

Reasons of Singles for Being Single: Evidence from Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Japan and the UK

Cross-Cultural Research

1–32

© 2021 SAGE Publications

Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/10693971211021816

journals.sagepub.com/home/ccr



**Menelaos Apostolou¹, Béla Birkás²,
Caio Santos A. da Silva³, Gianluca Esposito^{4,5},
Rafael Ming Chi S. Hsu³, Peter Karl Jonason^{6,7},
Konstantinos Karamanidis¹, Jiaqing O⁸,
Yohsuke Ohtsubo⁹, Ádám Putz²,
Daniel Sznycer¹⁰, Andrew G. Thomas¹¹,
Jaroslava Varella Valentova³,
Marco Antonio Correa Varella³,
Karel Kleisner¹², Jaroslav Flegr^{12,13},
and Yan Wang¹⁴**

¹University of Nicosia, Cyprus

²University of Pécs, Hungary

³University of São Paulo, Brazil

⁴Nanyang Technological University, Singapore

⁵University of Trento, Italy

⁶University of Padova, Italy

⁷Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński University in Warsaw, Warszawa, Poland

⁸Aberystwyth University, UK

⁹University of Tokyo, Japan

¹⁰University of Montreal, QC, Canada

¹¹Swansea University, Wales, UK

¹²Charles University, Prague, Czechia

¹³National Institute of Mental Health, Klecany, Czechia

¹⁴Fudan University, Shanghai, China

Corresponding Author:

Menelaos Apostolou, Department of Social Sciences, University of Nicosia, 46 Makedonitissas Avenue, Nicosia 1700, Cyprus.

Email: m.apostolou@gmail.com

Abstract

The current research aimed to examine the reasons people are single, that is, not in an intimate relationship, across eight different countries—Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Japan, and the UK. We asked a large cross-cultural sample of single participants ($N = 6,822$) to rate 92 different possible reasons for being single. These reasons were classified into 12 factors, including one's perceived inability to find the right partner, the perception that one is not good at flirting, and the desire to focus on one's career. Significant sex and age effects were found for most factors. The extracted factors were further classified into three separate domains: Perceived poor capacity to attract mates, desiring the freedom of choice, and currently being in between relationships. The domain structure, the relative importance of each factor and domain, as well as sex and age effects were relatively consistent across countries. There were also important differences however, including the differing effect sizes of sex and age effects between countries.

Keywords

singlehood, evolutionary mismatch, mating, cross-cultural research

Introduction

In most studied human cultures individuals typically form romantic bonds with another person (Fletcher et al., 2015). Nevertheless, a considerable proportion of people living in contemporary societies are single, that is, they do not have an intimate partner (Cherlin, 2009; DePaulo & Morris, 2005). To use one example, it has been found that, between one in four and one in three Americans were not in an intimate relationship (Pew Research Center, 2013; Rosenfeld et al., 2015). The relatively high prevalence of singlehood raises the question about its causes, and the current paper aims to examine the reasons why people are not in any form of romantic relationship, in eight different countries. These reasons could be better understood within an evolutionary theoretical framework that will be discussed next.

Explaining Singlehood

Previous studies have proposed four main reasons why people are single: (1) fitness advantages (i.e., singlehood could potentially increase one's reproductive success); (2) the result of evolutionary mismatch; (3) issues due to

one's own constraints; (4) and because one is currently in between relationships (Apostolou, 2015, 2017; Apostolou et al., 2019). In more detail, where one's fitness is concerned, it was theorized that it could potentially be beneficial for young people to divert their limited resources in acquiring a good education and a good job than in attracting and keeping a mate (Apostolou et al., 2020). As these traits are typically highly valued in the mating market (Buss, 2017), the proposition was such that they could serve to enhance their attractiveness to high quality mates at a later stage of their lives. In addition, individuals who possess traits such as good looks, which are highly valued in a casual mate (Buss & Schmitt, 2019), can benefit by remaining single and having casual sex with different partners instead of committing to an intimate relationship (Perilloux et al., 2013).

Separately, the evolutionary mismatch theorization would suggest that the psychological mechanisms involved in mating have evolved in a context where mate choice was regulated or dictated. Anthropological, historical, and phylogenetic evidence has indicated that, in ancestral pre-industrial societies, the prevalent mode of long-term mating was arranged marriage (Apostolou, 2007, 2010, 2012). Parents would negotiate with other families the marriage of their children with limited input from the latter (Coontz, 2005). In addition, several lines of evidence have likewise indicated that raids and wars were frequent in ancestral human societies, and they would often result in the winning males monopolizing access to women in the group that was conquered (Puts, 2010, 2016).

Although people generally have relatively unrestricted freedom with regard to mate choice in contemporary postindustrial societies, the transition from a preindustrial to a postindustrial context has taken place too rapidly evolutionarily-speaking, for selection forces to adjust mating-related mechanisms adequately to suit the demands of the free mate choice context. As a consequence, several of these adaptations fail to produce fitness-enhancing outcomes. This mismatch problem (Crawford, 1998; Li et al., 2017) has been proposed to be one of the main reasons for singlehood (Apostolou, 2015, 2017; see also Goetz et al., 2019).

In addition, personal constraints such as poor physical and mental health, could similarly prevent people from attracting a partner. The presence of such issues might be regarded as undesirable in a prospective partner (see Buss, 2017), or they could have made it difficult to find a mate because such factors could deprive people of the resources needed for being successful in the mating market. Nevertheless, even if people do not face any difficulties in attracting and retaining mates, they may still be single due to a variety of other reasons. Partners might have been unfaithful, or have passed on, or they might have decided to terminate a relationship on their own accord because

their mate value has increased, or that their partners' mate value has decreased over time and it has prompted them to find a new partner of a higher mate value (Buss et al., 2017).

