.7%) reported “less than high school,” *N* = 172 (10.9%) “high school,” *N* = 460 (29.0%) “some college,” *N* = 682 (43.0%) “four-year degree,” *N* = 219 (13.8%) “Master’s degree,” and *N* = 41 (2.6%) “Doctorate or professional degree.”

**Figure S1 – Relationship Formation Hypothesis Recruitment Flow Chart**



*Note*: Superscript 1 = Single participants who completed Time 1 survey. Superscript 2 = Partnered participants who completed Time 1 survey. Superscript 3 = Partnered participants who were invited to complete the Time 2 survey (a random subset of participants who were partnered at Time 1 were not invited to conserve funds). Superscript 4 = All participants who actually began the Time 2 survey. Superscript 5 = All participants who were permitted to complete the entire Time 2 survey (some participants who were single at Time 2 were sent directly to the end of the survey to conserve funds). Superscript 6 = All participants who completed the Time 2 survey and passed the attention checks. Superscript 7 = Final usable sample of steadily partnered participants (i.e., partnered at Time 1 and Time 2). Superscript 8 = Final usable sample of steadily single participants (i.e., single at Time 1 and Time 2). Superscript 9 = Final usable sample of newly partnered participants (i.e., single at Time 1 and partnered in a relationship of less than 5 months in duration at Time 2). Superscript 10 = Duplicate worker ID records that were excluded (in these cases, the latest report was the one retained for inclusion). Superscript 11 = Participants who straightlined responses to the ideals or the partner attributes. Superscript 12 = Participants who were partnered at Time 1 but single at Time 2. Superscript 13 = Participants who were single at Time 1, partnered at Time 2, but their relationship at time 2 was 5 months or longer in duration. Such a relationship length is not plausible given the time that had passed between Time 1 and Time 2. Superscript 14 = (a) Participants who were partnered at Time 2 but said their partner was anything other than a “spouse or fiancé” or “boyfriend/girlfriend/committed romantic partner” AND (b) participants who were single at Time 2 but said their most desired partner was “spouse or fiancé” or “boyfriend/girlfriend/committed romantic partner.”

Table S10 – Descriptive Statistics for Stated and Revealed Preferences (Partnered)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Stated Preferences |  |  | Revealed Preferences |
| Attribute |  | *N* |  | *M* | *SD* | Rank |  |  | *β* | Rank |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attractive  |  | 5540 |  | 8.90 | 1.86 | 16 |  |  | .44\*\*\* | 3 |  |
| Intelligent |  | 5543 |  | 9.46 | 1.60 | 9 |  |  | .37\*\*\* | 14 |  |
| Humorous |  | 5541 |  | 9.42 | 1.72 | 10 |  |  | .38\*\*\* | 13 |  |
| Considerate  |  | 5540 |  | 9.63 | 1.56 | 7 |  |  | .39\*\*\* | 9 |  |
| Honest |  | 5543 |  | 10.15 | 1.32 | 2 |  |  | .38\*\*\* | 11 |  |
| Understanding  |  | 5542 |  | 9.90 | 1.43 | 4 |  |  | .39\*\*\* | 10 |  |
| Ambitious |  | 5539 |  | 8.18 | 2.34 | 24 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 23 |  |
| Sporty and Athletic |  | 5541 |  | 7.16 | 2.46 | 29 |  |  | .18\*\*\* | 29 |  |
| Fun |  | 5544 |  | 9.47 | 1.63 | 8 |  |  | .42\*\*\* | 5 |  |
| Sensitive  |  | 5537 |  | 8.25 | 2.31 | 22 |  |  | .23\*\*\* | 26 |  |
