# **Supplemental Materials**

Negligible Evidence that People Desire Partners Who Uniquely Fit their Ideals

# **Table of Contents**

Study 1 additional analyses:	
Summary of results across models tested for primary analyses	p. S3
Ideal attribute-by-ideal attribute	p. S5
Including dyads who reported knowing each other	p. S7
Study 2 additional analyses:	
Summary of results across models tested for primary analyses	p. S8
Romantic partners (traits) robustness check	p. S9
Example SEM syntax and output	p. S10
Example Bayes Factor calculations	p. S11
Other- vs. self-generated attribute difference score analyses	p. S13
Study S1	p. S18
Study S2	p. S32
Appendix SA: Frequencies of Ideals for Study S1 and S2	p. S45
Synonym-level exclusion approach	p. S48
Fletcher three-factor exclusion approach	p. S54
Results using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes)	p. S60
Duplicate behaviors	p. S71

### Study 1: Summary of results across models tested for primary analyses

In Study 1, we tested different multilevel models using the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015) in the R environment (R Core Team, 2018). These included a cross-classified random intercepts, fixed slopes model that nested participants (level 1) within both a blind-date dyad (level 2) and a yoked-pair dyad (also level 2), and a simpler random intercept, fixed slopes model with participants (level 1) nested within a yoked-pair dyad (level 2). Given that the variance of our random effects were very small and even zero in some cases (especially for blind-date dyad), we also tested a simple linear regression model. The linear regression model provided the best fit to our data in this study (in terms of lowest BIC values; see bolded values in Table S1), and thus we present results from this model in our analyses in the main text. We provide a link to an R markdown document with R code and results from all models tested, see "JESP Models Tested Studies 1 and 2.html": https://osf.io/7fq9n/?view\_only=336e96f6730b480182be7afe49383d31 Below we present a summary of results; hypothesis tests reveal identical conclusions regardless of model chosen.

### Table S1

Model Specification	Self- generated- attribute/ romantic interest association	Self BIC values	Other- generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Other BIC values	Self-generated- attribute/ Other- generated-attribute association	Sample Size	Lee & Preacher z-score
Cross-classified	.46	350.0	.36	349.3	.42	125	1.16
Random intercept	.46	336.1	.36	344.5	.42	125	1.16
Linear regression	.46	324.7	.36	333.2	.42	125	1.16

### Summary of Results across Models

*Note.* The key associations, Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values, and Lee and Preacher (2013) *z*-scores across model specifications. BIC values are lowest for the linear regression model specification (see bolded values), and thus we present results from those models in our primary analyses. Self-generated-attribute/romantic interest association refers to the association

between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-generatedattribute/romantic interest association refers to the association between other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and othergenerated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test. All Lee and Preacher tests are non-significant, p's = .245, and thus hypothesis tests reveal identical conclusions across model specifications.

### Study 1: Ideal attribute-by-ideal attribute

Given that the reliability of the self-generated ideal attribute ratings ( $\alpha = .60$  with the attribute-category exclusion approach;  $\alpha = .63$  with all data) and other-generated attributes ( $\alpha =$ .42 with the attribute-category exclusion approach;  $\alpha = .49$  with all data) was somewhat low in Study 1, we re-ran the primary analyses separately on the first, second, and third attributes listed (rather than averaging them together). Consistent with the results from the primary analyses using the attribute-category exclusion data, we found that the first self-generated ideal attribute rating positively predicted romantic interest,  $\beta = .20$ , SE = .07, p = .007, as did the first othergenerated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .23$ , SE = .07, p = .001. Similarly, the second self-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .27$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the second other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .27$ , SE = .08, p = .001, both positively predicted romantic interest. Finally, the third self-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .27$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the third other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .17$ , SE = .07, p = .014, also positively predicted romantic interest. However, and of primary theoretical interest, the analyses using the Lee and Preacher (2013) test, again, did not reveal a significant difference in the association between the first pair (z =0.26, p = .795), second pair (z = 0.07, p = .943), or third pair (z = 0.91, p = .361) of selfgenerated and other-generated ideal attributes.

Using all the data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes), the first self-generated ideal attribute rating positively predicted romantic interest,  $\beta = .25$ , SE = .06, p < .001, as did the first other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .23$ , SE = .06, p < .001. Similarly, the second self-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .28$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the second other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .28$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the second other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .28$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the second other-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .35$ , SE = .07, p < .001, both positively predicted romantic interest. Finally, the third self-generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .31$ , SE = .06, p < .001, and the third other-

generated ideal attribute rating,  $\beta = .25$ , SE = .06, p < .001, also positively predicted romantic interest. However, the analyses using the Lee and Preacher (2013) test, again, did not reveal a significant difference in the association between the first pair (z = 0.21, p = .835), second pair (z = 0.68, p = .495), or third pair (z = 0.62, p = .536) of self-generated and other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Thus, looking ideal attribute-by-ideal attribute, our results remain consistent with our primary analyses: Participants expressed more romantic interest in their blind date partners to the extent that they perceived those partners to possess positive attributes; however, this association appeared to be nearly as strong for other attributes that a different participant nominated as ideal.

### Study 1: Including dyads who reported knowing each other

As mentioned in Study 1, three blind date dyads reported knowing each other before going on a blind date and were therefore excluded from the primary analyses in the main text. We used the same linear regression models and re-ran our primary analyses after including these three dyads. We standardized all variables, and then we predicted participants' romantic interest in their blind date partner from the extent to which their self-generated and other-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their blind date partner in two separate models. Unsurprisingly, both self-generated ideal attribute ratings,  $\beta = .47$ , SE = .07, p < .001, and othergenerated ideal attribute ratings,  $\beta = .35$ , SE = .08, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. However, these two associations ( $\beta = .47$  and  $\beta = .35$ ) were close in magnitude, and the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed that they did not significantly differ from each other, z =1.42, p = .156. Thus, consistent with our primary analyses, these additional results provide little evidence for the unique role of ideal partner preference-matching in predicting romantic interest.

### Study 2: Summary of results across models tested for primary analyses

In Study 2, we tested different multilevel models using the lme4 package (Bates et al., 2015) in the R environment (R Core Team, 2018). These included a three-level random intercepts, fixed slopes model that nested targets (level 1) within participant (level 2) within yoked-pair dyad (level 3), and a simpler two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) that ignored the yoked dyad. Given that the variances of the random effects were often small, we also tested a simple linear regression model. The two-level model nesting targets within participants provided the best fit to our data (in terms of lowest BIC values, see bolded values in Table S2) in this study, and thus we present results from this model in our primary trait and behavior analyses. We provide a link to an R markdown document with R code and results from all models tested, see "JESP Models Tested Studies 1 and 2.html": https://osf.io/7fq9n/?view\_only=336e96f6730b480182be7afe49383d31 Below we present a summary of results for traits and behaviors; hypothesis tests reveal identical conclusions regardless of model chosen.

## Table S2

Model Specification	Self- generated- attribute/ romantic interest association	Self BIC values	Other- generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Other BIC values	Self-generated- attribute/ Other- generated-attribute association	Sample Size	Lee & Preacher z-score
Three-level (traits)	.39	7986.2	.38	7994.2	.61	595	0.30
Two-level (traits)	.39	7978.3	.38	7987.0	.61	595	0.30
Linear regression (traits)	.36	7988.4	.36	7989.2	.62	591	0.12
Three-level (behaviors)	.38	7967.6	.38	7978.2	.62	595	0.12
Two-level (behaviors)	.38	7959.6	.38	7973.7	.62	595	0.18
Linear regression (behaviors)	.37	7959.6	.36	7974.1	.59	590	0.77

Summary of Results across Models

### IDEAL PARTNER PREFERENCE-MATCHING

*Note.* The key associations, Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values, and Lee and Preacher (2013) *z*-scores across model specifications. For both traits and behaviors, BIC values are lowest for the two-level model specification (see bolded values), and thus we present results from those models in our primary analyses. Self-generated-attribute/romantic interest association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Othergenerated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated-attribute self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test. All Lee and Preacher tests are non-significant, p's > .758, and thus hypothesis tests reveal identical conclusions across model specifications for both traits and behaviors.

### **Study 2: Romantic Partners (Traits) Robustness Check**

In Study 2, one significant result emerged: When partnered participants rated their "spouses or fiancés" or "boyfriends/girlfriends," self-generated ideal trait ratings predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings ( $\beta = .53$  vs.  $\beta = .45$ , p =.018. As a robustness check of this significant result (which only emerged in this one subsample, and only for traits, not behaviors), we re-ran our analyses after adding "casual romantic/sexual partners" to the definition of romantic partners. Although both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta$ = .54, SE = .03, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .51$ , SE = .03, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest, the Lee & Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between these two associations, z = 1.16, p = .245. Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained and constrained models fit the data equally well,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.14$ , p = .285. The Bayes factor for traits was 12.0 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.92), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Thus, this significant result was not robust to alternative ways of categorizing targets as "romantic partners."

### **Study 2: Example SEM syntax and output**

We used R's lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) to conduct our structural equation modeling analyses. This involved fitting an unconstrained model in which self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings simultaneously predicted romantic interest, and then fitting a constrained version of the model that forced the self-generated ideal attribute rating to be equal to the other-generated ideal attribute rating (see details on p. 31-32 of the main text). For readers interested in additional detail on the structural equation modeling used in the paper, we include example SEM syntax and output from Study 2's primary analysis (traits) at the following link, see "Example SEM Syntax and Output.html":

<u>https://osf.io/7fq9n/?view\_only=336e96f6730b480182be7afe49383d31</u>. We have also uploaded example R Markdown syntax and html output for the primary analyses reported in the main text, see folder titled "R Markdowns for primary analyses in main text":

https://osf.io/7fq9n/?view\_only=336e96f6730b480182be7afe49383d31, and uploaded the Study 2 data used to run the primary models:

https://osf.io/k28vb/?view\_only=21cec00531ef4a19a56d2f26eae9b61a. All syntax is available upon request.

### **Study 2: Example Bayes Factor calculations**

Following Wagenmakers (2007), we computed Bayes Factors that compared Bayesian Information Criterion (BIC) values from the unconstrained and constrained structural equation models for each of our analyses. Using R's lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) we first fit an unconstrained model in which self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings simultaneously predicted romantic interest. We then fit a constrained version of the model that forced the self-generated ideal attribute rating to be equal to the other-generated ideal attribute rating (see details on p. 31-32 of the main text). If self-generated ideal attribute ratings predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal attribute ratings (our key hypothesis), then the unconstrained model should provide a better fit to our data than the constrained model. However, our results indicated that the unconstrained and constrained models tended to fit the data equally well across all our analyses: Out of the 88 times both the constrained and unconstrained models converged across our primary attribute-category exclusion analyses, our synonym-level exclusion analyses, our Fletcher three-factor exclusion analyses, and analyses using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes), 18.2% of the time we found "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis, 78.4% of the time we found "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis, and 1.1% of the time we found "weak" evidence for the null hypothesis, and 2.3% of the time we found no evidence for the null hypothesis (see summary of Bayes Factors in Figures 1, S1, S2, S3, S4, and S5). In other words, we have "strong" or "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis in 96.6% of our analyses.

All Bayes Factors were computed using the formula presented below, where we simply plugged in BIC values from each model output. As an example, below we walk through the calculations for Study 2's primary analysis (traits). In this analysis, the unconstrained model  $(H_1)$  produced a BIC of 87250.19 and the constrained model  $(H_0)$  produced a BIC of 87242.84.

Following Wagenmakers (2007)'s equation (10),

$$BF \approx exp\left(\frac{BIC(H_1) - BIC(H_0)}{2}\right)$$
$$\approx exp((87250.19 - 87242.84)/2)$$
$$\approx exp(7.34/2)$$
$$BF \approx 39.4$$

the Bayes factor (BF) in favor of the null hypothesis was 39.4.

With equal priors on the unconstrained and constrained models, this would amount to a posterior probability of the null hypothesis of .98. According to Table 3 in Wagenmakers (2007), this constitutes "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis.