Demographic differences. Humans mate predominantly within pair-bonds where both sexes invest heavily in the relationship and offspring. As a result, both men and women tend to be highly selective about their partners (Stewart-Williams & Thomas, 2013). Thus, we expect pickiness to drive singlehood in both sexes as part of long-term mating strategy (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). However, while the typical levels of parental investment are high for both sexes, their obligatory levels of investment are asymmetrical—men can, and sometimes do, sire children with very little investment (Trivers, 1972). Over time, this asymmetry has led men to evolve a propensity toward uncommitted sex and sexual variety as part of their short-term mating strategy, whereas short-term strategies for women emphasize securing investment and good genes (Buss, 2017; Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Assuming that these reasons are at least in part cognitively accessible, we may expect men and women who are drawn to short-term mating to give qualitatively different reasons for staying single—with men emphasizing that a long-term intimate relationship causes them to forgo mating opportunities with women.

Some of the reasons for singlehood are also likely to differ with age; in addition to the greater need of younger individuals to build up their acquisitions first as indicated previously, developing good flirting skills in order to attract a relatively high value mate also requires having a range of different romantic experiences over an extended period of time, predicting a greater tendency among younger individuals to remain single. Nevertheless, because some older adults might encounter constraints such as a serious health issue or the existence of children from previous relationships, they might also more likely to be single.

Current Literature

The first comprehensive study on this topic with Greek-speaking participants (Apostolou, 2017) identified 76 reasons for being single and, classified them into 16 broad factors, including “difficulties with relationship initiation,” “preference for the freedom to flirt around,” and “mistrust of other individuals.” Subsequently, these factors were classified into three broader domains namely, “Difficulties with relationships,” “Freedom of choice,” and “Constraints.” Consistent with our theoretical framework here, the first factor reflected the mismatch problem, the second singlehood being beneficial for one's fitness, and the third issues due to one's own constraints. Men were

predictably found to desire singlehood for the freedom to flirt around, and women were more likely to prefer singlehood if they had negative experiences in a previous relationship. As expected, younger people tended to remain single for the freedom to flirt around, while older people tended to be single if they had a health problem and/or children from previous relationships.

A more recent study combined the reasons identified by Apostolou (2017) with the reasons identified by a qualitative study that analyzed Reddit responses (Apostolou, 2019) into a comprehensive list of 92 reasons for singlehood (Apostolou et al., 2020). Based on the responses of a sample of American participants, it classified these reasons in 18 broad factors. In turn, these factors were classified in four broader domains, namely “Low capacity for courtship,” “Freedom,” “Constraints from previous relationships,” and “Personal constraints.” Consistent with our theoretical framework, the first domain reflected the mismatch problem, the second the fitness benefits of being single, and the third and fourth factors people’s constraints. It was also found that men were more likely than women to indicate that they were single in order to be free to flirt around, and because they were not into family-making. Younger were more likely than older people to indicate that they were single because they had poor flirting skills, and because they did not like commitment. Finally, studies conducted in the Greek and Chinese cultural contexts, have found that about one in five people who were single, were between relationships; that is, they have recently exited a relationship and had not found yet another partner (Apostolou & Wang, 2019; Apostolou et al., 2019).

The Present Research

Taken together, the existing literature has thus far provided broad support for the leading theorizations of singlehood, while at the same time reinforcing the notion that singlehood is a complex phenomenon with many facets. To our knowledge, Apostolou et al. (2020) study, is the only one conducted to date that was based on an attempt to understand the reasons for singlehood among people who were actually single. The current study, aims to advance this line of work by examining the reasons for being single in different cultural contexts. Such endeavor is important in light of the possibility that cultural variations across nations might exist, and hence a cross-cultural examination of the factor structure is imperative in order to ascertain if the findings are generalizable universally. Examining differences and similarities between disparate cultures also allow us to understand to what extent aspects

of our mating psychology are static or highly canalized, and which are more sensitive to local cues (Thomas et al., 2020).

We predict that the main reasons for being single would be largely consistent across cultures. On the other hand, cultural factors are expected to affect the reasons for singlehood in some respects. For instance, some cultures tend to place more emphasis on getting a good education and having a good career than others, and we would thus expect that, people would be more likely to be single in those cultures so as to pursue education and career goals. On this basis, we predict that differences in the reasons for being single would arise between cultures.

Methods

Participants

Overall, 6,822 men and women from eight different countries (Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, India, Japan, and the UK) took part in the study. All studies were conducted online, and participants were recruited using a variety of different survey platforms including MTurk (India), the Cross Marketing Inc. (Japan), Prolific Inc., a University's participants' pool, and by word of mouth (UK), Facebook and other social media platforms (Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, and Hungary), and through lists of participants from previous studies who have agreed to be contacted for future studies, and via a call for participants that was published in the university's journal (Brazil). Participants in the Indian and Japanese samples, and some from the UK sample who participated via Prolific, did receive monetary reimbursement for their participation. UK participants who were recruited through the participants' pool received course credits, while those that were recruited through word of mouth did not receive any reimbursement just like those from Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, and Hungary.

All participants were at least 18 years old, and they had to be single (i.e., not currently in any form of romantic relationship) in order to be eligible to participate. The entries of those participants who indicated that they were not single, were not retained. The demographic information for each sample is presented in Table 1.

