

The Crossroads of Race and Sexuality

Date Selection Among Men in Internet “Personal” Ads

VOON CHIN PHUA
CUNY Graduate School

GAYLE KAUFMAN
Davidson College

The authors examine 2,400 personal ads from male advertisers collected from the Internet, focusing on issues of race and sexual orientation. They look at advertisers' desire for a partner of a particular race and the effect of their race and sexual orientation on their choices. The data indicate that Black, Hispanic, and Asian men are more likely than White men to have a race preference for a partner. Additionally, gay men are more likely to mention race than straight men. However, gay Black men and gay Hispanic men are less likely to have a race preference. The authors explain the differences in terms of race sensitivity and how preferences reflect the current racial hierarchy.

Keywords: *race; sexual orientation; date selection*

Personal ads have flourished over the years as a means of meeting potential dates and mates. The number of personal ads has increased in newspapers, magazines, and other periodicals. Additionally, the Internet provides a convenient and easily accessible outlet for personal ads. Increasingly, people have little time for more traditional modes of meeting. In contrast to traditional approaches to relationship initiation, personal ads allow advertisers “the opportunity to prescreen prospective dates” (Woll & Young, 1989, p. 487) without the awkwardness of in-person rejections.

Montini and Ovrebrot (1990) posit that those who place personal ads juggle a delicate balance of risk management and openness—“advertisers must be sufficiently ‘up front’ about what they want, while guarding themselves against risks” (p. 335). Framed using exchange theory, most studies of personal ads focus on the trading of traits, comparing what is sought after and what is presented, especially between men and women

Authors' Note: An earlier version of this article was presented at the 2000 American Sociological Association Meeting. We would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for helpful comments on earlier drafts. Direct correspondence to Gayle Kaufman, Department of Sociology, Davidson College, Davidson, North Carolina 28035 (gakaufman@davidson.edu).

JOURNAL OF FAMILY ISSUES, Vol. 24 No. 8, November 2003 981-994

DOI: 10.1177/0192513X03256607

© 2003 Sage Publications

(e.g., Yancey & Yancey, 1997). However, missing from this literature is comparative research on the intersection between race and sexual orientation in this mating ritual.

In this article, we explore issues of race and sexual orientation in a sample of 2,400 personal ads from male advertisers collected from the Internet. We look at advertisers' desire for a partner of a particular race and the effect of their own race and sexual orientation on their choices. We discuss our findings in terms of race sensitivity.

ATTRACTIVENESS AND RACE IN DATING CHOICES

In theorizing about mate selection, scholars focus on exchanges and trade-offs between mates. Studies show that people commodify traits such as education levels, beauty, age, personality, and wealth. For example, men are more likely to offer financial security in exchange for beauty (Weiderman, 1993). For some people, requests for certain traits in a mate, such as within a specific age range or educational level, are absolute. For others, a potential mate may be evaluated based on "the whole package," to decide whether some less desirable traits could be offset by other preferable characteristics.

Several studies report that men focus on physical characteristics and attractiveness in selecting a mate more than do women (Goode, 1996; South, 1991). More specifically, men who place personal ads are more likely to seek attractiveness than are women (Cicerello & Sheehan, 1995; Davis, 1990). In a study of video dating, thin women were more likely to receive requests for dates (Stack, 1996). Goode (1996) finds that men are more likely to respond to a personal ad placed by an attractive woman of low socioeconomic status than to one by an average-looking professional woman. A study of gay men also reports physical attractiveness to be the most important determinant of gay men's desire to continue dating a partner (Sergios & Cody, 1985). Men's emphasis on appearance of potential partners results in women and gay men spending more time on their appearance to be attractive. Among men, African Americans spend more time on appearance management than Asian or Caucasian men (Aune & Aune, 1994).

