

**The following analyses are supplementary analyses for Study 2 of Ma, Correll, & Wittenbrink (in press). The Chicago Face Database: A Free Stimulus Set of Faces and Norming Data. Behavior Research Methods.**

We also tested two separate two additional models in which 1) *racial* prototypicality and 2) *gender* prototypicality were allowed to interact with target category. To test the first question, we regressed suitability ratings on contrast-coded race (White = -1; Black = +1), contrast-coded gender (male = -1; female = +1), mean-centered racial prototypicality, mean-centered gender prototypicality, the race  $\times$  gender interaction, the race  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction, the gender  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction, and the race  $\times$  gender  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction. We observed an effect of race,  $t(149) = 2.49, p = .01$ . Black targets ( $M = 3.95, se = .04$ ) were rated higher in suitability than White targets ( $M = 3.92, se = .04$ ). Female targets ( $M = 4.06, se = .04$ ) were judged as more suitable than male targets ( $M = 3.81, se = .05$ ),  $t(149) = 4.45, p < .001$ . The race  $\times$  gender interaction was not statistically significant,  $t(149) = 1.46, p = .15$ . As before, higher ratings of racial and gender prototypicality positively predicted suitability,  $t(149) = 7.10, p < .001$  and  $t(149) = 8.20, p < .001$ , respectively. A significant race  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction,  $t(149) = -2.47, p = .02$ , suggested that the effect of racial prototypicality on suitability was moderated by target race. The effect of racial prototypicality on suitability was significant and positive for both White targets,  $t(149) = 6.93, p < .001$ , and Black targets,  $t(149) = 3.06, p = .003$ , but the effect was more pronounced for White targets. We also observed a significant gender  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction,  $t(149) = -4.11, p < .001$ . For male,  $t(149) = 8.46, p < .001$ , and female targets,  $t(149) = 1.99, p = .05$ , the effect of racial

prototypicality on suitability was significant, but this effect was stronger among male targets than female targets. Finally, the race  $\times$  gender  $\times$  racial prototypicality interaction was not statistically significant,  $t(149) = -1.20, p = .23$ .

To test whether the effect of *gender* prototypicality operates differently depending on target category, we regressed suitability ratings on contrast-coded race (White = -1; Black = +1), contrast-coded gender (male = -1; female = +1), mean-centered racial prototypicality, mean-centered gender prototypicality, the race  $\times$  gender interaction, the race  $\times$  gender prototypicality interaction, the gender  $\times$  gender prototypicality interaction, and the race  $\times$  gender  $\times$  gender prototypicality interaction. Analysis revealed a significant effect of racial prototypicality,  $t(149) = 7.69, p < .001$ , and gender prototypicality,  $t(149) = 7.49, p < .001$ , such that more racially prototypic and gender prototypic targets were rated higher in suitability. No other effects from this model were statistically reliable,  $ts \leq 1.67, ps \geq .10$ .