Materials

In order to measure the reasons for singlehood, we employed the 92-item instrument developed by Apostolou et al. (2020). For the Indian and the UK samples, the English version of the instrument was used. For the samples in

Table I. Demographic Information for the Eight Samples.

| Countries | Sample size | | | | Age | | Sexual orientation | | | | | |
|----------------|-------------|-------|-------|---------------|---------------|-------|--------------------|---|--------------|--|----------------|--|
| | Total | | Men | Women | Men | Women | Heterosexual (%) | Heterosexual with same-sex attraction (%) | Bisexual (%) | Homosexual with opposite-sex attractions (%) | Homosexual (%) | |
| | Women | Men | | | | | | | | | | |
| Total | 6,822 | 4,007 | 2,815 | 27.20 (9.14) | 28.29 (9.82) | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2,285 | 1,493 | 792 | 27.19 (8.24) | 25.32 (7.13) | | 65.5 | 19.8 | 4.2 | 4.4 | 6.1 | |
| China | 1,247 | 753 | 494 | 21.72 (3.26) | 22.03 (4.21) | | 86.8 | — | 8.0 | — | 5.2 | |
| Czech Republic | 909 | 552 | 357 | 28.94 (8.84) | 30.14 (8.87) | | 71.0 | 20.1 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 4.3 | |
| Greece | 708 | 379 | 329 | 30.01 (9.63) | 31.08 (9.77) | | — | — | — | — | — | |
| Hungary | 393 | 267 | 126 | 25.72 (8.37) | 25.21 (6.36) | | 81.2 | 12.7 | 2.8 | 1.8 | 1.5 | |
| India | 465 | 315 | 150 | 27.13 (4.97) | 28.27 (4.73) | | 69.2 | 6.2 | 17.8 | 1.9 | 4.7 | |
| Japan | 478 | 225 | 253 | 42.05 (13.01) | 46.26 (10.76) | | 88.9 | 5.2 | 3.6 | 2.7 | 3.9 | |
| UK | 337 | 188 | 149 | 22.98 (5.87) | 26.50 (7.51) | | 70.0 | 21.1 | 2.4 | 0.8 | 1.5 | |

Note. The Chinese study did not distinguish between heterosexual and heterosexual with same-sex attractions, and homosexual and homosexual with opposite-sex attraction. In addition, the Greek study did not record sexual orientation.

Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, and Japan, the instrument was translated into the native language. Back translation method was used, in the Chinese, Greek, and Japanese sample. The survey consisted of two parts. In the first part, participants were asked to indicate to what extent each of the 92 reasons contributed to their singlehood, using a five-point Likert scale (1—Strongly agree, 5—Strongly disagree). The order of presentation was randomized across participants. In the second part, demographic characteristics were collected.

Result

Factor Structure

Our first step was to classify the 92 reasons into broader factors. For this purpose, we employed principal components analysis on the pooled sample using the direct oblimin as the rotation method. The KMO statistic indicated that our sample was very good for principal components analysis to be performed (KMO=0.98). On the basis of the Kaiser criterion (Eigenvalue > 1), 12 factors were extracted (see Table 2). In order to classify these factors into broader domains, second-order principal components analysis was performed. In particular, 12 new variables were created, which reflected the mean of each extracted factor. Subsequently, principal components analysis was performed on these variables, using direct oblimin as the rotation method. Using the Kaiser criterion (Eigenvalue > 1), three domains have been extracted (see Table 2).

Next, we examined whether the domain structure was similar across countries. For this purpose, we ran confirmatory factor analysis using the maximum likelihood method separately on each sample. In Table 3 we present three goodness of fit estimates, namely the RMSEA, the CFI, and the SRMR. The RMSEA indicated that the model did not make a good fit, while the CFI and SRMR indicated that in most cases the model was a good fit. For instance, the SRMR was above 0.9 in six cases, and very close to it in two cases.

The “Poor capacity to attract mates” was the first domain to emerge, which included the “I am not good at flirting” factor—people indicated that they were single because they felt they were having difficulties attracting prospective mates due to their shyness, lack of flirting skills, introversion, and their perceived inability to detect clues of interest. The next factor to load on this domain was the “Poor achievement record,” which highlighted people’s reasons for their singlehood status in relation to their perceived lack of achievements and poor financial health. The “Poor looks” and the “Sexual and psychological problems” were two other factors that made up this domain.

Table 2. Classification of the Reasons for Staying Single in Factors and Domains Using the Pooled Sample.