Race adds another dimension to the weighing of traits, particularly in a racialized society, such as the United States (e.g., Fu, 2001). Almaguer (1994) suggests a racial hierarchy in which Whites rank the highest and Blacks the lowest. Some argue that Whites may use race as a valuable commodity and trade it for minorities' achievements (e.g., high educa-

tional attainment or wealth). Additionally, it has been argued that the racial hierarchy favors Whites in intermarriage. For example, some studies show that certain ethnic groups "trade" financial and educational aspects of human capital for "Whites" in assortative mating (e.g., Blackwell & Lichter, 2000; Qian, 1997). Some scholars argue that interracial marriage usually indicates a minority's desire to assimilate into the larger American society. In some cases, it may include a deliberate attempt at social mobility within the racial structure. Ethnic groups with lower socioeconomic status tend to be more willing to date those outside their ethnic group (Johnson & Ogasawara, 1988). Meanwhile, a recent study finds that Blacks and Whites have higher rates of endogamy than Asians and Hispanics (Heaton & Jacobson, 2000).

In an earlier study of dating choices, Allen (1976) finds that Whites emphasize both race and attractiveness in locating a potential date. In fact, Whites group attractive Blacks with unattractive potential dates. Allen concludes, "race may be a stronger rival to attractiveness relative to the more abstract factors with which attractiveness has been compared, because race, like attractiveness, is highly concrete and visible" (p. 289). In another earlier study of Black and White heterosexual college males, Blacks were more likely to get involved in interracial sexual liaisons (Sebald, 1974). Those who date people from other ethnic groups may do so because they identify less with their own ethnicity or simply to increase the number of potential partners (Shibazaki & Brennan, 1998; Tucker & Mitchell-Kernan, 1995). Twine (1996) reports that the choice of a dating partner is indicative of multiracial students' racial identity. From their study of Hawaiian personal ads, Sakai and Johnson (1997) state that although most persons placing an ad mention their own race, few insist potential partners be the same race. The same study indicates that among those who specify their race in personal ads, Whites are less likely than non-Whites to request race. However, White men are more likely than White women to seek a partner of a different race. Additionally, non-Whites are more likely to seek other non-White partners than to seek White partners. This finding may reflect the uniqueness of Hawaii, the only state where Whites are the minority.

In contrast, Laner and Kamel (1977) find that most Whites look for Whites, and Tucker and Mitchell-Kernan (1995) report that Blacks and Latinos are more likely to date persons of other ethnicities. As with heterosexuals, race can be a significant factor for gay men who are more likely than lesbians to seek information about ethnicity (Deaux & Hanna, 1984; Hatala & Prehodka, 1996). Furthermore, Deaux and Hanna (1984)

indicate that gay men are more likely to mention their own race and request a specific race than either heterosexual men or women.

Preferences for homogamy are sometimes structurally reinforced through lack of exposure to people of different cultures and xenophobia. Nonetheless, a strong argument for homogamy is the comfort of sharing the same language and culture. Fewer cultural barriers form obstacles to communication and understanding between couples of similar ethnic or racial backgrounds.

RACIAL SENSITIVITY

In constructing personal ads, individuals promote their best traits and minimize the less desirable ones, if they are mentioned at all. At the same time, they make requests for desired characteristics in a potential date. Advertisers almost always state their own race in their personal ads (Sakai & Johnson, 1997). Whether or not preference for race of potential mates is mentioned in personal ads reflects advertisers' sensitivity to race. Those who are sensitized to race in mate selection will be more likely to mention a preference or to state that they have no preference. One might argue that those who do not mention a racial preference for a partner are truly race-blind in the selection of mates. It may also be that those who ignore race do not understand racial dynamics. As Esterberg (1997) suggests, "In an attempt to be color-blind, they end up ignoring the realities of racism" (p. 102). By not stating anything about race in their ads, advertisers are leaving it up to the interpretation of the readers. Given the race situation in the United States and the explicitness of other advertisers, readers of a different race may be less likely to respond to ads with no mention of race. In cases where readers have a strong race preference, they might take a chance and respond to the ad. However, from the perspective of the advertisers, it is likely that they may think that a person of another race would not respond to them because of cultural differences and/or lack of encouragement (e.g., the ad did not mention "all races are welcomed" or "race doesn't matter"). In other words, no mention of race may signal an assumption that responses will come from those of the same race. The more explicitly and clearly their desires are stated, the greater the chances they are to get what they desire. Stating a racial preference for potential mates reflects the advertisers' awareness of the racial dynamics and is interpreted here as an indicator of racial sensitivity. However, this does not imply that the advertiser will not consider a partner from another race if he or she proves to be somehow "exceptional."