### **Other- vs. Self-Generated Attribute Difference Score Analyses**

Our studies use a common methodological convention in the ideal partner preferencematching literature whereby participants *themselves* rate partners on various attributes. This methodological choice follows naturally from the ideal standards model and associated evolutionary perspectives, which suggest that people perceive an attribute in a partner and then compare that attribute against an ideal. That is, the participant's subjective perception of the partner's attributes is part of the psychological process that should lead to preference-matching effects (Eastwick, Neff, Luchies, Finkel, & Hunt, 2014). Indeed, the majority of studies that purported to find evidence for ideal partner-preference matching have used this approach (e.g., Conroy-Beam & Buss, 2016; Conroy-Beam et al., 2016; Eastwick et al., 2011; Eastwick & Neff, 2012, Fletcher et al., 1999, 2000; Gerlach et al., 2019; Lam et al., 2016; Valentine et al., 2019).

However, participants who view a partner as possessing some positive traits typically perceive that the partner possesses many other positive traits, as evidenced by the strong correlations between the self-generated ideal attribute ratings and the other-generated ideal attribute ratings in our studies (see Table 4). Therefore, it is possible that participants do not exhibit enough idiosyncratic variability using this common approach (after accounting for normative desirability) to predict outcomes like romantic interest.

Nevertheless, there is surely variability in the extent to which participants perceived that a given partner possessed *more* of his/her self-generated ideal attributes than the other-generated ideal attributes. Furthermore, the ideal partner preference-matching hypothesis suggests that, if self- and other-generated attributes are not equal, participants should express more romantic interest in partners who possess the self-generated rather than the other-generated attributes (i.e., a predominance effect). To test this idea, we conducted piecewise linear regressions (Edwards, 1994; Griffin, Murray, & Gonzalez, 1999) that treat the self-generated ideal attribute rating and the other-generated ideal attribute rating as a difference score. In this analysis, we conducted separate regressions on the "negative" (i.e., the partner has more other- than self-generated attributes) and the "positive" (i.e., the partner has more self- than other-generated attributes) side of the zero point (i.e., the "point of equality" where self- and other-generated attributes are rated equally highly).

Results for Studies 1 and 2 (primary attribute-category exclusion strategy) are depicted below. Blue data points (left side of x axis) reflect cases where the participant rated the partner higher on other- than self-generated ideal attributes, and red data points (right side of x axis) reflect cases where the participant rated the partner higher on self- than other-generated ideal attributes. The y-axis is the romantic interest dependent measure (*z* scored), and colored bars (and +/- 1 *SE* error bars) reflect predicted values derived from the regressions. The two datasets revealed similar conclusions, although the larger *N* of Study 2 means that we can extrapolate out further on the x axis.



Study 1:

Other- vs. Self-Generated Attribute Difference score (in SDs)



Study 2:



Generally speaking, the blue datapoints are higher than the red datapoints within approximately 0.5 SDs from the point of equality. In other words, if a partner is going to have *a bit* more of one set of attributes, it is better for the partner to possess the other- than the selfgenerated attributes. This pattern is the opposite of the pattern predicted by the ideal partnerpreference matching hypothesis.

However, the red datapoints are higher than the blue datapoints beyond approximately 2.0 SDs from the point of equality. In other words, if a partner is going to have *a lot* more of one set of attributes, it is better for the partner to possess the self- than the other-generated attributes. This pattern is consistent with the pattern predicted by the ideal partner-preference matching hypothesis.

Overall, this analysis hints at the possibility that the relative level of self- versus othergenerated attributes might moderate the extent to which participants are likely to be romantically interested in partners. That is, the null effect we observed in the primary studies may conceal a pattern such that people are romantically interested in partners who match their own ideal partner under some circumstances and are interested in partners who match someone else's ideal partner under other circumstances. Nevertheless, we caution against overinterpreting this pattern until it is independently replicated, as the conclusions that apply at 2 *SD* and beyond (relative to the conclusions that apply within .5 *SD*s) are based on relatively few data points.

#### Study S1

Study S1 was the first study to apply our yoking method to a different paradigm in which participants reported on targets of their preferred sex they had previously met (including current romantic partners). As described in Study 2 in the main text, this paradigm allowed us to examine whether the predictive validity of ideal partner preference-matching varies depending on the nature of the relationship between the target and the participant (i.e., acquaintance/friend vs. current romantic partner). Second, it explicitly separated ideals for *traits* from ideals for *behaviors*. Thus, Study S1 tested whether matching on ideal behaviors (vs. ideal traits) might have divergent predictive power.

Participants in Study S1 were instructed to report both their top three most important *traits* and their top three most important *behavioral tendencies* characterizing an ideal romantic partner. They then reported on the extent to which five targets (i.e., individuals of their romantically preferred sex whom they knew personally) exhibited a set of self-generated and other-generated ideal traits and behavioral tendencies. Finally, they reported on their romantic interest in each target and their relationship with each target.

## Method

**Participants.** Participants were 172 undergraduates from a university in Texas who were recruited to participate in Part 1 of Study S1. Of the 172 participants, 24 did not complete Part 2, leaving a final sample of N = 148 participants (127 women, 21 men). Participants received course credit in one of three courses (i.e., two small summer courses and one large fall course) for completing the study. Our goal was to collect as many participants as possible by the end of the fall semester. In Study S1, participants were 20.4 years old on average (SD = 2.37 years). Approximately 33.8% of participants reported that they were Caucasian, 8.8% were African

American, 23.0% were Asian American/Pacific Islander, 27.0% were Hispanic, 7.4% were Multiracial (participants were able to select all races that applied). When Part 1 of the study was conducted, approximately 39.2% of participants reported being in a committed romantic relationship, 58.8% of participants reported being single, and 2.0% chose not to disclose their relationship status. This relationship status variable was used to determine who is committed versus single for our relationship status analyses.

**Procedure and Materials.** Study S1 consisted of two online questionnaires (i.e., Part 1 and Part 2).

*Part 1.* Participants began by listing their top three ideal partner traits and behaviors following the same instructions as in Study 2. Participants then provided race/ethnicity, age, and relationship status information.

Prior to Part 2, pairs of participants were yoked to one another. The yoking was run in four batches: Once for each of two small summer classes, once in the middle of the fall semester for the large class, and once near the end of the semester for the large class. The 172 participants who completed Part 1 were organized into 86 yoked pairs, and all except for two were same-sex pairs. We yoked individuals who generated inappropriate behavior examples (as coded by the third author; e.g., "be funny", which is really just the trait "funny") to each other wherever possible to maximize the number of usable pairs in the main analyses. Otherwise, the yoked pairs within each batch were determined randomly.

### Part 2.

*Target nominations*. In Part 2, participants were asked to provide the first and last initial of five individuals whom they know personally. As in Study 2, they were instructed to choose individuals of their romantically preferred sex, not related to them, around the same age as them,

and whom they had met in person. Participants who were in a romantic relationship were instructed to list their current romantic partner as one of the five individuals. Of the 740 total targets, 1.1% were spouses or fiancés, 8.6% were boyfriends/girlfriends, 7.7% were casual romantic/sexual partners, 68.1% were friends, 5.1% were colleagues or co-workers, 7.6% were acquaintances, 1.6% were strangers or people whom the participant had just met. As in Study 2, partners were coded as "romantic partners" if the participant selected the "spouses or fiancés" or "boyfriends/girlfriends" categories; otherwise, the partner was coded as "not a relationship partner."

Rating target traits and behaviors. Participants indicated the extent to which each selfgenerated and other-generated ideal trait and behavior described each nominated target using the same scales as in Study 2. Participants' ratings were then averaged to create composite scores that represented the extent to which their self-generated ideal traits ( $\alpha = .71$ ), self-generated ideal behaviors ( $\alpha = .82$ ), other-generated ideal traits ( $\alpha = .77$ ) and other-generated ideal behaviors ( $\alpha = .76$ ) described each target.

*Rating romantic interest.* To assess participants' overall romantic interest in each of their five nominated targets, participants rated them on the same set of six separate statements as described in Study 2 ( $\alpha = .94$ ).

**Exclusions.** Of the 148 participants who completed Part 2, 37 did not follow instructions for what qualified as an ideal trait or behavior or were yoked to someone who did not follow instructions, and one participant's full set of ideal trait ratings were dropped due to attribute-category exclusions. Thus, we exclude 38 participants for the primary trait analyses, leaving a total of N = 110 participants for the primary trait analyses, and we exclude 37 participants for the primary behavior analyses, leaving a total of N = 111 for the primary behavior analyses. Our

primary trait analyses reflect the same attribute-category exclusion approach described the main text; see Table S3 for exclusion rates. Results for the synonym-level, factor-level, and noexclusion approaches are included in the Supplemental Materials. All hypothesis tests revealed identical conclusions using all four approaches except for one: The nonsignificant finding that emerged in the primary trait analyses for romantic partners (i.e., p = .087; see below) drops below p < .05 such that other-generated trait rating predict romantic interest more strongly than self-generated trait ratings using the synonym-level and factor-level approaches (see Supplemental Materials).

For our behavior analyses, ideal behavior ratings were excluded only if behavioral ideals were worded identically (rare) or matched another behavior from the same behavior category (e.g., "housework/cleaning," "spending time together;" see details of duplicate behavior categories in Supplemental Materials). This procedure allowed us to eliminate any self-generated and other-generated ideal behavior ratings that came from the same category when creating the self-generated and other-generated ideal behavior averages for each participant; In Study S1, 3.3% of ideal behavior ratings were eliminated using this procedure, but no participants were dropped completely. Results for ideal behaviors using a no-exclusion approach are included in the Supplementary Materials; all hypothesis tests revealed identical conclusions (see Figure S5 in Supplemental Materials).

# IDEAL PARTNER PREFERENCE-MATCHING

# Table S3

# Summary of Attribute Exclusion Approaches: Studies S1 and S2

Exclusion		E. J. San J.	D. I. Lucid		Exclusion rates			Method of	Origin of	Support for predictive validity	
scheme	Exclusion rule Kule b	Rule breadth	Ideals	Participants	Attributes per participant	Kationale	combining traits	rationale	$egin{array}{c} eta_{ m dif} \ M \end{array}$	$\beta_{dif}$ range	
1	Attribute-level (primary analyses)	2 ideals match one of 95 attribute- categories	Narrow	Study S1: 12.4% Study S2: 9.2%	Study S1: 0.9% Study S2: 1.8%	Study S1: 5.24 Study S2: 5.31	Adopts the high fidelity of traits as defined in Fletcher et al. (1999, Tables 1 and 2)	Trained coder, $\kappa = .91$	Requested in round 1 reviews	.01	1415
2	Synonym-level (supplementary materials)	2 ideals match 1 of 10 "groups" or leftover 53 attribute-categories	Intermediate	Study S1: 28.0% Study S2: 17.0%	Study S1: 3.6% Study S2: 4.5%	Study S1: 4.31 Study S2: 4.86	Adopts an intermediate level of precision by combining across top synonyms only	Top synonyms of the 95 attributes at thesaurus.com	Requested in round 2 reviews	03	2306
3	Factor-level (supplementary materials)	2 ideals match 1 of 3 factors or leftover 40 attribute- categories	Broad	Study S1: 61.9% Study S2: 42.4%	Study S1: 32.4% Study S2: 24.3%	Study S1: 2.28 Study S2: 3.37	Adopts the broad bandwidth implied by participants' typical ratings of ideals and attributes	Factor analysis of ideals reported in Fletcher et al. (1999)	Original analysis (a priori) in initial submission	07	4104

*Note*. Summary of the three different approaches to determining which, if any, of the six attribute ratings (three for self-generated, three for other-generated) should be excluded for a given participant. Each approach relies on the coding procedure described in the main text, but differs in the extent to which they determine exclusions precisely (attribute-level) versus broadly (factor-level).

### Results

*Primary analyses.* The primary trait analyses for Study S1 were conducted on N = 110 participants (reporting on 550 targets) and the primary behavior analyses were conducted on N = 111 participants (reporting on 549 targets). For our primary analyses, we present results from the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model used in Study 2 with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) that ignored the yoked dyad. As in previous studies, we standardized all variables, and then ran two separate models, (a) a self-generated model that predicted participants' romantic interest in their target from the extent to which their self-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their target from the extent to which their other-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their target from the extent to which their other-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their target.