| Domains | Factors | Reasons | Factor loadings-first order | Factor loadings-second order |
|---------|---------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | Poor capacity to attract mates | | 0.938 |
| | | I am not good at flirting | 0.830 | |
| | | I am shy | 0.766 | |
| | | I am not good in flirting | 0.742 | |
| | | I am very introverted | 0.726 | |
| | | I am terrible at picking up on signals | 0.647 | |
| | | I am socially awkward | 0.625 | |
| | | I do not know how to start a relationship | 0.561 | |
| | | I do not feel confident | 0.532 | |
| | | I do not make any effort or make any moves to attract a potential partner | 0.463 | |
| | | I get high anxiety around women/men | 0.452 | |
| | | I am a boring individual | 0.415 | |
| | | I am not good in relationships | 0.381 | |
| | | I am single because I believe that nobody wants to be with me | | 0.820 |
| | | Poor achievement record | 0.497 | |
| | | I have not achieved much in life and I do not think I am attractive as a mate | 0.455 | |
| | | My financial situation prevents me from having a relationship | | 0.767 |
| | | Poor looks | | |
| | | Because of my weight | -0.488 | |
| | | I am not good looking | -0.401 | |
| | | I had many failures and I have given up trying | -0.398 | |
| | | I do not feel ready to start a relationship | 0.358 | |
| | | I have not accumulated enough experiences to commit to a relationship | 0.313 | |
| | | Sexual and psychological problems | | 0.674 |
| | | Sometimes I face sexual difficulties | -0.584 | |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Domains | Factor loadings-first order | Factor loadings-second order |
|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Factors | | |
| Reasons | | |
| I have psychological problems | -0.567 | |
| I am not doing very well in the sexual domain | -0.537 | |
| I am going through a period of intense stress and anxiety | -0.429 | |
| Personal constraints | | 0.339 |
| I have children from a previous relationship | 0.729 | |
| I want to devote my attention to my children | 0.682 | |
| I have a disability | 0.681 | |
| I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation | 0.670 | |
| Because of my sexual orientation | 0.669 | |
| I cannot have children | 0.641 | |
| I have a serious health issue | 0.579 | |
| Because of my addictions (alcohol, drugs, etc.) | 0.552 | |
| My relationship may not be socially acceptable | 0.549 | |
| I move often so it is not easy to keep a relationship | 0.533 | |
| I believe that I am too old to start a relationship | 0.459 | |
| I am grieving | 0.340 | |
| Freedom | | -0.929 |
| I want to be free to do whatever I want | | |
| I want to be able to be myself | 0.698 | |
| I want to be able to dress the way I want without having to answer to anyone | 0.651 | |
| I want to not have to answer to anyone about what I am doing | 0.581 | |
| I want to be able to go wherever I want without needing to answer to anyone | 0.577 | |
| I do not tolerate restrictions | 0.545 | |
| I like to have my own space | 0.528 | |
| I am single because I want to not get bored | 0.509 | |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Domains | Factor loadings-first order | Factor loadings-second order |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| Factors | | |
| Reasons | | |
| I do not want to lose my freedom | 0.473 | |
| I am single because I want to have more time to spend with my friends | 0.394 | |
| I want to avoid conflict | 0.371 | |
| I am single because I do not want to be alienated from my friends | 0.368 | |
| I want to not feel under pressure | 0.348 | -0.880 |
| I want to be free to flirt around | | |
| I want to be able to have many casual relationships | 0.779 | |
| I want to be free to flirt with whoever I want | 0.721 | |
| I want to have a freer sexual life | 0.652 | |
| I want to have more choices | 0.501 | |
| I want to be able to go out more often | 0.491 | |
| I want to avoid the responsibilities that a relationship entails | 0.436 | |
| I do not like commitment | 0.436 | |
| I want to have fewer obligations | 0.416 | |
| Commitment scares me | 0.375 | |
| Career focus | | -0.879 |
| I want to focus on my career | 0.839 | |
| I worry that a relationship is going to be damaging for my career | 0.693 | |
| I have different priorities | 0.678 | |
| I do not have enough time to devote to a relationship | 0.622 | |
| I want to be free to chase my own goals | 0.516 | |
| I feel that I need some time alone | 0.429 | |
| I am doing well right now | 0.406 | |
| I prefer to be alone | | -0.854 |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Domains | Factors | Reasons | Factor loadings-first order | Factor loadings-second order |
|---------|---------|---|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | I do not feel the emotional need to start a relationship | 0.551 | |
| | | I prefer to be alone | 0.519 | |
| | | I believe that being in a relationship will not make me happier than I am right now | 0.473 | |
| | | I got used to be alone | 0.448 | |
| | | I do not want to have a family | 0.406 | |
| | | I am not the family type | 0.382 | |
| | | I am not willing to make compromises and concessions | 0.276 | |
| | | Between relationships | | |
| | | I am between relationships | | 0.925 |
| | | I recently broke up | 0.754 | |
| | | I have not gotten over my previous relationship | 0.725 | |
| | | Bad experiences from previous relationships | 0.455 | |
| | | I cannot find the right one | | 0.617 |
| | | I cannot find someone interesting | 0.814 | |
| | | I cannot find the right one | 0.793 | |
| | | I am very picky | 0.556 | |
| | | I have no avenues for meeting available men/women | 0.389 | |
| | | I am attracted to the wrong men/women | 0.359 | |
| | | I fear I will get hurt | | 0.411 |
| | | I am afraid that the relationship will fail | 0.770 | |
| | | I am afraid that my partner will stop loving me | 0.710 | |
| | | I am afraid that my partner will cheat on me | 0.707 | |
| | | I am afraid that I will be disappointed | 0.704 | |
| | | I am afraid that what I will give to the relationship will be wasted | 0.636 | |

(continued)

Table 2. (continued)

| Domains | Factors | Reasons | Factor loadings-first order | Factor loadings-second order |
|---------|---------|--|-----------------------------|------------------------------|
| | | I am afraid that I will get hurt again | 0.612 | |
| | | I am single because love scares me | 0.540 | |
| | | I do not trust men/women | 0.530 | |
| | | I am single because I fear rejection | 0.478 | |
| | | I do not trust easily | 0.473 | |
| | | I am single because change scares me | 0.417 | |
| | | I want to avoid jealousy | 0.373 | |
| | | I am single because I fear that my negative aspects will be revealed | 0.361 | |
| | | I would not have to worry about where my partner is and what he/she is doing | 0.357 | |

Table 3. Goodness of Fit Indexes from Confirmatory Factor Analysis.

| Countries | RMSA | CFI | SRMR |
|----------------|-------|-------|--------|
| Brazil | 0.097 | 0.904 | 0.0709 |
| China | 0.144 | 0.845 | 0.0825 |
| Czech Republic | 0.102 | 0.915 | 0.0722 |
| Greece | 0.084 | 0.933 | 0.0637 |
| Hungary | 0.106 | 0.903 | 0.0846 |
| India | 0.150 | 0.931 | 0.0455 |
| Japan | 0.162 | 0.850 | 0.0915 |
| UK | 0.117 | 0.868 | 0.0873 |

The “Freedom” was the next domain in line, and it encompassed the “I want to be free to do whatever I want” factor, which included reasons such as wanting to be single so as to be themselves, to do things without having to answer to anyone, and because of one’s intolerance of restrictions. The domain also encompassed other factors such as “I want to be free to flirt around” factor, the “Career focus” factor, and the “I prefer to be alone” factor. The third domain to emerge was the “Between relationships.” Other than the “I am between relationships” factor, the domain was composed of factors such as the “I cannot find the right one,” and the “I fear I will get hurt.”