On the basis of the studies reviewed here, we hypothesize that White men are less likely to mention race than are members of minorities. As the majority, Whites face fewer obstacles because of their race. They may not understand how critical race can be as a selection criterion. Thus, they may be less sensitized to the importance of mentioning the desired race of potential mates. Although whiteness may be viewed as a valuable trait and be traded for higher human capital traits in potential mates, some White advertisers may not wish to trade. Whether or not Whites are willing to trade race or other characteristics depends on whether they view their race as a compensatory or noncompensatory social asset (e.g., Harrison & Saeed, 1977). We also hypothesize that Blacks are more sensitive to race and thus are more likely to explicitly state a racial preference in their ads.

Additionally, we examine differences between men seeking men and men seeking women. An earlier study suggests that gay men are more explicit than straight men in goals desired and emphasize more specific physical characteristics (Laner & Kamel, 1977). Moreover, homosexual men are more likely to emphasize sexuality (Child, Low, McCormick, & Cocciarella, 1996). Thus, we hypothesize that men seeking men are more likely to state a racial preference than men seeking women.

DATA AND METHODS

Data were collected in the spring of 1999 from Yahoo personal ads. These personal ads are free and easily accessible to anyone with an Internet connection. Lynn and Bolig (1985) outlined three advantages to using personal ads in research on establishing relationships. One advantage is that those who are being studied do not know they are being studied. Second, personal ads have consequences for both those who place them and those who respond to them. Finally, those who place and respond to personal ads are more representative of the general population than those involved in experiments. Nevertheless, the argument has been made that there is a stigma attached to this mode of contacting potential partners (Darden & Koski, 1988). However, Lynn and Bolig state that there is a lack of evidence that those who use ads are actually different from the general population. Furthermore, Yahoo personal ads provide a national sample in which every state in the United States is represented. In this way, we utilize nonintrusive methods to explore a growing mode of date selection.

Systematic sampling was used to collect our sample. We first used the program available through Yahoo personal ads to sort the data by sex, sex-

ual orientation, and race. Then within each group, we systematically selected every other block of 10 ads until we reached the quota of 300 for each category—White men seeking men, White men seeking women, Black men seeking men, Black men seeking women, Asian men seeking men, Asian men seeking women, Hispanic men seeking men, and Hispanic men seeking women. Personal ads that were repeats were discarded and replaced by others. Through this process, we collected 2,400 personal ads.

Men seeking men and men seeking women may not necessarily indicate gay or straight identities, respectively (see Phua & Kaufman, 1999). For example, in the men seeking men section, most explicitly mention that they are gay, although some mention that they are married or that they are bisexual or straight. In contrast, very few men in the men seeking women section ever mention their sexual identity. However, men seeking men and men seeking women do indicate their sexual preference for a companion or sexual partner, which by definition of sexual behavior (though not in terms of identity) could be defined as gay or straight. Thus, for present purposes, we use men seeking men and “gay” and men seeking women and “straight” synonymously. We also use the term *sexual orientation* (gay or straight) to indicate the preferred sex of partners as reflected in the section in which their ads appeared.

Each advertiser filled out some basic information and was allowed to write additional text and provide a hyperlink to their website. We coded only the basic demographic information such as age, race, sexual orientation, religion, educational level, and state of residence from the questionnaire. Most substantive information was coded from the written text and the headline. Information such as weight and height were included in the questionnaire, but we coded them only if they were repeated in the written text. We assume that the written text reflects the effort to emphasize important characteristics presented and sought after (see Yancey & Yancey, 1998, for similar arguments). We should note that we have not edited quoted materials. Therefore, quotes may contain spelling and/or grammatical errors.

The dependent variable is the request for race or its absence. This includes the subcategories of requesting one’s own race only, requesting Whites only, requesting other minorities only, having a mixed preference, and specifically mentioning “no preference.” The advertisers’ race as an independent variable is measured with dummy variables for Black, Asian, and Hispanic, with White as the reference category. Sexual orientation is measured with a dummy variable for gay (men seeking men), with straight (men seeking women) as the reference category.