| A good lover  |  | 5539 |  | 9.38 | 1.89 | 12 |  |  | .50\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| Nice body  |  | 5542 |  | 7.99 | 2.18 | 26 |  |  | .34\*\*\* | 15 |  |
| Confident |  | 5541 |  | 8.82 | 1.84 | 17 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 21 |  |
| Sexy  |  | 5540 |  | 8.50 | 2.16 | 19 |  |  | .42\*\*\* | 6 |  |
| Financially secure  |  | 5541 |  | 8.37 | 2.20 | 20 |  |  | .24\*\*\* | 24 |  |
| Supportive  |  | 5542 |  | 9.99 | 1.47 | 3 |  |  | .46\*\*\* | 2 |  |
| Dresses well  |  | 5541 |  | 8.18 | 2.17 | 24 |  |  | .28\*\*\* | 20 |  |
| A good listener  |  | 5541 |  | 9.73 | 1.56 | 5 |  |  | .38\*\*\* | 12 |  |
| Loyal |  | 5540 |  | 10.17 | 1.46 | 1 |  |  | .43\*\*\* | 4 |  |
| Successful  |  | 5540 |  | 8.22 | 2.22 | 23 |  |  | .32\*\*\* | 17 |  |
| Adventurous  |  | 5539 |  | 7.90 | 2.35 | 27 |  |  | .21\*\*\* | 27 |  |
| Good job  |  | 5541 |  | 8.29 | 2.18 | 21 |  |  | .24\*\*\* | 25 |  |
| Religious |  | 5539 |  | 4.67 | 3.33 | 31 |  |  | .05\*\* | 31 |  |
| Patient |  | 5541 |  | 9.40 | 1.68 | 11 |  |  | .29\*\*\* | 19 |  |
| Extraverted, enthusiastic  |  | 5540 |  | 7.75 | 2.21 | 28 |  |  | .18\*\*\* | 28 |  |
| Critical, quarrelsome  |  | 5540 |  | 3.29 | 2.62 | 33 |  |  | -.14\*\*\* | 35 |  |
| Dependable, self-disciplined  |  | 5542 |  | 9.28 | 1.80 | 14 |  |  | .33\*\*\* | 16 |  |
| Anxious, easily upset  |  | 5540 |  | 3.07 | 2.28 | 34 |  |  | -.11\*\*\* | 32 |  |
| Open to new experiences, complex  |  | 5541 |  | 8.65 | 2.10 | 18 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 22 |  |
| Reserved, quiet  |  | 5538 |  | 5.41 | 2.71 | 30 |  |  | .07\*\* | 30 |  |
| Sympathetic, warm  |  | 5542 |  | 9.66 | 1.55 | 6 |  |  | .39\*\*\* | 8 |  |
| Disorganized, careless  |  | 5538 |  | 2.73 | 2.17 | 35 |  |  | -.13\*\*\* | 34 |  |
| Calm, emotionally stable  |  | 5539 |  | 9.29 | 1.72 | 13 |  |  | .30\*\*\* | 18 |  |
| Conventional, uncreative  |  | 5540 |  | 4.05 | 2.61 | 32 |  |  | -.12\*\*\* | 33 |  |
| Smells good |  | 5541 |  | 9.17 | 1.95 | 15 |  |  | .39\*\*\* | 7 |  |
| W/T average |  | 5544 |  | 9.50 | 1.27 |  |  |  | .46\*\*\* |  |  |
| V/A average |  | 5543 |  | 8.54 | 1.54 |  |  |  | .49\*\*\* |  |  |
| S/R average |  | 5544 |  | 8.27 | 1.81 |  |  |  | .34\*\*\* |  |  |
| Ext average |  | 5541 |  | 7.17 | 1.78 |  |  |  | .07\*\*\* |  |  |
| Agr average |  | 5543 |  | 9.19 | 1.58 |  |  |  | .29\*\*\* |  |  |
| Con average |  | 5542 |  | 9.28 | 1.54 |  |  |  | .25\*\*\* |  |  |
| Emo average |  | 5541 |  | 9.11 | 1.57 |  |  |  | .24\*\*\* |  |  |
| Opn average |  | 5541 |  | 8.30 | 1.76 |  |  |  | .23\*\*\* |  |  |
| Attribute |  |  *N* |  | Stated Preferences |  | Revealed Preferences |
|  |  | *M* | *SD* |  |  | *β* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Gender Diff. |  |  | Gender Diff. |
| Attractiveness Composite |  |  |  |  |  | *t* | *d* |  |  | *t* | *q* |
|  Heterosexual Men |  | 1542 |  | 8.85 | 1.61 | 11.58\*\*\* | 0.29 |  | .52\*\*\* | 1.56 | -0.02 |
|  Heterosexual Women |  | 3019 |  | 8.36 | 1.80 |  |  |  | .53\*\*\* |  |  |
| Earning Potential Composite |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Heterosexual Men |  | 1542 |  | 7.59 | 1.85 | 18.36\*\*\* | 0.61 |  | .34\*\*\* | 0.02 | -0.02 |
|  Heterosexual Women |  | 3020 |  | 8.67 | 1.66 |  |  |  | .32\*\*\* |  |  |

Note: Effect sizes *d* and *q* are coded such that positive effect sizes are in the predicted direction.