In order to assess their relative importance, the means and standard deviations for each domain and factor were assessed. The percentage of participants who obtained a mean score that was greater than “3” (i.e., the middle point of each Likert scale assessing one’s response to an item) was calculated in order to evaluate the importance of each factor and domain. The results (see Table 4) indicated that the highest mean was obtained for the “I cannot find the right one” factor (59.2%), followed by the “I am not good at flirting” factor (47.3%). In terms of domains, the highest means were obtained for the “Between relationships” (33.9%) and the “Freedom” (33.8%).

Age and Sex Differences

In order to identify sex and age effects across factors, we performed a series of MANCOVAs, where the reasons composing each factor were entered as the dependent variables, and the participants’ sex and age were entered as the categorical independent and continuous independent variable respectively. The analysis was performed 12 times, once for each factor, and the results are presented in Table 4. In order to avoid the problem of alpha inflation, Bonferroni correction could be applied—hence, any effects stemming from

Table 4. Significant Sex and Age Effects for the 12 Extracted Factors.

| Domains/factors | Overall | | Frequencies* | | Sex** | | Age*** | | Country | | Country [†] sex | | Country [†] age | | | |
|---|-------------|------|--------------|-----------|------------|-----------|------------|---------|------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|--------------------------|---------|------------|------------|
| | Mean (SD) | % | % | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | η_p^2 | η_p^2 |
| Between relationships | 2.74 (0.72) | 33.9 | <.001 | <.001 | .015 | <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .014 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 |
| I am between relationships | 2.23 (1.08) | 20.1 | (w) <.001 | (w) <.001 | .007 | (+) <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .009 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .005 | <.001 |
| I cannot find the right one | 3.23 (0.84) | 59.2 | (w) <.001 | (w) <.001 | .020 | (+) <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .010 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 | .023 | <.001 |
| I fear I will get hurt | 2.75 (0.91) | 39.4 | (w) <.001 | (w) <.001 | .037 | (-) <.001 | .018 | <.001 | .009 | <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .005 | <.001 |
| Freedom | 2.60 (0.86) | 33.8 | <.001 | <.001 | .026 | <.001 | .031 | <.001 | .014 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 |
| I want to be free to do whatever I want | 2.71 (1.02) | 40.4 | (w) <.001 | (w) <.001 | .013 | (-) <.001 | .027 | <.001 | .013 | .001 | .003 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .005 | <.001 |
| I want to be free to flirt around | 2.30 (0.95) | 21.7 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .018 | (-) <.001 | .012 | <.001 | .010 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 |
| Career focus | 2.81 (1.01) | 42.0 | (w) <.001 | (w) <.001 | .013 | (-) <.001 | .015 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 |
| I prefer to be alone ^a | 2.57 (0.94) | 29.5 | (l) <.001 | (l) <.001 | .006 | (+) <.001 | .005 | <.001 | .007 | .059 | .001 | <.001 | .001 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 |
| Poor capacity to attract mates | 2.34 (0.74) | 17.2 | <.001 | <.001 | .036 | <.001 | .021 | <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .011 | <.001 |
| I am not good at flirting | 2.96 (0.96) | 47.3 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .025 | (-) <.001 | .027 | <.001 | .009 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 |
| Poor achievement record | 2.43 (1.16) | 24.1 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .025 | (+) <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .016 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .003 | <.001 | .007 | <.001 |
| Poor looks ^b | 2.50 (0.84) | 21.9 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .011 | (-) <.001 | .033 | <.001 | .010 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 |
| Sexual and psychological problems | 2.25 (0.97) | 18.8 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .013 | (+) <.001 | .011 | <.001 | .008 | <.001 | .002 | <.001 | .002 | <.001 | .004 | <.001 |
| Personal constraints ^c | 1.54 (0.71) | 5.2 | (m) <.001 | (m) <.001 | .027 | (+) <.001 | .058 | <.001 | .030 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .006 | <.001 | .016 | <.001 |

^aThe percentage of the participants who had a mean score above ".3."

^bm = men higher than women, w = women higher than men.

^cThe sign in the parenthesis indicates the sign of the regression coefficient of age.

^dMen gave significantly higher scores for the "I do not want to have a family" and the "I am not the family type" reasons, while women gave higher scores for the "I believe that being in a relationship will not make me happier than I am right now" reason.

^eWith respect to the age, the "I had many failures and I have given up trying" had a positive sign.

^fThe "I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation," the "Because of my sexual orientation," and the "My relationship may not be socially acceptable" had a negative sign. For Greece, the "I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation" had a negative sign.

the current and subsequent analyses that has a p -value larger than .004 (.05/12) would not be considered to be statistically significant. The same procedure was repeated in order to estimate sex and age effects across domains.