We also look at whether advertisers presented or requested the following information: interests/activities, explicit sexual requests, physical appearance (looks, specific body parts, color of hair and eyes, height and weight), financial status, gender roles (masculine or feminine), sexual roles (roles assumed in sexual acts, e.g., the aggressor), personality traits, and health status. Earlier studies indicate that these factors are important descriptives in personal ads—for example, age and sexual roles in Lee (1976); sexual roles and personalities in Cameron, Oskamp, and Sparks (1977); height, weight, and coloration in Lynn and Shurgot (1984); personalities, wealth, and beauty in Buss and Barnes (1986); and physical appearance and financial status in Hirschman (1987). In preliminary analyses, we tested individual characteristics, such as age, education, religion, interests or sexual acts, and health status, in predicting mentioning a race preference for a mate. We found that individually they do not add much to the explanatory power of the model when compared to their summary measures: revelations (mentioning traits) and stipulations (requesting traits) (Harrison & Saeed, 1977). Thus, we created two behavioral variables. Stipulations is an additive variable of the following requests: minimum and maximum ages, appearance, financial status, body parts, height, weight, personality traits, and eye, hair, or skin color. Revelations also is an additive variable of advertisers mentioning educational level, religion, age, interests, sexual acts, health status, and traditional values. We do, however, retain two individual variables, mentions of sexual roles (e.g., whether a person is the aggressor in sexual acts) and gender roles (e.g., mentions of masculinity and femininity), as they are related to issues of sexuality. Finally, we look at whether advertisers explicitly said “no” to anything. Advertisers who are vocal about what they do not like are likely to express a race preference if they have one.

We first provide a profile of advertisers in our sample by race and sexual orientation. Next, we examine the effects of selected variables on predicting whether advertisers mention a race preference in mate selection.

A PROFILE OF THE PERSONAL ADS

We profile the personal ads in terms of two major dimensions relating to our main focus: race and sexual orientation. Table 1 shows the mentioning or requesting of color (skin, hair, or eyes) and race preference in partners by the race and sexual orientation of advertisers.

TABLE 1
Distribution of Race-Related Factors Within Race
by Sexual Preference (in percentages)

	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Asian</i>	<i>Hispanic</i>
Men seeking women (<i>N</i> = 1,200)				
Mention color	17	11	7	12
Request color	0	2	1	1
Request race	9	36	20	20
Own race only	3	8	7	7
Whites only	3	5	3	2
Other minorities only	2	3	0	0
Mixed preference	1	3	5	3
No preference	4	17	5	7
Men seeking men (<i>N</i> = 1,200)				
Mention color	31	20	16	30
Request color	3	3	2	3
Request race	27	55	54	30
Own race only	14	19	8	4
Whites only	14	13	31	7
Other minorities only	6	2	0	3
Mixed preference	2	8	11	10
No preference	5	14	5	3

TABLE 2

COLOR

Mentioning one's own skin, eye, or hair color is more prevalent than requesting them (see Table 1). Gay men are more likely than straight men to request a particular skin, eye, or hair color and to mention their own color. Gay White and Hispanic men are most likely to mention their skin, eye or hair color. Notably, their mentioning of these traits emphasizes their whiteness. Gay White men mostly mention their blond hair and blue eyes whereas gay Hispanic men focus on the lightness of their skin and their nonblack hair and eyes. An example is a gay Hispanic man who highlights the fact that he is a "light skin Hispanic (but people pass me for white)" (LMM485—Latino man seeking man).

RACE

Within each racial group, men seeking men are more likely to request race than men seeking women. Over half of Black and Asian men seeking men specify a race preference. Although gay White men are least likely

among men seeking men to request race, they are three times more likely than straight White men to request race.

In addition to differences by sexual orientation, there are differences by race in indicating racial preferences for a potential partner. In general, minorities are more likely than Whites to specify a race preference. Regardless of sexual orientation, Blacks are most likely to mention a race preference for their partners—55% of men seeking men and 36% of men seeking women. Furthermore, Blacks are most likely to request that a partner be of the same race, with 19% of Black men seeking men requesting Black men only. In contrast, only 3% of White men seeking women specify White women only. However, Blacks are also most likely to write that they have no racial preference.