Table S11 – Descriptive Statistics for Stated and Revealed Preferences (Singles)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  | Stated Preferences |  |  | Revealed Preferences |
| Attribute |  | *N* |  | *M* | *SD* | Rank |  |  | *β* | Rank |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attractive  |  | 4144 |  | 8.78 | 1.89 | 16 |  |  | .34\*\*\* | 5 |  |
| Intelligent |  | 4146 |  | 9.31 | 1.68 | 9 |  |  | .31\*\*\* | 9 |  |
| Humorous |  | 4145 |  | 9.28 | 1.79 | 11 |  |  | .30\*\*\* | 13 |  |
| Considerate  |  | 4145 |  | 9.57 | 1.59 | 6 |  |  | .31\*\*\* | 10 |  |
| Honest |  | 4147 |  | 10.03 | 1.40 | 2 |  |  | .30\*\*\* | 14 |  |
| Understanding  |  | 4146 |  | 9.80 | 1.46 | 4 |  |  | .35\*\*\* | 4 |  |
| Ambitious |  | 4147 |  | 8.07 | 2.32 | 24 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 21 |  |
| Sporty and Athletic |  | 4147 |  | 7.11 | 2.38 | 29 |  |  | .14\*\*\* | 29 |  |
| Fun |  | 4149 |  | 9.39 | 1.67 | 8 |  |  | .30\*\*\* | 11 |  |
| Sensitive  |  | 4146 |  | 7.87 | 2.38 | 26 |  |  | .21\*\*\* | 24 |  |
| A good lover  |  | 4141 |  | 9.11 | 2.10 | 14 |  |  | .36\*\*\* | 1 |  |
| Nice body  |  | 4147 |  | 8.02 | 2.11 | 25 |  |  | .28\*\*\* | 16 |  |
| Confident |  | 4148 |  | 8.69 | 1.86 | 17 |  |  | .19\*\*\* | 27 |  |
| Sexy  |  | 4144 |  | 8.20 | 2.24 | 21 |  |  | .32\*\*\* | 8 |  |
| Financially secure  |  | 4143 |  | 8.36 | 2.17 | 19 |  |  | .19\*\*\* | 26 |  |
| Supportive  |  | 4145 |  | 9.88 | 1.53 | 3 |  |  | .36\*\*\* | 2 |  |
| Dresses well  |  | 4146 |  | 8.16 | 2.19 | 23 |  |  | .26\*\*\* | 18 |  |
| A good listener  |  | 4146 |  | 9.68 | 1.60 | 5 |  |  | .33\*\*\* | 7 |  |
| Loyal |  | 4147 |  | 10.08 | 1.53 | 1 |  |  | .30\*\*\* | 12 |  |
| Successful  |  | 4146 |  | 8.17 | 2.21 | 22 |  |  | .27\*\*\* | 17 |  |
| Adventurous  |  | 4142 |  | 7.87 | 2.36 | 26 |  |  | .19\*\*\* | 25 |  |
| Good job  |  | 4145 |  | 8.27 | 2.15 | 20 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 19 |  |
| Religious |  | 4143 |  | 4.91 | 3.32 | 31 |  |  | .07\*\*\* | 30 |  |
| Patient |  | 4145 |  | 9.30 | 1.68 | 10 |  |  | .25\*\*\* | 20 |  |
| Extraverted, enthusiastic  |  | 4144 |  | 7.58 | 2.15 | 28 |  |  | .14\*\*\* | 28 |  |