Significant main effects of sex and age were found for all domains. Female participants rated the "Between relationships" domain higher than males in general, with the largest sex difference being observed for the "I fear I will get hurt" and the "I cannot find the right one" factors. With respect to age, the largest effect was found for the "I fear I will get hurt" factor, with younger individuals more likely to rate it higher than older ones. With respect to the "Freedom" domain, the largest sex difference was observed for the "I want to be free to flirt around" factor, with men rating it higher than women, while the reverse was true for the "I want to be free to do whatever I want" factor. With respect to age, the largest effect was for the "I want to be free to do whatever I want" factor, with younger participants rating it higher than older ones, while the reverse was true for the "Career focus" factor. Within the "Poor capacity to attract mates" domain, men were found to consistently rate factors such as the "Personal constraints," the "I am not good at flirting," and the "Poor achievement record" more highly than women, while older participants were more likely to consider the "Personal constraints" as a more important factor than younger ones, although the converse was found where the "Poor looks" factor was concerned.

Country Differences

The means of factors and domains were first evaluated separately for each country. Subsequently, we ranked factors by placing the one with the highest mean first and the one with the lowest mean last (see Tables 5 and 6). Next, we ran an ANCOVA where the mean scores for a given factor (i.e., the average of the reasons making up the domain) were entered as the dependent variables, and the country and the participants' sex were entered as the independent categorical variables. Participants' age was entered as the continuous independent variable. Post hoc analysis using Bonferroni was performed in order to find any differences between countries. The procedure was performed 12 times, once for each factor. The results are presented in Table 5. A similar procedure was followed in order to estimate differences between countries across domains, but this time the mean scores of the factors composing each domain were entered as the dependent variables. The procedure was performed three times, once for each factor. The results are presented in Table 6, where we can see that significant main effects of the country of origin of the sample were found for all domains.

Table 5. (continued)

| Factors | Overall | | Sex | | Age | |
|---|--------------------------------------|------|-------------|-------------|---------|------------|
| | Mean (SD) | Rank | Women | Men | p-value | η_p^2 |
| | | | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | | |
| Hungary | 2.17 (0.89) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 5 | 2.23 (0.86) | 2.05 (0.92) | .002 | .056 |
| India | 3.71 (0.79) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 1 | 3.75 (0.93) | 3.69 (0.81) | .062 | .029 |
| Japan | 2.57 (0.79) C, Cz, G, H, I | 7 | 2.59 (0.84) | 2.55 (0.75) | .070 | .027 |
| UK | 2.63 (0.96) B, C, H, I, J | 4 | | | <.001 | .109 |
| I fear I will get hurt | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.78 (0.94) C, Cz, H, I, UK | 4 | 2.90 (0.94) | 2.54 (0.89) | <.001 | .141 |
| China | 2.96 (0.77) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 4 | 3.00 (0.75) | 2.89 (0.78) | <.001 | .082 |
| Czech Republic | 2.43 (0.82) | 3 | 2.48 (0.81) | 2.36 (0.82) | <.001 | .083 |
| Greece | 2.61 (0.87) | 3 | 2.60 (0.90) | 2.62 (0.83) | <.001 | .080 |
| Hungary | 2.31 (0.84) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 3 | 2.38 (0.83) | 2.17 (0.84) | <.001 | .175 |
| India | 3.45 (0.92) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 7 | 3.56 (0.85) | 3.40 (0.95) | .824 | .020 |
| Japan | 2.62 (0.82) C, Cz, H, I | 6 | 2.63 (0.85) | 2.61 (0.80) | .070 | .047 |
| UK | 2.68 (0.88) C, Cz, H, I | 3 | 2.84 (0.86) | 2.47 (0.86) | <.001 | .190 |
| I want to be free to do whatever I want | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.44 (0.99) C, Cz, G, H, I, J | 7 | 2.52 (1.00) | 2.28 (0.95) | <.001 | .038 |
| China | 3.46 (0.72) B, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 1 | 2.56 (0.67) | 3.31 (0.75) | <.001 | .056 |
| Czech Republic | 2.29 (0.89) B, C, G, H, I, J, UK | 7 | 2.34 (0.86) | 2.22 (0.91) | .001 | .035 |
| Greece | 2.68 (0.98) B, C, Cz, H, I, UK | 2 | 2.70 (0.99) | 2.66 (0.97) | .007 | .042 |
| Hungary | 2.08 (0.88) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 8 | 2.15 (0.88) | 1.91 (0.86) | .076 | .050 |
| India | 3.61 (0.81) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 2 | 3.67 (0.77) | 3.58 (0.83) | .990 | .008 |
| Japan | 2.66 (0.80) B, C, Cz, H, I, J | 5 | 2.69 (0.84) | 2.62 (0.75) | .005 | .058 |
| UK | 2.47 (0.90) C, Cz, G, H, I | 6 | 2.58 (0.77) | 2.33 (0.91) | .053 | .063 |
| I prefer to be alone | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.45 (0.91) C, G, H, I, J | 6 | 2.49 (0.91) | 2.36 (0.91) | <.001 | .017 |