Regardless of sexual orientation, minority men are unlikely to prefer a different minority race. Blacks are the least preferred minority race, which reinforces the image of their race being lowest in the United States race hierarchy. One gay Black man laments that “it’s hard for me to find a date because most men aren’t interested in black men and they’re entitled to their opinion” (BMM33—Black man seeking man). Among gay minority men, Whites appear to be a common preference. Thirty-one percent of Asian men seeking men specify a preference for White men only whereas just 3% of Asian men seeking women request White women only. In the mixed preference category, most advertisers request either their race or Whites.

THE CROSSROADS OF RACE AND SEXUALITY

Logistic regression analysis was used to predict the probability of advertisers’ mentioning a racial criterion as opposed to ignoring race in their partner selection (see Table 2). Advertisers’ race and sexual orientation have strong effects in predicting whether they have a race preference for partners. Black, Hispanic, and Asian men are all more likely than White men to mention a race preference for their partners. As hypothesized, Blacks are most likely to mention a race preference. In fact, Blacks are almost 6 times more likely than Whites to specify a race preference.¹ Asians are 2.8 times and Hispanics 2.5 times more likely than Whites to request race. Hispanics are the least likely to mention a race preference for partners among minorities; yet they are most likely to emphasize their whiteness in appearance, especially among gay men. Perhaps among minorities they have higher chances of being considered Whites both because of appearances and because of overlapping classification of His-

Probability of Requesting Race in Personal Advertisements

	<i>Coefficient</i>	SE
Race (reference: White)		
Black	1.77***	0.24
Asian	1.04***	0.25
Hispanic	0.93***	0.26
Sexual preference (reference: MSW)		
MSM	0.76**	0.26
Interaction effects		
Black × MSM	-0.37	0.30
Asian × MSM	0.23	0.32
Hispanic × MSM	-0.63*	0.32
Gender roles	0.17	0.14
Sex roles	0.16	0.15
Stipulations	0.42***	0.03
Revelations	0.05	0.06
Say no to anything	0.24*	0.11
Constant	-3.28***	0.29
Pseudo R^2	0.17	

NOTE: MSM = men seeking men; MSW = men seeking women.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

panic as an ethnic group and White as a race. Mentions, for example, that one is a White Cuban (and similar claims) are not uncommon in our data.

There is a significant difference in race preference by sexual orientation. Gay men are over twice as likely to mention race than straight men. This provides support for our hypothesis. As shown by Laner and Kamel (1977), gay men are more explicit than straight men about their desires in a partner. Thus, it is not surprising that gay men are more vocal about their race preference when they have one.

However, being Black or Hispanic *and* gay reduces the probability of having a race preference, even though the interaction effect is significant only for being gay and Hispanic. Hispanic as an ethnic category is more fluid than Asian or Black as racial categories. Hispanics can be of any race.

Mentioning sexual or gender roles has no statistically significant impact on predicting whether advertisers mention a race preference for potential partners. However, because of data constraints, we did not look specifically at whether mentioning or requesting masculinity or femininity is associated with race preferences in partners. A future study might examine sexual stereotyping by race.

Not surprising, the more requests advertisers make, the higher the likelihood they are to request for race. Advertisers who mention a race prefer-

ence make on average 2.8 requests for other traits, whereas those who do not mention any race preference make on average only 1.5 requests. Stipulations is a strategy used to narrow the search. Those who focus on physical appearance may have visualizations of what a potential partner should look like. Thus, they may create racial profiles and increase their mentioning of a race preference.

The amount of information advertisers reveal about themselves is not statistically significant in predicting whether they mention a race preference in their ads. This is true even when tested individually (data available on request). The average number of traits mentioned for advertisers with a race preference in a partner is 3.4 and 3.5 for others, a negligible difference. However, being vocal about what advertisers do not want has a positive effect. Similar to requesting for traits, saying no to certain traits is associated with advertisers' willingness to be specific. Thus, if and when race is an issue, a preference is likely to be raised.

DISCUSSION

Race remains a critical issue in mate selection in the United States. The findings of this study confirm our hypothesis that White men are less likely to mention a race preference than members of minorities. It would appear that minority men are more sensitive to race than are White men, probably due to their experiences as minorities. Racial relationships may have conditioned the perception of individuals and colored their views toward what constitutes desirable qualities. In a racialized society, race becomes commodified and traded in the dating/mating market.