| Critical, quarrelsome  |  | 4141 |  | 3.52 | 2.63 | 33 |  |  | -.03 | 33 |  |
| Dependable, self-disciplined  |  | 4147 |  | 9.23 | 1.79 | 13 |  |  | .28\*\*\* | 15 |  |
| Anxious, easily upset  |  | 4143 |  | 3.07 | 2.09 | 34 |  |  | -.01 | 32 |  |
| Open to new experiences, complex  |  | 4147 |  | 8.64 | 2.07 | 18 |  |  | .24\*\*\* | 22 |  |
| Reserved, quiet  |  | 4142 |  | 5.61 | 2.56 | 30 |  |  | .07\*\* | 31 |  |
| Sympathetic, warm  |  | 4145 |  | 9.57 | 1.59 | 6 |  |  | .33\*\*\* | 6 |  |
| Disorganized, careless  |  | 4144 |  | 2.82 | 2.09 | 35 |  |  | -.08\*\*\* | 34 |  |
| Calm, emotionally stable  |  | 4146 |  | 9.24 | 1.76 | 12 |  |  | .22\*\*\* | 23 |  |
| Conventional, uncreative  |  | 4145 |  | 3.88 | 2.40 | 32 |  |  | -.08\*\*\* | 35 |  |
| Smells good |  | 4147 |  | 8.99 | 2.02 | 15 |  |  | .35\*\*\* | 3 |  |
| W/T average |  | 4152 |  | 9.36 | 1.29 |  |  |  | .39\*\*\* |  |  |
| V/A average |  | 4149 |  | 8.40 | 1.58 |  |  |  | .40\*\*\* |  |  |
| S/R average |  | 4150 |  | 8.24 | 1.80 |  |  |  | .31\*\*\* |  |  |
| Ext average |  | 4144 |  | 6.98 | 1.78 |  |  |  | .05\*\* |  |  |
| Agr average |  | 4146 |  | 9.02 | 1.61 |  |  |  | .21\*\*\* |  |  |
| Con average |  | 4147 |  | 9.20 | 1.54 |  |  |  | .22\*\*\* |  |  |
| Emo average |  | 4147 |  | 9.09 | 1.50 |  |  |  | .14\*\*\* |  |  |
| Opn average |  | 4150 |  | 8.38 | 1.70 |  |  |  | .20\*\*\* |  |  |
| Attribute |  |  *N* |  | Stated Preferences |  | Revealed Preferences |
|  |  | *M* | *SD* |  |  | *β* |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | Gender Diff. |  |  | Gender Diff. |
| Attractiveness Composite |  |  |  |  |  | *t* | *d* |  |  | *t* | *q* |
|  Heterosexual Men |  | 1153 |  | 8.58 | 1.79 | 6.39\*\*\* | 0.15 |  | .33\*\*\* | 1.64 | -0.06 |
|  Heterosexual Women |  | 2092 |  | 8.31 | 1.80 |  |  |  | .38\*\*\* |  |  |
| Earning Potential Composite |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Heterosexual Men |  | 1153 |  | 7.31 | 1.85 | 20.17\*\*\* | 0.87 |  | .26\*\*\* | 1.94 | 0.07 |
|  Heterosexual Women |  | 2093 |  | 8.81 | 1.57 |  |  |  | .32\*\*\* |  |  |

Note: Effect sizes *d* and *q* are coded such that positive effect sizes are in the predicted direction.