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

| Factors | Overall | | Sex | | Age | | | |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|-------------|-------------|---------|------------|------------|------|
| | Mean (SD) | Rank | Women | Men | p-value | η_p^2 | | |
| | | | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | | | | |
| China | 2.74 (0.80) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 6 | 2.79 (0.80) | 2.65 (0.78) | .013 | .014 | (+), .002 | .018 |
| Czech Republic | 2.36 (0.93) B, C, H, I, J | 5 | 2.39 (0.93) | 2.33 (0.92) | .204 | .011 | (+), .005 | .022 |
| Greece | 2.34 (0.90) B, C, H, I, J | 7 | 2.37 (0.88) | 2.31 (0.91) | .463 | .010 | (+), <.001 | .059 |
| Hungary | 2.10 (0.91) B, C, Cz, G, I, J, UK | 6 | 2.13 (0.93) | 2.05 (0.86) | .366 | .020 | (+), .053 | .035 |
| India | 3.52 (0.97) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 4 | 3.56 (0.80) | 3.50 (0.91) | .279 | .019 | (-), <.001 | .111 |
| Japan | 2.97 (0.86) B, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 1 | 2.95 (0.88) | 2.99 (0.84) | .142 | .023 | (+), <.001 | .059 |
| UK | 2.42 (0.81) C, H, I, J | 7 | 2.36 (0.70) | 2.51 (0.93) | <.001 | .076 | (+), .476 | .020 |
| Poor looks ^b | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.51 (0.83) Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 5 | 2.46 (0.82) | 2.61 (0.85) | <.001 | .045 | (-), <.001 | .070 |
| China | 2.56 (0.70) Cz, G, H, I, J | 9 | 2.56 (0.66) | 2.55 (0.74) | <.001 | .047 | (-), <.001 | .018 |
| Czech Republic | 2.31 (0.78) B, C, G, I, J, UK | 6 | 2.25 (0.79) | 2.41 (0.75) | <.001 | .062 | (-), <.001 | .093 |
| Greece | 2.14 (0.76) B, C, Cz, I, J, UK | 8 | 2.10 (0.74) | 2.19 (0.79) | <.001 | .047 | (-), <.001 | .086 |
| Hungary | 2.23 (0.79) B, C, I, J, UK | 4 | 2.22 (0.78) | 2.25 (0.81) | .037 | .030 | (-), .004 | .044 |
| India | 3.29 (1.01) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 9 | 3.34 (0.96) | 3.26 (1.04) | .830 | .005 | (-), <.001 | .119 |
| Japan | 2.54 (0.77) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 8 | 2.47 (0.80) | 2.61 (0.74) | .153 | .017 | (-), <.001 | .066 |
| UK | 2.56 (0.76) C, Cz, G, H, I, J | 5 | 2.58 (0.70) | 2.52 (0.83) | .060 | .032 | (-), <.001 | .044 |
| Poor achievement record | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.39 (1.22) Cz, G, H, I, J | 8 | 2.21 (1.15) | 2.73 (1.23) | <.001 | .040 | (-), <.001 | .012 |
| China | 2.58 (0.98) Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 8 | 2.47 (0.95) | 2.75 (0.99) | <.001 | .024 | (+), .016 | .007 |
| Czech Republic | 2.07 (1.00) B, C, H, I, J, UK | 9 | 1.90 (0.91) | 2.33 (1.08) | <.001 | .045 | (-), .004 | .012 |
| Greece | 2.07 (1.06) B, C, I, J, UK | 11 | 1.82 (0.93) | 2.36 (1.13) | <.001 | .062 | (+), <.001 | .069 |
| Hungary | 1.83 (0.97) B, C, Cz, I, J, UK | 10 | 1.65 (0.85) | 2.19 (1.11) | <.001 | .098 | (+), .004 | .028 |

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

| Factors | Overall | Sex | | Rank | Age | | |
|-----------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|---------|------------|---------|----------|
| | | Women | Men | | | | |
| | | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | | | | |
| | Mean (SD) | Mean (SD) | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | |
| India | 3.53 (1.07) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 3.52 (0.99) | 3.54 (1.11) | 3 | .002 | <.001 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.89 (1.09) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 2.64 (1.07) | 3.11 (1.06) | 4 | .071 | <.001 | .177 |
| UK | 2.34 (1.10) C, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 2.08 (0.94) | 2.67 (1.19) | 8 | .086 | <.001 | <.001 |
| I want to be free to flirt around | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.10 (0.95) C, Cz, H, I, J | 2.08 (0.94) | 2.15 (0.97) | 11 | .049 | <.001 | <.001 |
| China | 2.67 (0.90) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 2.64 (0.68) | 2.70 (0.73) | 7 | .078 | <.001 | .761 |
| Czech Republic | 1.99 (0.83) C, G, H, I, J | 1.95 (0.80) | 2.04 (0.88) | 11 | .032 | .001 | <.001 |
| Greece | 2.13 (0.91) C, Cz, H, I, J | 2.03 (0.83) | 2.25 (0.97) | 10 | .107 | <.001 | <.001 |
| Hungary | 1.80 (0.84) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 1.80 (0.82) | 1.80 (0.88) | 11 | .013 | .845 | <.047 |
| India | 3.47 (0.90) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 3.52 (0.89) | 3.45 (0.91) | 6 | .026 | .221 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.44 (0.76) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 2.40 (0.78) | 2.47 (0.74) | 9 | .074 | <.001 | .211 |
| UK | 2.18 (0.86) C, H, I, J | 2.28 (0.88) | 2.05 (0.82) | 11 | .107 | <.001 | <.001 |
| Sexual and psychological problems | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.29 (0.97) C, H, I, J | 2.26 (0.97) | 2.35 (0.98) | 9 | .023 | <.001 | <.001 |
| China | 2.05 (0.80) B, Cz, G, I, J, UK | 2.01 (0.78) | 2.10 (0.83) | 11 | .008 | .035 | .265 |
| Czech Republic | 2.17 (0.92) C, Cz, H, I, J | 2.13 (0.94) | 2.23 (0.88) | 8 | .016 | .005 | <.001 |
| Greece | 2.13 (0.85) C, H, I, J | 2.04 (0.78) | 2.24 (0.92) | 9 | .056 | <.001 | <.006 |
| Hungary | 1.95 (0.89) B, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 1.90 (0.88) | 2.04 (0.92) | 9 | .026 | .038 | <.028 |
| India | 3.10 (1.19) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 3.18 (1.15) | 3.06 (1.21) | 12 | .005 | .673 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.34 (0.93) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 2.26 (0.92) | 2.41 (0.93) | 10 | .032 | .004 | <.018 |
| UK | 2.20 (0.91) C, H, I, J | 2.05 (0.83) | 2.39 (0.97) | 9 | .081 | <.001 | .362 |
| I am between relationships | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.19 (1.05) Cz, G, I, J | 2.27 (1.04) | 2.02 (1.05) | 10 | .026 | <.001 | (+) .006 |
| China | 2.11 (1.00) Cz, G, I, J | 2.00 (0.98) | 2.27 (1.00) | 10 | .019 | <.001 | (+) .002 |