*Traits.* Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .42$ , t(459.4) = 10.16, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .44$ , t(417.3) = 10.58, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest (see Table S4 for descriptive statistics of all variables used in models). Using Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility, there was no significant difference between the strength of the self- and other-generated ideal trait ratings; z = 0.28, p = .783 (see Figure S1).

#### Table S4

Descriptive statistics of primary variables: Study S1

Variable	Mean	SD
Romantic interest (dependent variable)	4.47	2.91
Self-generated ideal trait ratings (independent variable for self-generated trait model)	7.75	2.21
Other-generated ideal trait ratings (independent variable for other-generated trait model)	7.47	2.24
Self-generated ideal behavior ratings (independent variable for self-generated behavior model)	7.07	2.56
Other-generated ideal behavior ratings (independent variable for other-generated behavior model)	6.80	2.41

*Note.* Means and standard deviations from the unstandardized variables used in the self-generated multilevel model and the other-generated multilevel model. All variables were measured on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 11 (*strongly agree*).

# Table S5

Summary of Associations using the Primary, Attribute-Category Exclusion Approach: Study S1

Analysis	Self-generated- attribute/ romantic interest association	Other-generated- attribute/ romantic interest association	Self-generated- attribute/ Other- generated-attribute association	Sample Size
Primary (traits)	.42	.44	.64	110
Primary (behaviors)	.50	.45	.67	111
Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.36	.38	.59	110
Friends/acquaintances (behaviors)	.40	.43	.64	111
Romantic partners (traits)	.49	.63	.74	52
Romantic partners (behaviors)	.50	.39	.45	52
Single participants (traits)	.30	.34	.58	69
Single participants (behaviors)	.38	.46	.62	70
Committed participants (traits)	.53	.53	.71	40
Committed participants (behaviors)	.60	.46	.72	40

*Note.* The key associations used for the Lee and Preacher (2013) tests across our primary attribute-category exclusion analyses in Study S1. Self-generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test.

## IDEAL PARTNER PREFERENCE-MATCHING



Figure S1 – Effect Sizes, 95% Confidence Intervals, and Bayes Factors Indicating Support for H<sub>0</sub>: Study S1

*Figure S1:* Plot showing the difference in the strength of association between (a) self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest and (b) other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest in each sample reported in Study S1. The size of the difference is close to zero, indicating that self-generated ideal attribute ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals as calculated from regression or multilevel regression. Bayes factors (BFs) reflect the strength of the evidence (i.e., 100% "positive") for the null hypothesis based on SEM as described by Wagenmakers (2007, Table 3).

Because the Lee and Preacher (2013) test may not generalize to Study S1's multilevel context, we also used multilevel structural equation modeling to compare the self-generated ideal associations to the other-generated ideal associations while controlling for the correlation between the self and other ideal associations (Rosseel, 2017). Using R's lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) and the same unconstrained and constrained models described in Study 2, our results indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.15$ , p = .700. Following Wagenmakers (2007), with equal priors on the unconstrained models, the Bayes factor for this analysis was 17.3 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.95). According to Table 3 in Wagenmakers (2007), this value constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Thus, this analysis allows us to conclude that we have positive evidence to support the idea that self-generated ideal trait ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings.

**Behaviors.** We conducted the same analyses with our behavior data. Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .50$ , t(492.6) = 12.40, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .45$ , t(429.1) = 11.22, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest, and there was again no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.75, p = .456 (see Figure S1). Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that

the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal associations with romantic interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these associations were assumed to be the same,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.14$ , p = .286. The Bayes factor for behaviors was 12.0 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.93), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Thus, we have positive evidence to support the idea that self-generated ideal behavior ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings. Thus, as in Studies 1 and 2, there was no evidence for the unique role of ideal-partner preference-matching in predicting romantic interest.

**Relationship status analyses.** We examined whether predictive validity varied depending on (a) whether participants described the target as a romantic partner or not, and (b) whether participants described *themselves* as single or in a committed relationship. For targets who were not in a romantic relationship with the participant or a relationship was not reported (for traits: target n = 498, participant n = 110; for behaviors: target n = 503, participant n = 111), we used the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) as in the primary analyses. For targets who were involved in a romantic relationship with the participant (for traits: n = 52; for behaviors: n = 52), we used simple linear regressions because participants tended to report only one romantic partner.

We also examined whether predictive validity varied across all targets for single participants (for traits: target n = 345, participant n = 69; for behaviors: target n = 350, participant n = 70) versus committed participants (for traits: target n = 200, participant n = 40; for behaviors: target n = 200, participant n = 40) as defined by the relationship status variable that characterizes participants themselves. This analysis examined close to 5 targets per participant, and so we used the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) as described in Study 2.

*Friends and acquaintances (traits).* Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .36$ , t(471.5) = 8.13, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .38$ , t(451.2) = 8.21, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.25, p = .803; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.85$ , p = .356. The Bayes factor for traits was 11.7 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.92), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Friends and acquaintances (behaviors).* Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .40$ , t(453.8) = 8.75, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .43$ , t(458.8) = 9.51, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.41, p = .681; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.15$ , p = .701. In addition, the Bayes factor for behaviors was 18.7 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.95), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Romantic partners (traits).* Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .49$ , SE = .12, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .63$ , SE = .11, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. In this sample, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed that other-generated

ideal trait ratings actually predicted romantic interest marginally more strongly than selfgenerated ideal trait ratings, z = 1.71, p = .087; see Figure S1. However, using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results indicated that the unconstrained and constrained models did not differ in fit,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.01$ , p = .928. In fact, in this analysis, the Bayes factor for traits was 5.5 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.85), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

**Romantic partners (behaviors).** Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .50$ , SE = .12, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .39$ , SE = .13, p = .004, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.85, p = .394; see Figure S1. Using structural equation modeling, our results indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.01$ , p = .928. The Bayes factor for traits was 5.5 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.85), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

Single participants (traits). For single participants, both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .30, t(298.7) = 5.32, p < .001$ , and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .34, t(270.4) =$  5.90, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.38, p = .705; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.89, p = .346$ . The Bayes factor for traits was 9.6 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.91), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Single participants (behaviors). For single participants, both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .38$ , t(313.8) = 6.89, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .46$ , t(311.8) = 8.79, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. But again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.85, p = .397; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.09$ , p = .767. The Bayes factor for behaviors was 16.2 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.94), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Committed participants (traits).* For committed participants, both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .53$ , t(200.0) = 8.78, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .53$ , t(200.0) = 8.94, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.08, p = .938; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.76$ , p = .383. The Bayes factor for traits was 7.5 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.88), which constitutes "positive"

*Committed participants (behaviors).* For committed participants, both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .60$ , t(200.0) = 10.66, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .46$ , t(200.0) = 7.39, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. But again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 1.40, p = .163; see Figure S1. Using multilevel structural equation modeling,

our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.23$ , p = .136. The Bayes factor for traits was about 4.1 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.81), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

### Discussion

As in Study 1 and 2, the overall results of Study S1 do not support the hypothesis that self-generated ideals predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideals using a more optimal yoked design. In the primary analyses, the friends and acquaintances analyses, the romantic partner analyses, and the single and committed participant analyses, we found no evidence of ideal partner preference-matching for either traits or behaviors (Figure S1, data points 1-10). In fact, in the subsample of romantic partners we found that other-generated ideal trait ratings were marginally more strongly associated with romantic interest than self-generated ideal trait ratings—a small, but marginal effect in the opposite direction of our key hypothesis (Figure S1, data point 5,  $\beta_{difference} = -0.14$ ). However, we also saw the largest difference between self- and other-generated ideal ratings emerge in the subsample of romantic partners when rating ideal behaviors, although the effect size was still small and non-significant (Figure S1, data point 6,  $\beta_{difference} = 0.11$ ).

#### Study S2

Study S2 was largely identical to Study S1 but used a sample of participants who were recruited online.

### Method

Participants. Participants were 237 Amazon Mechanical Turk workers who were recruited to participate in Part 1 of Study S2. Of these 237 participants, 223 expressed interest in completing a "follow-up survey" and provided a valid email address, and were thus eligible to complete Part 2. Our goal was to collect as many participants as possible in Part 1 until at least 200 participants expressed interest in completing Part 2. Of the 223 eligible participants, 103 did not complete Part 2, leaving a final sample of N = 120 participants (79 women, 39 men, 2) unreported). In Study S2, participants were 32.1 years old on average (SD = 9.9 years). Approximately 72.5% of participants reported that they were Caucasian, 9.2% were African American, 6.7% were Asian, 3.3% were Hispanic, 0.83% were Native American, 3.3% were Multiracial, and 4.2% either chose other, not to disclose, or N/A (participants were able to select all races that applied). Participants received an initial payment of \$0.25 for completing Part 1 of the study and an additional \$0.75 for completing Part 2. When Part 1 of the study was conducted, approximately 75.0% of participants reported being in a relationship, 22.5% of participants reported being single, and 2.5% chose not to disclose their relationship status. This relationship status variable was again used to determine who is committed versus single for our relationship status analyses.

**Procedure and Materials.** Study S2 consisted of two online questionnaires (i.e., Part 1 and Part 2).

*Part 1.* Participants began by listing their top three ideal partner traits and behaviors following the same instructions as in Study 2. Participants then provided race/ethnicity, age, and relationship status information. At the end of the survey, participants were told that they were eligible to complete a follow-up study for a bonus payment. Interested participants provided their email address.

Prior to Part 2, pairs of participants were randomly yoked together (in batches of approximately 100).

#### Part 2.

Emails were sent to eligible participants with a link to Part 2 of the study.

*Target nominations*. In Part 2, participants were asked to provide the first and last initial of five individuals whom they know personally. As in Study 2 and S1, they were instructed to choose individuals of their romantically preferred sex, not related to them, around the same age as them, and whom they had met in person. Participants who were in a romantic relationship were instructed to list their current romantic partner as one of the five individuals. Of the 600 total targets, 10.3% were spouses or fiancés, 6.7% were boyfriends/girlfriends, 7.8% were casual romantic/sexual partners, 45.0% were friends, 14.7% were colleagues or co-workers, 12.3% were acquaintances, 1.0% were strangers or people whom the participant had just met, and 2.2% were unreported. As in previous studies, partners were coded as "romantic partners" if the participant selected the "spouses or fiancés" or "boyfriends/girlfriends" categories.

*Rating target traits and behaviors.* Participants indicated the extent to which each selfgenerated and other-generated ideal trait and behavior described each nominated target using the same scales as in Study 2. Participants' ratings were averaged to create composite scores that represented the extent to which their self-generated ideal traits ( $\alpha = .81$ ), self-generated ideal behaviors ( $\alpha = .81$ ), other-generated ideal traits ( $\alpha = .79$ ), and other-generated ideal behaviors ( $\alpha = .78$ ) described each target.

*Construal level manipulation.* We also manipulated participants' construal level prior to their romantic evaluation of each of their five targets using a modified version of Fujita, Trope, Liberman, and Levin-Sagi's (2006) construal-level manipulation task, in which participants were given a list of words and were asked to provide an example of each word (low-level construal), provide a word that each word was an example of (high-level construal), or simply study each word (control). However, experimental condition did not interact with any of the predictors of romantic interest presented in the analyses of Study S2. Thus, this construal level manipulation constituted a failed manipulation for a different hypothesis, and we are simply making use of the data in the present paper to support our overall findings.

*Rating romantic interest.* To assess participants' overall romantic interest in each of their five nominated targets, participants rated them on the same set of six statements as described in Study 2 ( $\alpha = .96$ ).

**Exclusions.** Of the 120 participants who completed Part 2, 9 did not follow instructions for what qualified as an ideal partner behavior (e.g., they generated a trait preceded by the word "be", like "be honest" or "be reliable") or were yoked to someone who did not follow instructions, and 2 participants' full set of ideal trait ratings were dropped due to attribute-category exclusions. Thus, we excluded 11 participants for the primary trait analyses, leaving a total of N = 109 participants for the primary trait analysis, and we excluded 9 participants for the primary behavior analyses, leaving a total of N = 111 for the primary behavior analyses. Our primary trait analyses reflect the same attribute-category exclusion approach described the main text; see Table S3 for exclusion rates. Results for the synonym-level, factor-level, and no-

exclusion approaches are included in the Supplemental Materials. All hypothesis tests revealed identical conclusions using all four approaches.