Table S12 – Descriptive Statistics for Stated and Revealed Preferences for Men and Women Separately

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  | Stated Preferences |  | Revealed Preferences |
|  |  | Men | Women |  | Men | Women |
| Attribute |  | *M* | *SD* | Rank | *M* | *SD* | Rank |  | *β* | Rank | *β* | Rank |
|  |  |  |
| Attractive  |  | 9.00 | 1.78 | 9 | 8.85 | 1.90 | 18 |  | .43\*\*\* | 7 | .43\*\*\* | 8 |
| Intelligent |  | 8.97 | 1.78 | 11 | 9.61 | 1.52 | 10 |  | .41\*\*\* | 10 | .38\*\*\* | 11 |
| Humorous |  | 8.83 | 1.89 | 13 | 9.56 | 1.67 | 11 |  | .37\*\*\* | 15 | .36\*\*\* | 15 |
| Considerate  |  | 9.16 | 1.70 | 6 | 9.82 | 1.46 | 6 |  | .41\*\*\* | 9 | .40\*\*\* | 10 |
| Honest |  | 9.75 | 1.54 | 1 | 10.25 | 1.24 | 2 |  | .46\*\*\* | 4 | .44\*\*\* | 6 |
| Understanding  |  | 9.35 | 1.64 | 3 | 10.06 | 1.30 | 4 |  | .40\*\*\* | 11 | .43\*\*\* | 7 |
| Ambitious |  | 7.50 | 2.46 | 25 | 8.46 | 2.23 | 22 |  | .22\*\*\* | 22 | .23\*\*\* | 24 |
| Sporty and Athletic |  | 7.16 | 2.29 | 29 | 7.38 | 2.44 | 29 |  | .07\*\* | 32 | .13\*\*\* | 28 |
| Fun |  | 9.03 | 1.75 | 8 | 9.63 | 1.57 | 8 |  | .39\*\*\* | 12 | .38\*\*\* | 12 |
| Sensitive  |  | 7.90 | 2.25 | 22 | 8.18 | 2.41 | 25 |  | .37\*\*\* | 14 | .26\*\*\* | 20 |
| A good lover  |  | 8.99 | 2.02 | 10 | 9.41 | 1.92 | 14 |  | .51\*\*\* | 2 | .57\*\*\* | 1 |
| Nice body  |  | 8.52 | 1.96 | 18 | 7.88 | 2.18 | 28 |  | .38\*\*\* | 13 | .31\*\*\* | 17 |
| Confident |  | 8.38 | 1.98 | 19 | 9.01 | 1.78 | 16 |  | .18\*\*\* | 27 | .19\*\*\* | 26 |
| Sexy  |  | 8.67 | 2.03 | 17 | 8.33 | 2.25 | 23 |  | .43\*\*\* | 6 | .45\*\*\* | 5 |
| Financially secure  |  | 7.50 | 2.25 | 25 | 8.92 | 1.98 | 17 |  | .20\*\*\* | 24 | .21\*\*\* | 25 |
| Supportive  |  | 9.34 | 1.81 | 4 | 10.19 | 1.28 | 3 |  | .46\*\*\* | 3 | .50\*\*\* | 3 |
| Dresses well  |  | 8.09 | 2.15 | 21 | 8.32 | 2.15 | 24 |  | .33\*\*\* | 19 | .23\*\*\* | 22 |
| A good listener  |  | 9.08 | 1.79 | 7 | 9.95 | 1.43 | 5 |  | .36\*\*\* | 16 | .36\*\*\* | 13 |
| Loyal |  | 9.70 | 1.77 | 2 | 10.32 | 1.32 | 1 |  | .52\*\*\* | 1 | .52\*\*\* | 2 |
| Successful  |  | 7.53 | 2.28 | 24 | 8.68 | 2.06 | 21 |  | .35\*\*\* | 17 | .26\*\*\* | 19 |
| Adventurous  |  | 7.55 | 2.37 | 23 | 8.04 | 2.36 | 26 |  | .18\*\*\* | 26 | .15\*\*\* | 27 |
| Good job  |  | 7.49 | 2.22 | 27 | 8.85 | 1.95 | 18 |  | .24\*\*\* | 20 | .24\*\*\* | 21 |
| Religious |  | 4.99 | 3.18 | 31 | 5.16 | 3.42 | 30 |  | .09\*\*\* | 30 | .03 | 31 |
| Patient |  | 8.82 | 1.81 | 14 | 9.62 | 1.57 | 9 |  | .20\*\*\* | 23 | .32\*\*\* | 16 |
| Extraverted, enthusiastic  |  | 7.46 | 2.19 | 28 | 7.89 | 2.16 | 27 |  | .17\*\*\* | 28 | .12\*\*\* | 29 |
| Critical, quarrelsome  |  | 3.67 | 2.71 | 33 | 3.23 | 2.60 | 33 |  | -.02 | 33 | -.07\*\*\* | 35 |
