



SCAN ME

Do you want to date a vegetarian? We know the answer.

Verification report of Adamczyk et al. (2024) ¹

By Vijlbrief & Zweistra

Research question and conclusions

The study in question examined how dissimilarity in diet (eating vs not eating meat) affects the attractiveness of a potential dating partner among meat-eaters. They reached the following **conclusions**:

1. Being a vegetarian made a person less attractive as a potential dating partner.
2. The control diet was evaluated most positively, and the vegetarian for health reasons the least positively (least dateable, gender congruent, masculine and feminine).
3. Men who were vegetarians for ethical reasons were perceived less positively than women who were vegetarians.
4. Identification as a meat-eater influenced the evaluation of the target

Target findings by Adamczyk et al. (2024)

The target finding that we wished to reproduce was a series of **ANOVAs** and their corresponding **post-hoc** and **contrast** analyses. The ANOVAs consisted of an F-test with p-value and an effect size by means of a partial eta squared. They tested the effects of diet and sex on the variables 'general likeability', 'willingness to date', 'gender congruence', 'masculine traits' and 'feminine traits'. The ANOVAs and their post-hoc results were used as support for conclusions **2.** and **3.**. The contrast analysis is their basis for conclusion **1.**. Conclusion **4.** was done through a series of ANCOVA which we did not perform.

Target findings by Vijlbrief & Zweistra (2025)

We aimed to reproduce their target findings for conclusions 1-3. Our verification analysis produced largely similar results. We found small differences for most F-values and p-values but only two p-values had a difference of larger than .02 (**Table 3**). The only result that was of concern was the main effect of sex on the Masculinity variable. We found a difference of .05 in the p-value which led to a **significance reversal** from significant to insignificant. We found no differences in any of their interaction effects nor their effect sizes which are thus not included in the table below.

Post hoc Pairwise T-test	Control	Eco	Health	Ethics
Our findings	P = .95	P = .12	P = .83	P = .001
Difference with original	0	0.01	0.03	0.003

Table 1. ↑ Post-hoc comparison of general attitudes.

Test of contrasts	Estimate	SE	P value
-control + veg	-1.08	0.457	0.018

Table 2. ↑ Test of contrasts for the Willingness to date ANOVA. The control target was seen as more dateable than the vegetarian conditions.

Table 3. → Table 1 provides an overview of the ANOVAs by Adamczyk et al. and the verification thereof by Vijlbrief and Zweistra. In the right most column differences between the original and verified numbers are reported.

dependent variable	Independent variable	Adamczyk et al. (2024)	Vijlbrief & Zweistra (2025)	Differences
General likeability	Diet	F(3, 396) = 5.37 p = .001*	F(3, 396) = 5.36 p = .001*	F() = -0.01
	Sex	F(3, 396) ≤ 1	F(1, 396) ≤ 1	F(-2,)
Willingness to date	Diet	F(3, 396) = 2.67 p = .047	F(3, 396) = 2.70 p = .045	F() = +0.03 p = -0.002
	Sex	F(3, 396) = 1.02 p = .383	F(1, 396) = 0.982 p = .322	F(-2,) = -0.038 p = -.061
Gender congruence	Diet	F(3, 396) = 7.11 p < .001*	F(3,396) = 7.30 p = <.001*	F() = -0.19
	Sex	F(3, 396) = 16.23 p < .001*	F(1, 396) = 16.14 p = <.001*	F(-2,) = -0.09
Masculine traits	Diet	F(3, 396) = 3.01 p = .030*	F(3,396) = 3.05 p = .029*	F() = +0.04 p = -0.01
	Sex	F(3, 396) = 3.57 p = .014*	F(1, 396) = 3.46 p = .064	F(-2) = -0.11 p = +0.05 significance reversal
Feminine traits	Diet	F(3, 396) = 4.95 p = .002*	F(3,396) = 5.00 p = .002*	F() = 0.05
	Sex	F(3, 396) = 8.21 p < .001*	F(1, 396) = 8.00 p = .005*	F(-2) = -0.21 p = >+.004

Reproducing the conclusions

We were able to reproduce 2 out of 3 investigated conclusions.

Conclusion 1. we were able to verify using the contrast analysis. Our results showed that willingness to date was lower for the vegetarian condition than the control condition (**Table 2.**).

Conclusion 2. was not verified through post-hoc tests. The control condition did have the highest mean in all variables except feminine traits but did not differ significantly from eco or health in any variable other than gender congruence. Health was indeed the lowest in all mentioned variables but often only differed significantly from the control condition.

Conclusion 3. was verified through the significant post-hoc test of differences between general likeability per diet and sex (**Table 1.**).

The verification process

During the reproduction we ran into several issues.

Issue 1. We had to make a fair number of assumptions before we could reproduce their analyses (for example: equal variances).

Issue 2. There was no information on what software was used to analyse the data.

Issue 3. Limited information was available on constructed variables, such as willingness to date and variable labels.

Issue 4. A lack of structure in the analyses performed, such as missing contrast tests for one ANOVA.

Takeaways

- Publish syntax files or analysis code
- Copy numerical values carefully from software to text editor
- Communicate assumptions clearly
- Stick to an analysis plan and argue why you omit certain analyses
- Word conclusions carefully
- Clearer links between analysis results and conclusions

References

1. Adamczyk, D., Nezlek, J. B., & Maison, D. (2024). Dating a vegetarian? Perception of masculinity, attractiveness, and the willingness to date vegetarians. *Social Psychological Bulletin*, 19. <https://doi.org/10.32872/spb.14457>

AI-statement

We did not make use of AI tools.