For our behavior analyses, ideal behavior ratings were excluded only if ideals were worded identically (rare) or matched another behavior from the same behavior category (e.g., "housework/cleaning," "spending time together;" see details of duplicate behavior categories in Supplemental Materials). This procedure allowed us to eliminate any self-generated and othergenerated ideal behavior ratings that came from the same category when creating the selfgenerated and other-generated ideal behavior averages for each participant; In Study S1, 1.2% of ideal behavior ratings were eliminated using this procedure, but no participants were dropped completely. Results for ideal behaviors using a no-exclusion approach are included in the Supplementary Materials; all hypothesis tests revealed identical conclusions (see Supplemental Materials).

### Results

*Primary analyses.* The primary trait analyses for Study S2 were conducted on N = 109 participants (reporting on 534 targets) and the primary behavior analyses were conducted on N = 111 participants (reporting on 549 targets). For our primary analyses, we present results from the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model used in Studies 2 and S1 with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) that ignored the yoked dyad. As in previous studies, we standardized all variables, and then ran two separate models, (a) a self-generated model that predicted participants' romantic interest in their target from the extent to which their self-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their target from the extent to which their other-generated ideal attributes were rated as characteristic of their target.

*Traits*. Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .27$ , t(533.0) = 6.36, p < .001, and

other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .26$ , t(534.0) = 6.17, p < .001, positively predicted

romantic interest (see Table S6 for descriptive statistics of all variables used in models). Using

Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility, there was no significant difference between the strength

of the self- and other-generated ideal trait ratings; z = 0.12, p = .903 (see Figure S2).

## Table S6

Descriptive statistics of primary variables: Study S2

Variable	Mean	SD
Romantic interest (dependent variable)	3.91	3.26
Self-generated ideal trait ratings (independent variable for self-generated trait model)	7.75	2.32
Other-generated ideal trait ratings (independent variable for other-generated trait model)	7.72	2.24
Self-generated ideal behavior ratings (independent variable for self-generated behavior model)	7.42	2.77
Other-generated ideal behavior ratings (independent variable for other-generated behavior model)	7.20	2.55

*Note.* Means and standard deviations from the unstandardized variables used in the selfgenerated multilevel model and the other-generated multilevel model. All variables were measured on a scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 11 (*strongly agree*).

# Table S7

Summary of Associations using the Primary, Attribute-Category Exclusion Approach: Study S2

Analysis	Self-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Other-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Self-generated-attribute/ Other-generated- attribute association	Sample Size
Primary (traits)	.27	.26	.61	109
Primary (behaviors)	.32	.32	.59	111
Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.23	.19	.57	108
Friends/acquaintances (behaviors)	.27	.24	.56	111
Romantic partners (traits)	.38	.37	.62	95
Romantic partners (behaviors)	.45	.33	.48	95
Single participants (traits)	.26	.40	.53	24
Single participants (behaviors)	.33	.18	.43	25
## IDEAL PARTNER PREFERENCE-MATCHING

Committed participants (traits)	.27	.23	.61	82
Committed participants (behaviors)	.32	.35	.62	83

*Note.* The key associations used for the Lee and Preacher (2013) tests across our primary attribute-category exclusion analyses in Study S2. Self-generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test.

## IDEAL PARTNER PREFERENCE-MATCHING





*Figure S2:* Plot showing the difference in the strength of association between (a) self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest and (b) other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest in each sample reported in Study S1. The size of the difference is close to zero, indicating that self-generated ideal attribute ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals as calculated from regression or multilevel regression. Bayes factors (BFs) reflect the strength of the evidence (i.e., 10% strong, 90% "positive") for the null hypothesis based on SEM as described by Wagenmakers (2007, Table 3).

Because the Lee and Preacher (2013) test may not generalize to Study S2's multilevel context, we also used multilevel structural equation modeling to compare the self-generated ideal associations to the other-generated ideal associations while controlling for the correlation between the self and other ideal associations (Rosseel, 2017). Using R's lavaan package (Rosseel, 2012) and the same unconstrained and constrained models described in Study 2, our results indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.23$ , p = .633. Following Wagenmakers (2007), with equal priors on the unconstrained models, the Bayes factor for this analysis was 18.2 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.95). According to Table 3 in Wagenmakers (2007), this value constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Thus, this analysis allows us to conclude that we have positive evidence to support the idea that self-generated ideal trait ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings.

*Behaviors.* We conducted the same analyses with our behavior data. Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .32$ , t(546.0) = 7.77, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .32$ , t(546.0) = 7.68, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest, and there was again no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.05, p = .961 (see Figure S2). Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal associations with romantic

interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these associations were assumed to be the same,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.16$ , p = .689. The Bayes factor for behaviors was 20.7 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.95), which constitutes "strong" evidence for the null hypotheses. Thus, we have strong evidence to support the idea that self-generated ideal behavior ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings. Thus, as in Studies 1, 2, and S1, there was no evidence for the unique role of ideal-partner preference-matching in predicting romantic interest.

**Relationship status analyses.** We examined whether predictive validity varied depending on (a) whether participants described the target as a romantic partner or not, and (b) whether participants described *themselves* as single or in a committed relationship. For targets who were not in a romantic relationship with the participant or a relationship was not reported (for traits: target n = 439, participant n = 108; for behaviors: target n = 454, participant n = 111), we used the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) as in the primary analyses. For targets who were involved in a romantic relationship with the participant (for traits: n = 95; for behaviors: n = 95), we used simple linear regressions because participants tended to report only one romantic partner.

We also examined whether predictive validity varied across all targets for single participants (for traits: target n = 119, participant n = 24; for behaviors: target n = 125, participant n = 25) versus committed participants (for traits: target n = 400, participant n = 82; for behaviors: target n = 409, participant n = 83) as defined by the relationship status variable that characterizes participants themselves. This analysis examined close to 5 targets per participant, and so we used the same two-level random intercept, fixed slopes model with targets (level 1) nested within participant (level 2) as described in Study 2.

*Friends and acquaintances (traits).* Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .23$ , t(436.1) = 4.67, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .19$ , t(439.0) = 4.10, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.45, p = .649; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.61$ , p = .434. The Bayes factor for traits was 13.7 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.93), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Friends and acquaintances (behaviors).* Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .27$ , t(449.0) = 5.61, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .24$ , t(449.2) = 4.95, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.35, p = .729; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.59$ , p = .443. In addition, the Bayes factor for behaviors was 15.1 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.94), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Romantic partners (traits).* Both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .38$ , SE = .10, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .37$ , SE = .10, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. In this sample, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed that other-generated

ideal trait ratings actually predicted romantic interest marginally more strongly than selfgenerated ideal trait ratings, z = 0.12, p = .904; see Figure S2. Using structural equation modeling, our results indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.67$ , p = .412. In this analysis, the Bayes factor for traits was 6.0 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.86), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Romantic partners (behaviors).* Both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .45$ , SE = .09, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .33$ , SE = .10, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 1.26, p = .208; see Figure S2. Using structural equation modeling, our results indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.18$ , p = .671. The Bayes factor for traits was 8.7 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.90), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

Single participants (traits). For single participants, both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .26$ , t(97.7) = 2.75, p = .007, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .40$ , t(102.6) = 4.42, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.72, p = .475; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.20$ , p = .652. The Bayes factor for traits was 8.8 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.90), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses. Single participants (behaviors). For single participants, both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .33$ , t(93.3) = 3.77, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .18$ , t(123.3) = 2.02, p = .045, positively predicted romantic interest. But again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.69, p = .489; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.19$ , p = .139. The Bayes factor for behaviors was 3.6 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.78), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

*Committed participants (traits).* For committed participants, both self-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .27$ , t(399.0) = 5.64, p < .001, and other-generated ideal trait ratings,  $\beta = .23$ , t(400.0) = 4.79, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. Once again, however, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.42, p = .675; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.59$ , p = .442. The Bayes factor for traits was 13.0 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.93), which constitutes "positive"

*Committed participants (behaviors).* For committed participants, both self-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .32$ , t(406.0) = 6.69, p < .001, and other-generated ideal behavior ratings,  $\beta = .35$ , t(406.0) = 7.31, p < .001, positively predicted romantic interest. But again, the Lee and Preacher (2013) test revealed no significant difference between the strength of these two associations, z = 0.33, p = .741; see Figure S2. Using multilevel structural equation modeling,

our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.64$ , p = .104. The Bayes factor for traits was 5.2 (i.e., the posterior probability of the null hypothesis was approximately 0.84), which constitutes "positive" evidence for the null hypotheses.

### Discussion

Once again, our analyses revealed no support for the hypothesis that participants' romantic interest judgments are driven more by their personal, idiosyncratic ideals than a yoked partner's idiosyncratic ideals. Nevertheless, Study S2 provided some tentative evidence for the idea that the predictive validity of ideal-matching for behaviors emerges when participants report on romantic partners. In these cases, the average difference between self- and other-generated ideal behaviors and romantic interest was  $\beta_{difference} = .12$ , which is again approximately a small effect size (see Figure S2, data point 6). We were underpowered to detect the  $\beta_{difference} = .12$  effect: A power analysis in GPower suggested that we would need n = 448 to achieve 80% power to detect an effect of that magnitude. We pursued a much larger sample in Study 2 with the intention of collecting enough participants reporting on a relationship partner that we would be powered to detect a difference of this size.

