

A.4 Supplementary Tables

Dependent Variable:	Mean Got-Yes	Mean Got-Yes	Matchability
	(1)	(2)	(3)
log(Height)	-0.012 (0.2485)	1.641*** (0.398)	-1.701 (1.261)
log(Weight)	0.139** (0.0682)	-0.375*** (0.0975)	0.486 (0.325)
Physically attractive	0.144*** (0.0053)		0.796*** (0.0254)
Gender \times group size FE	X	X	X
Observations	349	349	349
R^2	0.676	0.072	0.767

Robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 11: Determinants of attraction and matching success, at the observation level of participants, and none of the variables being standardized. Column (1) is identical to Column (3) of Table 3.

Dependent Variable	Said-Yes	Said-Yes
Rater's Attraction to Target		0.165*** (0.005)
Target's Vertical Score	0.233*** (0.007)	0.070*** (0.008)
Rater's Vertical Score	-0.036*** (0.011)	-0.005 (0.009)
Observations	4,100	4,088
R^2	0.229	0.461

Standard errors clustered at the target level. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$

Table 12: When including the subjective evaluation of a partner, the coefficient on the partner's vertical score does not become negative, which it would if there was a serious rejection cost. The subjective evaluation is ℓ_{ij} , rescaled to be the same scale as the vertical scores (which are standardized): its standard deviation becomes 1.77 after rescaling.

	Caucasian	East Asian	Hispanic	African American	Middle Eastern	South Asian	Mixed
Caucasian	24.8%	14.4%	20.3%	19.1%	17.9%	22.1%	22.4%
East Asian		19.4%	27.3%	7.7%	0.0%	9.1%	17.1%
Hispanic			100.0%	50.0%	0.0%	66.7%	40%
African American				100.0%	0.0%	33.3%	0.0%
Middle Eastern					–	66.7%	–
South Asian						0.0%	20%
Mixed							37.5%
Observations	2,929	539	99	73	36	192	232

Table 13: Matching rates by ethnicity. Compared with an overall matching rate of 21.7%, a preference for same-ethnicity matching is evident.

	Christian	Jewish	Agnostic/Atheist	Other religion
Christian	22.3%	19.0%	22.9%	17.9%
Jewish		22.8%	21.3%	16.9%
Agnostic/Atheist			27.5%	15.5%
Other religion				21.4%
Observation	1,945	675	1,169	311

Table 14: Matching rates by religion. Compared with an overall matching rate of 21.7%, a preference for same-religion matching appears likely, but is weaker than that for ethnicity.

Correlation with horizontal attraction <i>to</i> a partner			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
“Have a lot in common”	0.515*** (0.016)		
“Similar personalities”		0.527*** (0.016)	
“Had a real connection”			0.524*** (0.018)
Observations	4,087	4,088	4,088

Standard errors clustered at rater level. *** indicates $p < 0.01$.

Table 15: Evidence of compatibility-based sorting. Participants’ attraction to a meeting partner is highly correlated with their own judgment that their partner might be compatible.

Correlation with horizontal attraction <i>by</i> a partner			
	(1)	(2)	(3)
“Have a lot in common”	0.0604*** (0.015)		
“Similar personalities”		0.052*** (0.015)	
“Had a real connection”			0.052*** (0.014)
Observations	4,075	4,076	4,076

Standard errors clustered at rater level. *** indicates $p < 0.01$.

Table 16: Evidence of compatibility-based sorting. Participants’ attraction to a meeting partner is correlated with their partner’s judgment that they might be compatible.