Blacks are most likely to mention a race preference. They are also more likely to mention phrases such as "all races are welcome." For example, some advertisers, especially Black men, mention that they do not have a race preference or that all races are welcome to respond. One straight Black man insists, "Please keep in mind that I am looking for a woman not a color, so all may reply" (BMW213—Black man seeking woman) and a gay Black man explains that "the color of a person's skin is NOT in issue with me. As far as I am concerned, we were all created by the same CREATOR (Can I get a witness here?)" (BMM425—Black man seeking man).

Our descriptive data suggest that minorities' racial preference in a partner reflects the racial hierarchy. Most advertisers prefer either their own race or Whites, and least prefer Blacks, regardless of sexual orientation. Exceptions exist; some minorities explicitly do not want Whites. For example, some gay Black men specifically state "no white men"

(BMM76—Black man seeking man) or “NO WHITE BOYS” (BMM97—Black man seeking man). Another straight Black man insists that “[HE] DONT WANT A WHITE WOMAN WHO THINKS SHE’S BLACK” (BMW45—Black man seeking woman). A gay Asian man emphasizes that he is looking for “a gAm-not a gWm” (AMM55—Asian man seeking man), where gAm means gay Asian man and gWm stands for gay White man. Some do not date people of the same race as illustrated by these three Black men seeking women: “I do not date any BLACK WOMEN!” (BMW117—Black man seeking woman); “I’m looking for any women not black because my sisters have too much attitude” (BMW46—Black man seeking woman); and “NO HATE MAIL FROM BLACK WOMEN” (BMW27—Black man seeking woman). Finally, some specifically exclude a particular race or ethnicity: “Latinoes, Hispanic, African American Welcome NO Chinese Please” (BMM322—Black man seeking man).

Our finding that gay men mention race more often than straight men but that being gay and Black or Hispanic actually reduces the likelihood of mentioning race points out a complex relationship between race and sexuality. The interaction of two minority statuses, those of race and sexual orientation, may produce a desire to avoid limiting categories. On the other hand, gay White men may simply be more interested in experimenting with other races.

Some advertisers are both specific and absolute about their preference for a particular race. Preferences for minorities often are tinted with stereotypical images: Asians as exotic, docile, loyal partners; Hispanics as passionate, fiery lovers; and Blacks as “well-endowed,” forbidden partners. Future studies might delve deeper into such preferences to examine the issue of race exclusivity and how it relates to racism and to the sexual stereotypical objectification of ethnicity.

NOTE

1. Odds ratios can be calculated by using the formula $e^{\text{coefficient}}$.

REFERENCES

- Allen, B. P. (1976). Race and physical attractiveness as criteria for White subjects' dating choices. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 4, 289-296.
- Almaguer, T. (1994). *Racial fault lines: The historical origins of White supremacy in California*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