# Appendix SA: Frequencies of Ideals for Study S1 and S2

Attribute-Category         Study S1         Study S2         exclusion (synonym)         exclusion (synonym)         exclusion (three-factor)           1         Good Sense of Hunor         11,72%         12,54%         none         V/A           3         Honest         5,21%         7,65%         2         W.T           4         Attractive         7,81%         5,20%         3         V/A           5         Kind         4,17%         4,59%         4         W.T           6         Understanding         2,34%         5,50%         4         W.T           7         Ambitious         5,73%         4,59%         none         V/A           8         Loyalty         4,17%         3,67%         2         W.T           10         In Love (feelings)         2,08%         1,22%         5         W.T           11         Trustworthy         3,91%         2,75%         2         W.T           11         Tostworthy         3,91%         2,75%         2         W.T           12         Considerate         2,08%         1,83%         4         W.T           13         Good Fun         1,82%         0,53%         0,01%					Grouping for	Grouping for
Attribute-Category         Study S1         Study S2         scheme 3 (synonym)         (three-factor)           1         Good Sense of Humor         11.72%         12.54%         none         V/A           2         Intelligent         7.03%         10.70%         1         none           3         Honest         5.21%         7.65%         2         W/T           4         Attractive         7.81%         5.20%         3         V/A           5         Kind         4.17%         4.59%         4         W/T           6         Understanding         2.34%         5.50%         4         W/T           7         Ambitious         5.73%         4.59%         none         V/A           8         Logaty         4.17%         3.67%         2         W/T           10         In Love (techings)         2.08%         1.83%         4         W/T           11         Toustworthy         3.91%         2.75%         2         W/T           12         Considerate         2.08%         1.53%         none         none           13         Good Fan         1.82%         0.92%         none         none	Attailanta Catagora		Cturder C1	Cturder CO	exclusion	exclusion
$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$		Aundule-Calegory	Study S1	Study 52	scheme 2	scheme 3
I         Good Sense of Humor         11.72%         12.54%         none         V/A           2         Intelligent         7.03%         10.70%         1         none           3         Honest         5.21%         7.65%         2         W/T           4         Attractive         7.81%         5.20%         3         V/A           5         Kind         4.17%         4.59%         4         W/T           6         Understanding         2.34%         5.50%         4         W/T           7         Ambitous         5.73%         4.59%         4         W/T           9         Caring         4.17%         4.59%         4         W/T           10         In Love (feelings)         2.08%         1.23%         5         W/T           12         Considerate         2.08%         1.33%         4         W/T           13         Good Fun         1.82%         0.92%         none         N/A           14         Reliable         0.52%         0.61%         2         W/T           15         Patient         1.56%         0.52%         0.61%         3         V/A           14					(synonym)	(three-factor)
	1	Good Sense of Humor	11.72%	12.54%	none	V/A
3         Honest $5.21\%$ $7.65\%$ 2         W/T           4         Attractive $7.81\%$ $5.20\%$ 3         V/A           5         Kind $4.17\%$ $4.59\%$ 4         W/T           6         Understanding $2.34\%$ $5.50\%$ 4         W/T           6         Logalty $4.17\%$ $3.67\%$ 2         W/T           7         Ambitious $5.73\%$ 4.89%         More         V/A           8         Logalty $4.17\%$ $4.59\%$ 4         W/T           10         In Love (feelings) $2.08\%$ $1.22\%$ 5         W/T           11         Trustworthy $3.91\%$ $2.75\%$ 2         W/T           13         Good Fun $1.82\%$ $0.92\%$ none         Note           14         Reliable $0.78\%$ $2.75\%$ 2         W/T           15         Patient $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ none         Note           14         Reliable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ 2         W/T	2	Intelligent	7.03%	10.70%	1	none
4       Attractive       7.81%       5.20%       3       V/A         5       Kind       4.17%       4.59%       4       W/T         6       Understanding       2.34%       5.50%       4       W/T         7       Ambitious       5.73%       4.59%       none       V/A         8       Loyalty       4.17%       3.67%       2       W/T         9       Caring       4.17%       4.59%       4       W/T         10       In Love (feelings)       2.08%       1.22%       5       W/T         11       Trustworthy       3.91%       2.75%       2       W/T         12       Considerate       2.08%       1.83%       4       W/T         13       Good Fun       1.82%       0.92%       none       none         14       Reliable       0.78%       2.75%       2       W/T         15       Patient       1.56%       0.92%       none       none         16       Warm       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         17       Outgoing       1.30%       1.53%       0       V/A         20       Nice Body       2.34% <td>3</td> <td>Honest</td> <td>5.21%</td> <td>7.65%</td> <td>2</td> <td>W/T</td>	3	Honest	5.21%	7.65%	2	W/T
5       Kind       4.17%       4.59%       4       W/T         6       Understanding       2.34%       5.50%       4       W/T         7       Ambitious       5.73%       4.59%       none       V/A         8       Loyalty       4.17%       3.67%       2       W/T         9       Caring       4.17%       4.59%       4       W/T         10       In Love (feelings)       2.08%       1.22%       5       W/T         12       Considerate       2.08%       1.83%       4       W/T         13       Good Fun       1.82%       0.92%       none       N/A         14       Reliable       0.78%       2.75%       2       W/T         15       Patient       1.56%       0.92%       none       none         16       Warm       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         17       Outgoing       1.30%       1.53%       9       V/A         18       Stable       0.52%       0.61%       2       W/T         19       Confident       1.82%       1.53%       5       V/A         21       Generous       0.78%	4	Attractive	7.81%	5.20%	3	V/A
6         Understanding         2.34%         5.50%         4         W/T           7         Ambitious         5.73%         4.59%         none         V/A           8         Loyalty         4.17%         3.67%         2         W/T           9         Caring         4.17%         3.67%         2         W/T           9         Caring         4.17%         4.59%         4         W/T           10         In Love (feelings)         2.08%         1.22%         5         W/T           11         Trustworthy         3.91%         2.75%         2         W/T           12         Considerate         2.08%         1.83%         4         W/T           13         Good Fun         1.82%         0.92%         none         N/A           14         Reliable         0.78%         2.75%         2         W/T           15         Patient         1.50%         1.53%         none         N/A           18         Stable         0.52%         0.61%         3         V/A           20         Nice Body         2.34%         0.61%         3         V/A           23         Passionate	5	Kind	4.17%	4.59%	4	W/T
7       Ambitious $5.73\%$ $4.59\%$ none       V/A         8       Loyalty $4.17\%$ $3.67\%$ $2$ W/T         9       Caring $4.17\%$ $4.59\%$ $4$ W/T         10       In Love (feelings) $2.08\%$ $1.22\%$ $5$ W/T         11       Trustworthy $3.91\%$ $2.75\%$ $2$ W/T         13       Good Fun $1.82\%$ $0.92\%$ none       V/A         14       Reliable $0.78\%$ $2.75\%$ $2$ W/T         15       Patient $1.56\%$ $0.92\%$ none       none         16       Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ none       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ $2$ W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ $9$ V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ $5$ V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ $4$ none         23       passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $5$ V/A	6	Understanding	2.34%	5.50%	4	W/T
8         Loyalty $4.17\%$ $3.67\%$ 2         W/T           9         Caring $4.17\%$ $4.59\%$ 4         W/T           10         In Love (feelings) $2.08\%$ $1.22\%$ 5         W/T           11         Trustworthy $3.91\%$ $2.75\%$ 2         W/T           12         Considerate $2.08\%$ $1.83\%$ 4         W/T           13         Good Fun $1.82\%$ $0.92\%$ none         V/A           14         Reliable $0.78\%$ $2.75\%$ $2$ W/T           15         Patient $1.56\%$ $0.92\%$ none         none           16         Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ $4$ W/T           17         Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ $9$ V/A           18         Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ $2$ W/T           19         Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ $9$ V/A           20         Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ $none$ $N/A$ <td>7</td> <td>Ambitious</td> <td>5.73%</td> <td>4.59%</td> <td>none</td> <td>V/A</td>	7	Ambitious	5.73%	4.59%	none	V/A
9         Caring         4.17%         4.59%         4         W/T           10         In Love (feelings)         2.08%         1.22%         5         W/T           11         Trustworthy         3.91%         2.75%         2         W/T           12         Considerate         2.08%         1.83%         4         W/T           13         Good Fun         1.82%         0.92%         none         V/A           14         Reliable         0.78%         2.75%         2         W/T           15         Patient         1.56%         0.92%         none         none           16         Warm         1.30%         1.53%         pone         V/A           18         Stable         0.52%         0.61%         2         W/T           19         Confident         1.82%         1.53%         9         V/A           20         Nice Body         2.34%         0.61%         3         VA           21         Adventurous         1.56%         1.53%         5         V/A           23         Passionate         0.78%         0.31%         5         V/A           24         Broad-Minded	8	Loyalty	4.17%	3.67%	2	W/T
10       In Love (feelings)       2.08%       1.22%       5       W/T         11       Trustworthy       3.91%       2.75%       2       W/T         13       Good Fun       1.82%       0.92%       none       V/A         14       Reliable       0.78%       2.75%       2       W/T         15       Patient       1.56%       0.92%       none       none       none         16       Warm       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         17       Outgoing       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         19       Confident       1.82%       1.53%       9       V/A         20       Nice Body       2.34%       0.61%       3       V/A         21       Adventrous       1.56%       1.53%       5       V/A         22       Generous       0.78%       0.92%       4       none         23       Pasaionate       0.78%       0.31%       6       W/T         24       Broad-Minded       1.04%       0.61%       none       none         25       Religious Beliefs       3.13%       1.22%       none       Nore         24 <td>9</td> <td>Caring</td> <td>4.17%</td> <td>4.59%</td> <td>4</td> <td>W/T</td>	9	Caring	4.17%	4.59%	4	W/T
11       Trustworthy $3.91\%$ $2.75\%$ $2$ W/T         12       Considerate $2.08\%$ $1.83\%$ $4$ W/T         13       Good Fun $1.82\%$ $0.92\%$ none       V/A         14       Reliable $0.78\%$ $2.75\%$ $2$ W/T         15       Patient $1.50\%$ $0.92\%$ none       none         16       Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ 4       W/T         17       Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ $3$ V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ $3$ V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ $5$ V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $5$ V/A         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $5$ V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $0.29\%$ none       No	10	In Love (feelings)	2.08%	1.22%	5	W/T
12       Considerate       2.08%       1.83%       4       W/T         13       Good Fun       1.82%       0.92%       none       V/A         14       Reliable       0.78%       2       W/T         15       Patient       1.56%       0.92%       none       none         16       Warm       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         17       Outgoing       1.30%       1.53%       anone       V/A         18       Stable       0.52%       0.61%       2       W/T         19       Confident       1.82%       1.53%       9       V/A         20       Nice Body       2.34%       0.61%       3       V/A         21       Adventurous       1.56%       1.53%       5       V/A         22       Generous       0.78%       0.31%       5       V/A         23       Passionate       0.78%       0.31%       6       W/T         24       Broad-Minded       1.04%       0.61%       none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs)       0.00%       0.00%       none       V/A         27       Respect	11	Trustworthy	3.91%	2.75%	2	W/T
13       Good Fun       1.82%       0.92%       none       V/A         14       Reliable       0.78%       2.75%       2       W/T         15       Patient       1.56%       0.92%       none       none         16       Warm       1.30%       1.53%       4       W/T         17       Outgoing       1.30%       1.53%       9       W/T         18       Stable       0.52%       0.61%       2       W/T         19       Confident       1.82%       1.53%       9       V/A         20       Nice Body       2.34%       0.61%       3       V/A         21       Adventurous       1.56%       1.53%       9       V/A         22       Generous       0.78%       0.31%       5       V/A         23       Passionate       0.78%       0.31%       5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded       1.04%       0.61%       none       none         25       Religious Beliefs       3.13%       1.22%       none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs)       0.00%       none       none         26       Compati	12	Considerate	2.08%	1.83%	4	W/T
14       Reliable $0.78\%$ $2.75\%$ 2       W/T         15       Patient $1.56\%$ $0.92\%$ none       none         16       Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ 4       W/T         17       Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ none       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ 2       W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ 3       V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       N/A         28       Resport $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7	13	Good Fun	1.82%	0.92%	none	V/A
15       Patient $1.56\%$ $0.92\%$ none       none         16       Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ 4       W/T         17       Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ none       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ 2       W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ 3       V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       N/A         29       Respontity/Similar Personalities $1.36\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sportry And Athletic $0.78\%$	14	Reliable	0.78%	2.75%	2	W/T
16       Warm $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ 4       W/T         17       Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ none       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ 2       W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ 3       V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       mone         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       N/T         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$	15	Patient	1.56%	0.92%	none	none
17       Outgoing $1.30\%$ $1.53\%$ none       V/A         18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ 2       W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ 3       V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         26       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         33       Friendly $1.04\%$	16	Warm	1.30%	1.53%	4	W/T
18       Stable $0.52\%$ $0.61\%$ $2$ W/T         19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ $9$ V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ $3$ V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ $5$ V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ $4$ none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $5$ $V/A$ 24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.31\%$ $6$ $W/T$ 27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $6$ $W/T$ 28       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ $4$ none         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $0.82\%$ $7$ $V/A$ 31       Creative	17	Outgoing	1.30%	1.53%	none	V/A
19       Confident $1.82\%$ $1.53\%$ 9       V/A         20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ 3       V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       none         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.31\%$ 6       W/T         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 6       W/T         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8       W/T         33 <td< td=""><td>18</td><td>Stable</td><td>0.52%</td><td>0.61%</td><td>2</td><td>W/T</td></td<>	18	Stable	0.52%	0.61%	2	W/T
20       Nice Body $2.34\%$ $0.61\%$ $3$ V/A         21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ $5$ V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ $4$ none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $5$ V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       W/T         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.01\%$ none       none         26       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ $7$ V/A         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ $4$ none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ $7$ $V/A$ 31       Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ $1$ none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ $8$ W/T         34 </td <td>19</td> <td>Confident</td> <td>1.82%</td> <td>1.53%</td> <td>9</td> <td>V/A</td>	19	Confident	1.82%	1.53%	9	V/A
21       Adventurous $1.56\%$ $1.53\%$ 5       V/A         22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       W/T         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 6       W/T         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8       W/T         33       Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4       W/T         34       <	20	Nice Body	2.34%	0.61%	3	V/A
22       Generous $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 4       none         23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       W/T         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 6       W/T         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7       V/A         31       Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8       W/T         33       Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4       W/T         34       Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5       V/A         35       Supportive $0.52\%$	21	Adventurous	1.56%	1.53%	5	V/A
23       Passionate $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 5       V/A         24       Broad-Minded $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ none       NONE         25       Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none       none         26       Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none       none         27       Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 6       W/T         28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7       V/A         31       Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8       W/T         33       Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4       W/T         34       Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5       V/A         35       Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none       V/A         38       Sexy $0.52\%$ <	22	Generous	0.78%	0.92%	4	none
24         Broad-Minded         1.04%         0.61%         none         W/T           25         Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ none         none           26         Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ none         none           27         Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ 6         W/T           28         Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none         V/A           29         Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4         none           30         Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7 $V/A$ 31         Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1         none           32         Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8         W/T           33         Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4         W/T           34         Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ $5$ $V/A$ 35         Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none $W/T$ 36         Affectionate $1$	23	Passionate	0.78%	0.31%	5	V/A
25Religious Beliefs $3.13\%$ $1.22\%$ nonenone26Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ nonenone27Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $6$ W/T28Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none $V/A$ 29Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4none30Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7 $V/A$ 31Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1none32Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8 $W/T$ 33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4 $W/T$ 34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5 $V/A$ 35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none $W/T$ 36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4 $W/T$ 37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ none $V/A$ 38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ $3$ $V/A$ 39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ $5$ $W/T$ 40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ $5$ $W/T$ 43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ $6$ $V/A$ 44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ $1$ none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ $9$ none44Educated $1.0$	24	Broad-Minded	1.04%	0.61%	none	W/T
26Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs) $0.00\%$ $0.00\%$ nonenone27Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $6$ W/T28Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ noneV/A29Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4none30Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7V/A31Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1none32Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8W/T33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4W/T34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5V/A35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ noneW/T36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4W/T37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ noneV/A38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3V/A39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5W/T40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ noneS/R42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.90\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ noneS/R44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ n	25	Religious Beliefs	3.13%	1.22%	none	none
27Easygoing $0.78\%$ $0.31\%$ $6$ $W/T$ 28Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none $V/A$ 29Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4none30Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7 $V/A$ 31Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1none32Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8 $W/T$ 33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4 $W/T$ 34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5 $V/A$ 35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none $W/T$ 36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4 $W/T$ 37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ none $V/A$ 38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3 $V/A$ 39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5 $W/T$ 40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ $none$ $S/R$ 42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ $6$ $V/A$ 44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none	26	Compatibility (thinking/talking/beliefs)	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
28       Personality/Similar Personalities $1.30\%$ $0.31\%$ none       V/A         29       Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4       none         30       Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7       V/A         31       Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1       none         32       Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8       W/T         33       Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4       W/T         34       Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5       V/A         35       Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none       W/T         36       Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4       W/T         36       Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4       W/T         37       Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ none       V/A         38       Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3       V/A         39       Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5       W/T         40       Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ <td< td=""><td>27</td><td>Easygoing</td><td>0.78%</td><td>0.31%</td><td>6</td><td>W/T</td></td<>	27	Easygoing	0.78%	0.31%	6	W/T
29Respect $1.56\%$ $1.83\%$ 4none30Sporty And Athletic $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ 7 $V/A$ 31Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1none32Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8 $W/T$ 33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4 $W/T$ 34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5 $V/A$ 35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ none $W/T$ 36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4 $W/T$ 37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ none $V/A$ 38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3 $V/A$ 39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5 $W/T$ 40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ none $S/R$ 42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ 6 $V/A$ 44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ nonenone	28	Personality/Similar Personalities	1.30%	0.31%	none	V/A
30Sporty And Athletic $0.78%$ $0.92%$ $7$ $V/A$ $31$ Creative $0.52%$ $0.92%$ $1$ none $32$ Sensitive $1.30%$ $0.61%$ $8$ $W/T$ $33$ Friendly $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $4$ $W/T$ $34$ Interesting $0.00%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $V/A$ $35$ Supportive $0.52%$ $0.92%$ none $W/T$ $36$ Affectionate $1.04%$ $0.61%$ $4$ $W/T$ $36$ Affectionate $0.78%$ $0.92%$ none $V/A$ $38$ Sexy $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $3$ $V/A$ $39$ Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $W/T$ $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $none$ $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	29	Respect	1.56%	1.83%	4	none
31Creative $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ 1none32Sensitive $1.30\%$ $0.61\%$ 8W/T33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4W/T34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5V/A35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ noneW/T36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4W/T37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ noneV/A38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3V/A39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5W/T40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ noneS/R42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ 6V/A44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ nonenone	30	Sporty And Athletic	0.78%	0.92%	7	V/A
32Sensitive $1.30%$ $0.61%$ $8$ W/T $33$ Friendly $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $4$ W/T $34$ Interesting $0.00%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $V/A$ $35$ Supportive $0.52%$ $0.92%$ none $W/T$ $36$ Affectionate $1.04%$ $0.61%$ $4$ $W/T$ $37$ Independent $0.78%$ $0.92%$ none $V/A$ $38$ Sexy $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $3$ $V/A$ $39$ Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $W/T$ $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ none $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	31	Creative	0.52%	0.92%	1	none
33Friendly $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 4W/T34Interesting $0.00\%$ $1.22\%$ 5V/A35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ noneW/T36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4W/T37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ noneV/A38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3V/A39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5W/T40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ noneS/R42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ 6V/A44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ nonenone	32	Sensitive	1.30%	0.61%	8	W/T
34Interesting $0.00%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $V/A$ $35$ Supportive $0.52%$ $0.92%$ none $W/T$ $36$ Affectionate $1.04%$ $0.61%$ $4$ $W/T$ $37$ Independent $0.78%$ $0.92%$ none $V/A$ $38$ Sexy $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $3$ $V/A$ $39$ Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $W/T$ $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ none $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	33	Friendly	1.04%	0.31%	4	W/T
35Supportive $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ noneW/T36Affectionate $1.04\%$ $0.61\%$ 4W/T37Independent $0.78\%$ $0.92\%$ noneV/A38Sexy $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 3V/A39Romantic $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ 5W/T40Similar Interests $0.78\%$ $0.61\%$ nonenone41Financially Secure $0.26\%$ $1.22\%$ noneS/R42Humble $0.52\%$ $0.00\%$ 4none43Relaxed $0.26\%$ $0.92\%$ 6V/A44Educated $1.04\%$ $0.31\%$ 1none45Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00\%$ $0.61\%$ 9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52\%$ $0.92\%$ nonenone	34	Interesting	0.00%	1.22%	5	V/A
36 $Affectionate$ $1.04%$ $0.61%$ $4$ $W/T$ $37$ Independent $0.78%$ $0.92%$ none $V/A$ $38$ Sexy $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $3$ $V/A$ $39$ Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ $W/T$ $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ none $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	35	Supportive	0.52%	0.92%	none	W/T
37Independent $0.78%$ $0.92%$ noneV/A $38$ Sexy $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $3$ V/A $39$ Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ W/T $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ none $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	36	Affectionate	1.04%	0.61%	4	W/T
38Sexy0.52%0.00%3V/A $39$ Romantic0.26%1.22%5W/T $40$ Similar Interests0.78%0.61%nonenone $41$ Financially Secure0.26%1.22%noneS/R $42$ Humble0.52%0.00%4none $43$ Relaxed0.26%0.92%6V/A $44$ Educated1.04%0.31%1none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic0.00%0.61%9none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented0.52%0.92%nonenone	37	Independent	0.78%	0.92%	none	V/A
39Romantic $0.26%$ $1.22%$ $5$ W/T $40$ Similar Interests $0.78%$ $0.61%$ nonenone $41$ Financially Secure $0.26%$ $1.22%$ none $S/R$ $42$ Humble $0.52%$ $0.00%$ $4$ none $43$ Relaxed $0.26%$ $0.92%$ $6$ $V/A$ $44$ Educated $1.04%$ $0.31%$ $1$ none $45$ Hopeful/Optimistic $0.00%$ $0.61%$ $9$ none $46$ Family-/Friend-Oriented $0.52%$ $0.92%$ nonenone	38	Sexv	0.52%	0.00%	3	V/A
40       Similar Interests       0.78%       0.61%       none       none         41       Financially Secure       0.26%       1.22%       none       S/R         42       Humble       0.52%       0.00%       4       none         43       Relaxed       0.26%       0.92%       6       V/A         44       Educated       1.04%       0.31%       1       none         45       Hopeful/Optimistic       0.00%       0.61%       9       none         46       Family-/Friend-Oriented       0.52%       0.92%       none       none	39	Romantic	0.26%	1.22%	5	W/T
41       Financially Secure       0.26%       1.22%       none       S/R         42       Humble       0.52%       0.00%       4       none         43       Relaxed       0.26%       0.92%       6       V/A         44       Educated       1.04%       0.31%       1       none         45       Hopeful/Optimistic       0.00%       0.61%       9       none         46       Family-/Friend-Oriented       0.52%       0.92%       none       none	40	Similar Interests	0.78%	0.61%	none	none
42       Humble       0.52%       0.00%       4       none         43       Relaxed       0.26%       0.92%       6       V/A         44       Educated       1.04%       0.31%       1       none         45       Hopeful/Optimistic       0.00%       0.61%       9       none         46       Family-/Friend-Oriented       0.52%       0.92%       none       none	41	Financially Secure	0.26%	1.22%	none	S/R
43       Relaxed       0.26%       0.92%       6       V/A         44       Educated       1.04%       0.31%       1       none         45       Hopeful/Optimistic       0.00%       0.61%       9       none         46       Family-/Friend-Oriented       0.52%       0.92%       none       none	42	Humble	0.52%	0.00%	4	none
44Educated1.04%0.31%1none45Hopeful/Optimistic0.00%0.61%9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented0.52%0.92%nonenone	43	Relaxed	0.26%	0.92%	6	V/A
45Hopeful/Optimistic0.00%0.61%9none46Family-/Friend-Oriented0.52%0.92%nonenone	44	Educated	1.04%	0.31%	1	none
46 Family-/Friend-Oriented 0.52% 0.92% none none	45	Hopeful/Optimistic	0.00%	0.61%	9	none
•	46	Family-/Friend-Oriented	0.52%	0.92%	none	none