| Dependable, self-disciplined  |  | 8.78 | 1.92 | 15 | 9.55 | 1.67 | 12 |  | .35\*\*\* | 18 | .36\*\*\* | 14 |
| Anxious, easily upset  |  | 3.64 | 2.45 | 34 | 2.73 | 2.06 | 34 |  | .08\*\* | 31 | -.01 | 32 |
| Open to new experiences, complex  |  | 8.11 | 2.24 | 20 | 8.82 | 2.03 | 20 |  | .24\*\*\* | 21 | .23\*\*\* | 23 |
| Reserved, quiet  |  | 6.14 | 2.53 | 30 | 5.15 | 2.70 | 31 |  | .09\*\*\* | 29 | .05\* | 30 |
| Sympathetic, warm  |  | 9.26 | 1.68 | 5 | 9.78 | 1.49 | 7 |  | .42\*\*\* | 8 | .40\*\*\* | 9 |
| Disorganized, careless  |  | 3.24 | 2.31 | 35 | 2.47 | 2.01 | 35 |  | -.09\*\*\* | 34 | -.04\*\* | 33 |
| Calm, emotionally stable  |  | 8.90 | 1.82 | 12 | 9.54 | 1.62 | 13 |  | .19\*\*\* | 25 | .31\*\*\* | 18 |
| Conventional, uncreative  |  | 4.56 | 2.58 | 32 | 3.89 | 2.52 | 32 |  | -.09\*\*\* | 35 | -.06\*\*\* | 34 |
| Smells good |  | 8.72 | 2.04 | 16 | 9.29 | 1.93 | 15 |  | .45\*\*\* | 5 | .46\*\*\* | 4 |
| W/T average |  | 8.96 | 1.42 |  | 9.64 | 1.18 |  |  | .51\*\*\* |  | .49\*\*\* |  |
| V/A average |  | 8.55 | 1.55 |  | 8.50 | 1.56 |  |  | .51\*\*\* |  | .51\*\*\* |  |
| S/R average |  | 7.65 | 1.83 |  | 8.69 | 1.67 |  |  | .35\*\*\* |  | .30\*\*\* |  |
| Ext average |  | 6.66 | 1.63 |  | 7.37 | 1.81 |  |  | .06\*\* |  | .05\*\* |  |
| Agr average |  | 8.79 | 1.67 |  | 9.27 | 1.55 |  |  | .23\*\*\* |  | .26\*\*\* |  |
| Con average |  | 8.77 | 1.64 |  | 9.54 | 1.44 |  |  | .24\*\*\* |  | .23\*\*\* |  |
| Emo average |  | 8.63 | 1.66 |  | 9.40 | 1.42 |  |  | .06\* |  | .19\*\*\* |  |
| Opn average |  | 7.78 | 1.78 |  | 8.46 | 1.70 |  |  | .20\*\*\* |  | .18\*\*\* |  |

1. We could have selected item #7 instead of item #6 as the sixth item, as that they exhibited identical correlations with relationship satisfaction. We opted to go with the latter given that it comes from the established *attachment features and functions scale* (Tancredy & Fraley, 2006). Given that two of the other selected items also come from this scale (i.e., items #3 and #4), in principle, an interested scholar could look at those three items (i.e., items 3, 4, and 6) as a separate subscale from the other three more romantic evaluative items (i.e., items, 1, 2, and 5). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. In addition, exploratory factor analyses (principle axis factoring) on all conceivable combinations of these 15 items consistently return a one-factor solution. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. Note, also, that this relatively modest amount of heterogeneity across samples is highly consistent with the results of Klein et al. (2018; i.e., “Many Labs 2”). These scholars found that, when implementing the identical study design across different sites (as we do here), heterogeneity in effect sizes tended to be quite small. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)