- Aune, R. K., & Aune, K. S. (1994). The influence of culture, gender, and relational status on appearance management. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 25*, 258-272.
- Blackwell, D. L., & Lichter, D. T. (2000). Mate selection among married and cohabiting couples. *Journal of Family Issues, 21*, 275-302.
- Buss, D. M., & Barnes, M. (1986). Preferences in human mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 50*, 559-570.
- Cameron, C., Oskamp, S., & Sparks, W. (1977). Courtship American style: Newspaper ads. *The Family Coordinator, 26*, 27-30.
- Child, M., Low, K. G., McCormick, C. M., & Cocciarella, A. (1996). Personal advertisements of male-to-female transsexuals, homosexual men, and heterosexuals. *Sex Roles, 34*, 447-455.
- Cicerello, A., & Sheehan, E. P. (1995). Personal advertisements: A content analysis. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10*, 751-756.
- Darden, D. K., & Koski, P. R. (1988). Using the personals ads: A deviant activity. *Deviant Behavior, 9*, 383-400.
- Davis, S. (1990). Men as success objects and women as sex objects: A study of personal advertisements. *Sex Roles, 23*, 43-50.
- Deaux, K., & Hanna, R. (1984). Courtship in the personals column: The influence of gender and sexual orientation. *Sex Roles, 11*, 363-375.
- Esterberg, K. G. (1997). *Lesbian and bisexual identities: Constructing communities, constructing selves*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- Fu, V. K. (2001). Racial intermarriage pairings. *Demography, 38*, 147-159.
- Goode, E. (1996). Gender and courtship entitlement: Responses to personal ads. *Sex Roles, 34*, 141-169.
- Harrison, A. A., & Saeed, L. (1977). Let's make a deal: An analysis of revelations and stipulations in lonely hearts advertisements. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35*, 257-264.
- Hatala, M. K., & Prehodka, J. (1996). Content analysis of gay male and lesbian personal advertisements. *Psychological Reports, 78*, 371-374.
- Heaton, T. B., & Jacobson, C. K. (2000). Intergroup marriage: An examination of opportunity structures. *Sociological Inquiry, 70*, 30-41.
- Hirschman, E. C. (1987). People as products: Analysis of a complex marketing exchange. *Journal of Marketing, 51*, 98-108.
- Johnson, R. C., & Ogasawara, G. M. (1988). Within- and across-group dating in Hawaii. *Social Biology, 35*, 103-109.
- Laner, M. R., & Kamel, G. W. L. (1977). Media mating I: Newspaper "personals" ads of homosexual men. *Journal of Homosexuality, 3*, 149-162.
- Lee, J. A. (1976). Forbidden colors of love: Patterns of gay love and gay liberation. *Journal of Homosexuality, 1*, 401-418.
- Lynn, M., & Bolig, R. (1985). Personal advertisements: Sources of data about relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 2*, 377-383.
- Lynn, M., & Shurgot, B. A. (1984). Responses to lonely hearts advertisements: Effects of reported physical attractiveness, physique, and coloration. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 10*, 349-357.
- Montini, T., & Ovrebø, B. (1990). Personal relationship ads: An informal balancing act. *Sociological Perspectives, 33*, 327-339.
- Phua, V. C., & Kaufman, G. (1999). Using the census to profile same-sex cohabitation: A research note. *Population Research and Policy Review, 18*, 373-386.

- Qian, Z. (1997). Breaking the racial barriers: Variations in interracial marriage between 1980 and 1990. *Demography*, *34*, 263-276.
- Sakai, D. K., & Johnson, R. C. (1997). Active phenotypic assortment in mate selection: Self-descriptions and sought-for attributes of mates in dating advertisements. *Social Biology*, *44*, 258-264.
- Sebald, H. (1974). Patterns of interracial dating and sexual liaison of White and Black college men. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, *4*, 23-36.
- Sergios, P. A., & Cody, J. (1985). Physical attractiveness and social assertiveness skills in male homosexual dating behavior and partner selection. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *125*, 505-514.
- Shibazaki, K., & Brennan, K. A. (1998). When birds of different feathers flock together: A preliminary comparison of intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic dating relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *15*, 248-256.
- South, S. J. (1991). Sociodemographic differentials in mate selection preferences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *53*, 928-940.
- Stack, S. (1996). The effect of physical attractiveness on video dating outcomes. *Sociological Focus*, *29*, 83-85.
- Tucker, M. B., & Mitchell-Kernan, C. (1995). Social structural and psychological correlates of interethnic dating. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *12*, 341-361.
- Twine, F. W. (1996). Heterosexual alliances: The romantic management of racial identity. In M. Root (Ed.), *The multiracial experience: Racial borders as the new frontier* (pp. 291-304). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Wiederman, M. W. (1993). Evolved gender differences in mate preferences: Evidence from personal advertisements. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, *14*, 331-351.
- Woll, S., & Young, P. (1989). Looking for Mr. or Ms. Right: Self-presentation in videodating. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *51*, 483-488.
- Yancey, G., & Yancey, S. (1997). Black-White differences in the use of personal advertisements for individuals seeking interracial relationships. *Journal of Black Studies*, *27*, 650-667.
- Yancey, G., & Yancey, S. (1998). Interracial dating: Evidence from personal advertisements. *Journal of Family Issues*, *19*, 334-348.