Percentage of Ideals Nominated by Participants at Pre-test by Attribute-Category

47	Active Lifestyle	0.78%	0.31%	7	V/A
48	Communicative	0.00%	0.31%	none	W/T
49	Moral	0.26%	0.00%	none	none
50	Refined	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
51	Good Lover	0.00%	0.61%	none	V/A
52	Masculinity	1.04%	0.31%	none	none
53	Spontaneous	0.26%	0.00%	6	V/A
54	Assertive	0.78%	0.31%	9	V/A
55	Good Listener	0.26%	0.92%	none	W/T
56	Self-Aware	0.26%	0.00%	none	W/T
57	Acceptance	0.00%	0.31%	none	W/T
58	Successful	1.82%	0.00%	none	S/R
59	Likes Children	0.00%	0.31%	none	none
60	Commitment	0.00%	0.31%	none	W/T
61	Confronts Conflict	0.00%	0.61%	none	none
62	Geeky	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
63	Mature	0.00%	0.00%	none	W/T
64	Nice House or Apartment/Rich	0.00%	0.31%	none	S/R
65	Dresses Well	0.52%	0.00%	none	S/R
66	Politics	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
67	Protective	0.78%	0.00%	4	none
68	Reserved	0.00%	0.31%	none	none
69	Compromise	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
70	Display Emotion	0.00%	0.00%	8	none
71	Equality	0.00%	0.61%	none	W/T
72	Exciting	0.00%	0.00%	5	V/A
73	Good Job	0.00%	0.00%	none	S/R
74	Unusual	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
75	Animal Lover	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
76	Appropriate Ethnicity	0.00%	0.00%	none	S/R
77	Challenging	0.00%	0.00%	none	V/A
78	Goofy	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
79	Sharing	0.00%	0.00%	none	W/T
80	Asexual	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
81	Chaste	0.00%	0.00%	10	none
82	Childfree	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
83	Deals Well With Criticism	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
84	Does Not Smoke	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
85	Early riser	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
86	Good Memory	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
87	Location	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
88	Neat	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
89	Non-materialistic	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
90	Popular	0.00%	0.00%	3	none
91	Simple	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
92	Soul	0.26%	0.00%	5	none
93	Tattoos	0.00%	0.00%	none	none
94	Appropriate Age	0.00%	0.00%	none	S/R
95	Monogamous	0.00%	0.00%	10	W/T

*Note.* The percentage of total ideals nominated at pre-test by attribute-category grouping across all studies. Attribute groupings are sorted from descending frequency on the Overall column. That is, across Studies 1, 2, S1, and S2, the three most frequently nominated attributes are Good Sense of Humor, Intelligent, and Honest. Synonym-level exclusion groupings were devised using

the most common (i.e., dark orange) synonyms and definitions from thesaurus.com (e.g., intelligent and creative are synonyms). Three-factor groupings were assigned by loadings over .40 in Fletcher (1999) Table 1 (bolded values), and if the attribute-category was not found in Table 1, then we used the values reported in Fletcher et al. (1999) Table 2. The three-factor approach excludes ideals if they matched on one of the three factors from Fletcher et al. (1999); if the ideals did not fit into one of the three factors, they were excluded if they matched at the attribute-category level for one of the remaining 40 attributes (as in our primary, attribute-category exclusion approach). W/T = warmth/trustworthiness; V/A = vitality/attractiveness; S/R = status/resources.

