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 × gender interaction, the race × racial prototypicality interaction, the gender × racial prototypicality interaction, and the race × gender × 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 × 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 × 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 × 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 × gender × 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 × gender interaction, the race × gender prototypicality interaction, the gender × gender prototypicality interaction, and the race × gender × 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 ≤ 1.67, ps $\geq .10$.