### Synonym-level exclusion approach

As described in the main text, we re-conducted all analyses such that ideals were excluded based on 10 groups determined by synonyms taken from thesaurus.com; these 10 synonym groups encompass 42 of the 95 attributes in Appendix A (see also Appendix SA). This approach would eliminate the participant's ratings on the attributes stable and trustworthy, for example, because they belong to the same attribute group. If the ideals did not fit into one of the 10 groups, they were excluded if they matched at the attribute-category level for one of the remaining 53 attributes (as in our primary, attribute-category exclusion approach). The middle rows in Table 1 and Table S3 describe the exclusion rates based on this approach; we implemented this method in response to reviewer comments after the second round of reviews. **Results** 

**Primary analyses.** All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S8. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described in the attribute-category exclusion approach for each study.

*Traits.* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S8), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings in our primary trait analyses; for Study 1, z = 0.90, p = .370; for Study 2, z = 0.56, p = .578; for Study S1, z = 0.04, p = .971; for Study S2, z = 0.03, p = .974 (see all self-other differences in Figure S3). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal trait ratings with romantic interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these ideal trait ratings were

assumed to be the same. For Study 1, the structural equation model did not converge. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.03$ , p = .853, and the Bayes factor = 31.0 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.21$ , p = .643, and the Bayes factor = 12.9 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.98$ , p = .322, and the Bayes factor = 11.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

### **Table S8**

Summary of Associations using the Synonym-level Exclusion Approach

Study	Analysis	Self-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Other-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Self-generated-attribute/ Other-generated attribute association	Sample Size
1	Primary	.46	.38	.37	124
2	Primary (traits)	.38	.36	.56	570
2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.30	.27	.52	566
2	Romantic partners (traits)	.51	.43	.55	478
2	Single participants (traits)	.35	.36	.53	150
2	Committed participants (traits)	.38	.36	.56	420
<b>S</b> 1	Primary (traits)	.40	.40	.55	107
<b>S</b> 1	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.36	.35	.50	107
<b>S</b> 1	Romantic partners (traits)	.40	.63	.63	50
<b>S</b> 1	Single participants (traits)	.30	.32	.52	68
<b>S</b> 1	Committed participants (traits)	.50	.50	.58	39
<b>S</b> 2	Primary (traits)	.25	.25	.52	106
<b>S</b> 2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.21	.15	.51	106
<b>S</b> 2	Romantic partners (traits)	.33	.36	.42	93
<b>S</b> 2	Single participants (traits)	.26	.33	.47	24
<b>S</b> 2	Committed participants (traits)	.25	.24	.51	80

*Note.* The key associations used for the Lee and Preacher (2013) tests across our synonym-level exclusion analyses. Self-generated- attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test.



Figure S3 – Effect Sizes, 95% Confidence Intervals, and Bayes Factors Indicating Support for H<sub>0</sub>: Synonym-Level Trait Exclusions

*Figure S3*: Plot showing the difference in the strength of association between (a) self-generated ideal trait ratings and romantic interest and (b) other-generated ideal trait ratings and romantic interest in each sample reported in Study 1, 2 S1, and S2 using the Synonym-level traits exclusion approach. The size of the difference is close to zero, indicating that self-generated ideal attribute ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals as calculated from regression or multilevel regression. Bayes factors (BFs) reflect the strength of the evidence (i.e., "strong" or "positive" or "no evidence") for the null hypothesis based on SEM as described by Wagenmakers (2007, Table 3). The SEM did not converge in Study 1. In cases of disagreement between 95% confidence intervals and SEM, quantitatively minded scholars generally consider SEM results to be more accurate (Klein, 2005; Ledgerwood & Shrout, 2011).

### Relationship status analyses. We examined whether predictive validity varied

depending on (a) whether participants described the target as a romantic partner or not, and (b) whether participants described *themselves* as single or in a committed relationship. All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S8. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described using the attribute category exclusion approach for each study.

*Friends and acquaintances (traits).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S8), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.77, p = .444; for Study S1, z = 0.11, p = .912; for Study S2, z = 0.63, p = .530 (see all self-other differences in Figure S3). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.47$ , p = .495, and the Bayes factor = 22.7 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.26$ , p = .261, and the Bayes factor = 7.3 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.26$ , p = .261, and the Bayes factor = 12.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Romantic partners (traits).* In Study 2, Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility found that self-generated ideal trait ratings did predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings, z = 2.16, p = .031. However, in Study S1, other-generated ideal trait ratings were more predictive, z = 2.27, p = .023 (see all self-other differences in Figure S3). Finally, in Study S2, self-generated ideal trait ratings did not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings, z = 0.29, p = .774. Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.04$ , p = .836, and the Bayes factor = 13.0 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.22$ , p = .073, and the Bayes factor = 0.82 indicating no evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.09$ , p = .762, and the Bayes factor = 7.5 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Single participants (traits).* For single participants, in each study, although both selfgenerated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S8), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that selfgenerated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.14, p = .892; for Study S1, z = 0.18, p = .861; for Study S2, z = 0.33, p = .741 (see all self-other differences in Figure S3). Using structural equation modeling, for Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.96$ , p = .327, and the Bayes factor = 9.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.62$ , p = .106, and the Bayes factor = 3.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.56$ , p = .455, and the Bayes factor = 7.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Committed participants (traits).* For committed participants, in each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted

romantic (see all associations in Table S8), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than othergenerated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.48, p = .633; for Study S1, z = 0.01, p = .994; for Study S2, z = 0.09, p = .927 (see all self-other differences in Figure S3). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.19$ , p = .665, and the Bayes factor = 25.0 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.13$ , p = .287, and the Bayes factor = 4.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.11$ , p = .147, and the Bayes factor = 5.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

### **Fletcher three-factor exclusion approach**

As described in the main text, we re-conducted all analyses such that ideals were excluded if they matched on one of the three categories of attributes from Fletcher et al., (1999): (a) *Warmth-Trustworthiness/Intimacy-Loyalty*, (b) *Vitality-Attractiveness/Passion*, and (c) *Status-Resources*. If the ideals did not fit into one of the three factors, they were excluded if they matched at the attribute-category level for one of the remaining 40 attributes (as in our primary, attribute-category exclusion approach); see Table 1 in the main text and Table S3 in the supplement for exclusion rates.

### Results

**Primary analyses.** All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S9. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described in the attribute-category exclusion approach for each study.

*Traits.* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S9), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings in our primary trait analyses; for Study 1, z = 1.25, p = .211; for Study 2, z = 0.63, p = .531; for Study S1, z = 0.28, p = .779; for Study S2, z = 0.18, p = .856 (see all self-other differences in Figure S4). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal trait ratings with romantic interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these ideal trait ratings were assumed to be the same. For Study 1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.10$ , p = .753, and the Bayes factor = 3.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.60$ , p = .437, and

the Bayes factor = 13.3 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1, the multilevel structural equation model did not converge. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.44$ , p = .231, and the Bayes factor = 7.5 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

## Table S9

Study	Analysis	Self-generated- attribute/ romantic-interes association	Other-generated- attribute/ romantic-interest association	Self-generated- attribute/ Other- generated attribute association	Sample Size
1	Primary	.41	.27	.35	90
2	Primary (traits)	.37	.34	.46	399
2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.30	.25	.42	396
2	Romantic partners (traits)	.48	.42	.39	339
2	Single participants (traits)	.33	.26	.32	110
2	Committed participants (traits)	.38	.36	.51	295
<b>S</b> 1	Primary (traits)	.34	.37	.51	75
<b>S</b> 1	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.34	.31	.45	75
<b>S</b> 1	Romantic partners (traits)	.13	.54	.72	36
<b>S</b> 1	Single participants (traits)	.23	.20	.45	48
<b>S</b> 1	Committed participants (traits)	.44	.60	.60	27
S2	Primary (traits)	.25	.23	.47	84
S2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.19	.16	.44	84
<b>S</b> 2	Romantic partners (traits)	.19	.26	.49	73
<b>S</b> 2	Single participants (traits)	.22	.35	.30	21
S2	Committed participants (traits)	.25	.21	.50	65

Summary of Associations using the Secondary, Fletcher Three-Factor Exclusion Approach

*Note.* The key associations used for the Lee and Preacher (2013) tests across our Fletcher threefactor exclusion analyses. Self-generated- attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-generatedattribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and othergenerated ideal attribute ratings. Sample size refers to the *N* who contributed to at least one of the three associations required for the Lee and Preacher (2013) test. Figure S4 – Effect Sizes, 95% Confidence Intervals, and Bayes Factors Indicating Support for  $H_0$ : Fletcher Three-Factor Traits Exclusions



*Figure S4:* Plot showing the difference in the strength of association between (a) self-generated ideal trait ratings and romantic interest and (b) other-generated ideal trait ratings and romantic interest in each sample reported in Study 1, 2 S1, and S2 using the Fletcher three-factor traits exclusion approach. The size of the difference is close to zero, indicating that self-generated ideal attribute ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal attribute ratings. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals as calculated from regression or multilevel regression. Bayes factors (BFs) reflect the strength of the evidence (i.e., "strong", "positive", or "no evidence") for the null hypothesis based on SEM as described by Wagenmakers (2007, Table 3). If a BF is not listed it means the SEM failed to converge. In cases of disagreement between 95% confidence intervals and SEM, quantitatively minded scholars generally consider SEM results to be more accurate (Klein, 2005; Ledgerwood & Shrout, 2011).

### Relationship status analyses. We examined whether predictive validity varied

depending on participants' relationship status with the target of attraction. All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S9. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described using the attribute category exclusion approach for each study.

*Friends and acquaintances (traits).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S9), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.97, p = .332; for Study S1, z = 0.26, p = .794; for Study S2, z = 0.18, p = .856 (see all self-other differences in Figure S4). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.15$ , p = .285, and the Bayes factor = 9.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1, the multilevel structural equation model did not converge. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.61$ , p = .436, and the Bayes factor = 10.3 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Romantic partners (traits).* In Studies 2 and S2, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic, Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 1.16, p = .245; for Study S2, z = 0.60, p = .549. For Study S1, self-generated ideal trait ratings did not significantly predict romantic interest, although other-generated ideal trait ratings did (see all associations in Table S9). Thus, once again the Lee and Preacher (2013) test confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings did not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings for Study S1, in fact, other-generated ideal trait ratings were more predictive in this sample, z = 3.55, p < .001 (see all self-other differences in Figure S4). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.33$ , p = .249, and the Bayes factor = 4.0 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1, the multilevel structural equation model did not converge. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.12$ , p = .727, and the Bayes factor = 5.9 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

Single participants (traits). For single participants, in each study, although both selfgenerated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S9), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that selfgenerated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.66, p = .508; for Study S1, z = 0.20, p = .843; for Study S2, z= 0.50, p = .620 (see all self-other differences in Figure S4). Using structural equation modeling, for Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 7.11$ , p = .008, and the Bayes factor = 0.24 indicating no evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1, the multilevel structural equation model did not converge. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.64$ , p = .056, and the Bayes factor = 1.3 indicating "weak" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Committed participants (traits).* For committed participants, in each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S9), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.38, p = .705; for Study S1, z = 1.08, p = .281; for Study S2, z = 0.33, p = .744 (see all self-other differences in Figure S4). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.36$ , p = .548, and the Bayes factor = 13.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1, the multilevel structural equation model did not converge. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.22$ , p = .136, and the Bayes factor = 4.2 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

### **Results using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes)**

We acknowledge that analyses using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes) could artificially suppress any differences between the self-generated and other-generated ideal attribute associations by not accounting for overlap between the two (i.e., duplicate ideals). Despite this fact, we re-conducted all analyses using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes) to demonstrate the robustness of our results under various approaches (the primary attribute-category exclusion approach, the Synonym-level exclusion approach, the Fletcher three-factor exclusion approach, and all data).

### Results

*Primary analyses.* All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S10. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described in the attribute-category exclusion approach for each study.

*Traits.* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 1, z = 0.15, p = .881; for Study 2, z = 0.69, p = .493; for Study S1, z = 0.31, p = .759; for Study S2, z = 0.38, p = .701 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel A). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal trait ratings with romantic interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these ideal trait ratings were assumed to be the same. For Study 1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.38$ , p = .540, and the Bayes factor = 9.0 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.00$ , p = .979, and the Bayes factor = 54.1 indicating "strong"

evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.61$ , p = .434, and the Bayes factor =

16.6 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.31$ , p = .580,

and the Bayes factor = 19.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

## Table S10

Summary of Associations using All Data (No Exclusions for Duplicate Attributes)

Study	Analysis	Self-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Other-generated- attribute/ romantic- interest association	Self-generated- attribute/ Other- generated-attribute association	Sample Size
1	Primary	.52	.51	.59	128
2	Primary (traits)	.41	.39	.69	597
2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.32	.30	.66	593
2	Romantic partners (traits)	.55	.50	.70	502
2	Single participants (traits)	.38	.38	.65	155
2	Committed participants (traits)	.40	.38	.70	442
2	Primary (behaviors)	.39	.38	.62	595
2	Friends/acquaintances (behaviors)	.32	.29	.58	591
2	Romantic partners (behaviors)	.51	.49	.60	503
2	Single participants (behaviors)	.40	.37	.59	155
2	Committed participants (behaviors)	.38	.37	.63	440
<b>S</b> 1	Primary (traits)	.44	.46	.70	111
<b>S</b> 1	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.36	.39	.65	111
<b>S</b> 1	Romantic partners (traits)	.64	.68	.83	52
<b>S</b> 1	Single participants (traits)	.29	.34	.64	70
<b>S</b> 1	Committed participants (traits)	.56	.55	.77	40
<b>S</b> 1	Primary (behaviors)	.50	.46	.68	111
<b>S</b> 1	Friends/acquaintances (behaviors)	.40	.44	.65	111
<b>S</b> 1	Romantic partners (behaviors)	.48	.39	.44	52
<b>S</b> 1	Single participants (behaviors)	.38	.47	.63	70
<b>S</b> 1	Committed participants (behaviors)	.60	.47	.73	40
<b>S</b> 2	Primary (traits)	.28	.25	.64	111
<b>S</b> 2	Friends/acquaintances (traits)	.24	.19	.61	110
<b>S</b> 2	Romantic partners (traits)	.38	.35	.66	95
<b>S</b> 2	Single participants (traits)	.31	.41	.55	25
<b>S</b> 2	Committed participants (traits)	.28	.22	.65	83
<b>S</b> 2	Primary (behaviors)	.32	.32	.59	111
<b>S</b> 2	Friends/acquaintances (behaviors)	.27	.24	.56	111
<b>S</b> 2	Romantic partners (behaviors)	.45	.33	.49	95
<b>S</b> 2	Single participants (behaviors)	.33	.20	.44	25

S2	Committed participants (behaviors)	.32	.35	.62	83	
	Note. The key associations used for the l	Lee and Preache	r (2013) tests across all d	lata (no		
	exclusion for duplicates) analyses. Self-	generated-attrib	ite/romantic-interest asso	ciation refers to		
	the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Other-					
	generated-attribute/romantic-interest association refers to the association between other-					
	generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest. Self-generated-attribute/Other-generated-					
	attribute association refers to the association between self-generated ideal attribute ratings and					
	other-generated ideal attribute ratings. S	ample size refer	s to the N who contribute	d to at least one		
	of the three associations required for the	Lee and Preach	er (2013) test.			

**Panel A** – Effect Sizes, 95% Confidence Intervals, and Bayes Factors Indicating Support for  $H_0$ : All Data (No Exclusions for Duplicate Traits)







All Data (No Exclusions for Duplicate Behaviors)

*Figure S5:* Plot showing the difference in the strength of association between (a) self-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest and (b) other-generated ideal attribute ratings and romantic interest in each sample in each study using all data (no exclusions for duplicate attributes). Panel A contains the results for traits, and Panel B contains the results for behaviors. The size of the difference is close to zero, indicating that self-generated ideal trait ratings do not predict romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings. Error bars indicate 95% confidence intervals as calculated from regression or multilevel regression. Bayes factors (BFs) reflect the strength of the evidence (i.e., "strong" or "positive") for the null hypothesis based on SEM as described by Wagenmakers (2007, Table 3). In cases of disagreement between 95% confidence intervals and SEM, quantitatively minded scholars generally consider SEM results to be more accurate (Klein, 2005; Ledgerwood & Shrout, 2011).

*Behaviors.* All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S10. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described in the attribute-category exclusion approach for each study.

In each study, although both self-generated ideal behavior ratings and other-generated ideal behavior ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal behavior ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.31, p = .758; for Study S1, z = 0.61, p = .544; for Study S2, z = 0.03, p = .980 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel B). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model in which the self- and other-generated ideal behavior ratings with romantic interest were allowed to differ did not fit the data any better than the constrained model in which these ideal behavior ratings were assumed to be the same. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.48$ , p = .488, and the Bayes factor = 42.1 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.83$ , p = .363, and the Bayes factor = 14.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.27$ , p = .601, and the Bayes factor = 19.9 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

**Relationship status analyses.** We examined whether predictive validity varied depending on participants' relationship status with the target of attraction. All sample sizes and association used for statistical tests are presented in Table S10. Below we present a summary of results using the same models as described using the attribute category exclusion approach for each study.

*Friends and acquaintances (traits).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.63, p = .532; for Study S1, z = 0.41, p = .683; for Study S2, z = 0.60, p = .547 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel A). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.12$ , p = .145, and the Bayes factor = 17.0 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.62$ , p = .204, and the Bayes factor = 9.6 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.62$ , p = .204, and the Bayes factor = 11.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Friends and acquaintances (behaviors).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal behavior ratings and other-generated ideal behavior ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal behavior ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.84, p = .399; for Study S1, z = 0.56, p = .577; for Study S2, z = 0.35, p = .729 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel B). Using structural equation modeling, our results indicated that in in Study 2, the unconstrained model fit

the data better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 4.35$ , p = .037, but the Bayes factor = 5.5 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. However, the unconstrained model did not fit the data better than the constrained model in Studies S1 and S2. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.25$ , p = .620, and the Bayes factor = 18.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.81$ , p = .369, and the Bayes factor = 13.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Romantic partners (traits).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 1.75, p = .081 (a marginal effect); for Study S1, z = 0.66, p = .508; for Study S2, z = 0.38, p = .704 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel A). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.58$ , p = .209, and the Bayes factor = 10.2 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.31$ , p = .576, and the Bayes factor = 5.9 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.08$ , p = .784, and the Bayes factor = 9.3 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Romantic partners (behaviors).* In each study, although both self-generated ideal behavior ratings and other-generated ideal behavior ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal behavior ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.60, p = .550; for Study S1, z = 0.69, p = .493; for Study S2, z

= 1.27, p = .203 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel B). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.01$ , p = .921, and the Bayes factor = 22.2 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.21$ , p = .643, and the Bayes factor = 6.3 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1)$ = 0.13, p = .722, and the Bayes factor = 9.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

Single participants (traits). For single participants, in each study, although both selfgenerated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that selfgenerated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.10, p = .923; for Study S1, z = 0.51, p = .607; for Study S2, z = 0.54, p = .589 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel A). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.36$ , p = .550, and the Bayes factor = 22.9 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.45$ , p = .228, and the Bayes factor = 8.6 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1)$ = 1.20, p = .274, and the Bayes factor = 6.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Single participants (behaviors).* For single participants, in each study, although both selfgenerated ideal behavior ratings and other-generated ideal behavior ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal behavior ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.45, p = .652; for Study S1, z = 0.97, p = .333; for Study S2, z = 0.61, p = .544 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel B). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 2.96$ , p = .085 (a marginal effect), and the Bayes factor = 6.2 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.11$ , p = .745, and the Bayes factor = 16.8 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.02$ , p = .082, and the Bayes factor = 2.4 indicating "weak" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Committed participants (traits).* For committed participants, in each study, although both self-generated ideal trait ratings and other-generated ideal trait ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility confirmed that self-generated ideal trait ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal trait ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.60, p = .551; for Study S1, z = 0.11, p = .912; for Study S2, z = 0.67, p = .505 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel A). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.02$ , p = .878, and the Bayes factor = 46.0 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.00$ , p = 1.00, and the Bayes factor = 13.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.34$ , p = .247, and the Bayes factor = 10.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

*Committed participants (behaviors).* For committed participants, in each study, although both self-generated ideal behavior ratings and other-generated ideal behavior ratings positively predicted romantic (see all associations in Table S10), Lee and Preacher's (2013) web utility

confirmed that self-generated ideal behavior ratings never predicted romantic interest more strongly than other-generated ideal behavior ratings; for Study 2, z = 0.27, p = .790; for Study S1, z = 1.32, p = .186; for Study S2, z = 0.33, p = .741 (see all self-other differences in Figure S5, Panel B). Using structural equation modeling, our results again indicated that the unconstrained model did not fit the data any better than the constrained model. For Study 2,  $\chi^2(1) = 0.00$ , p = .953, and the Bayes factor = 46.0 indicating "strong" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S1,  $\chi^2(1) = 1.42$ , p = .234, and the Bayes factor = 6.7 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis. For Study S2,  $\chi^2(1) = 3.15$ , p = .076 (a marginal effect), and the Bayes factor = 4.1 indicating "positive" evidence for the null hypothesis.

### **Duplicate behaviors**

The first author read through all ideal behaviors and noted common themes that emerged, and then grouped duplicate behaviors into the categories outlined below. Note that this list represents a small proportion of the total number of nominated behaviors (because the vast majority of nominated behaviors were idiosyncratic). Duplicate behaviors were removed from all analyses using the primary attribute-category exclusion approach. If one member of a yoked pair had a behavior in one category (housework/cleaning) and the other member of the yoked pair had a behavior in the same category, both were removed from the calculations in the primary attribute-category exclusion approach. For example, if one member of a yoked pair listed "housework" as one of their top three ideal partner behaviors, and their yoked partner listed "share household responsibilities" as one of their top three ideal partner behaviors, the behavior ratings for both "housework" and "share household responsibilities" were removed from the calculations in the analyses.

#### Housework/cleaning

Share household responsibilities Doing their fair share of housework/chores Helping me with housework daily Housework Help around the home Help with housework Helps around the house House work Clean and help around the house Does chores around the house Help me maintain the household Clean the house regularly Helps clean around the house Help around the house Do an equal portion of the household work/chores Cleans the house when it needs to be cleaned Can clean up his mess by himself

to help me cleaning up clean

### **Doing dishes**

Wash dishes Washing the dishes if i cook dinner

### **Caring for Kids**

Share in child rearing responsibilities Baby sit the kids every now and then without grumbling

### Time

Spends time with me Spends quality time with me

### **Compliments me**

Give me compliments Complimenting me on my appearance or personal attributes

### Hugs me

Hugs me Hug and/or kiss me daily

### Shows affection

Demonstrates affection daily Show affection often Show affection in the morning and before bed to show their compassion/affection to me show me signs of affection Shows me that he cares for me, such as showing me affection with hugs, and kisses. I want my partner to give me hugs and kisses regularly

### Hygiene

Takes care of themselves, hygiene and health wise Keeping up with his appearance and health

### Ask about day

Ask me how my day was everyday Ask how things are going - check in Ask me how my day was

# **Be supportive** Be supportive when I need it

To be supportive of me
**Be funny** Make me laugh humorous

## **Pursue goals**

A passion for pursuing life goals or dreams. sets ambitious goals in work and life

## Be trustworthy

Be honest I want my partner to be trustworthy

**Do laundry** wash his own laundry Do the laundry sometimes

## Communicate with me

Talking with me spend time talking