(continued)

Table 5. (continued)

| Factors | Sex | | | | | | Age | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------|-------------|------|-------------|------|---------|------------|-----------|------|
| | Overall | | Women | | Men | | p-value | η^2_p | | |
| | Mean (SD) | Rank | Mean (SD) | Rank | Mean (SD) | Rank | | | | |
| Czech Republic | 2.04 (0.96) B, C, G, I | 10 | 2.08 (0.96) | | 1.96 (0.94) | | .008 | .013 | (+) .058 | .008 |
| Greece | 2.54 (1.13) B, C, Cz, H, I, J, UK | 5 | 2.65 (1.14) | | 2.41 (1.11) | | .003 | .021 | (+) .005 | .019 |
| Hungary | 2.08 (1.06) G, I | 7 | 2.24 (1.08) | | 1.75 (0.94) | | <.001 | .056 | (-) .004 | .034 |
| India | 3.17 (1.24) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 10 | 3.22 (1.19) | | 3.15 (1.26) | | .943 | .001 | (-) <.001 | .086 |
| Japan | 1.88 (0.78) B, C, G, I, UK | 12 | 1.82 (0.79) | | 1.94 (0.77) | | .206 | .010 | (-) .062 | .015 |
| UK | 2.18 (1.11) C, G, I, J | 10 | 2.38 (1.14) | | 1.93 (1.01) | | <.001 | .065 | (+) .124 | .017 |
| Personal constraints ^c | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 1.27 (0.34) C, Cz, G, H, I, J | 12 | 1.26 (0.34) | | 1.29 (0.36) | | <.001 | .036 | (+) <.001 | .156 |
| China | 1.69 (0.65) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 12 | 1.58 (0.55) | | 1.87 (0.74) | | <.001 | .063 | (+) <.001 | .101 |
| Czech Republic | 1.39 (0.39) B, C, H, I, J | 12 | 1.39 (0.38) | | 1.41 (0.40) | | <.001 | .087 | (+) <.001 | .268 |
| Greece | 1.37 (0.38) B, C, H, I, J | 12 | 1.38 (0.37) | | 1.37 (0.39) | | <.001 | .062 | (+) <.001 | .352 |
| Hungary | 1.17 (0.25) B, C, Cz, G, I, J, UK | 12 | 1.18 (0.26) | | 1.16 (0.23) | | .005 | .071 | (+) <.001 | .228 |
| India | 3.12 (1.13) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 11 | 3.24 (1.09) | | 3.07 (1.15) | | .039 | .047 | (-) <.001 | .126 |
| Japan | 1.89 (0.69) B, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 11 | 1.75 (0.63) | | 2.01 (0.73) | | <.001 | .123 | (+) <.001 | .140 |
| UK | 1.34 (0.39) C, H, I, J | 12 | 1.34 (0.39) | | 1.34 (0.39) | | <.001 | .107 | (+) <.001 | .171 |

^aThe trend was to have a positive sign with the exception of the "I am single because I want to have more time to spend with my friends" and the "I am single because I do not want to be alienated from my friends" reasons.

^bFor Brazil, China, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, and UK the "I had many failures and I have given up trying" had a positive sign.

^cFor Brazil and Czech Republic the "I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation," the "Because of my sexual orientation," and the "My relationship may not be socially acceptable" had a negative sign. For Greece, the "I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation" had a negative sign. For Japan, the "My relationship may not be socially acceptable" had a negative sign. For the UK the "I need some time to decide about my sexual orientation" and the "Because of my sexual orientation" had a negative sign.

Table 6. Mean Differences in Domains and Sex and Age Effects Across Countries.

| Domains | Sex | | | | | | Age | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|------------|---------|------------|---------|------|-------|
| | Overall | Women | | Men | | η_p^2 | p-value | η_p^2 | p-value | | |
| | | Mean (SD) | Rank | Mean (SD) | Rank | | | | | | |
| Between relationships | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.77 (0.70) Cz, H, I, J | 1 | 2.90 (0.67) | | 2.54 (0.68) | | <.001 | .083 | <.001 | .025 | <.001 |
| China | 2.69 (0.67) G, H, I, J | 2 | 2.71 (0.65) | | 2.67 (0.71) | | <.001 | .065 | <.001 | .014 | <.001 |
| Czech Republic | 2.60 (0.63) B, C, G, I | 1 | 2.67 (0.61) | | 2.49 (0.64) | | <.001 | .034 | <.001 | .018 | <.001 |
| Greece | 2.81 (0.71) C, Cz, H, I, J, UK | 1 | 2.87 (0.73) | | 2.73 (0.68) | | <.001 | .036 | <.001 | .049 | <.001 |
| Hungary | 2.52 (0.67) B, C, G, I, UK | 1 | 2.61 (0.66) | | 2.32 (0.65) | | <.001 | .052 | <.001 | .624 | <.001 |
| India | 3.37 (0.94) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 2 | 3.45 (0.87) | | 3.32 (0.97) | | .301 | .008 | <.001 | .109 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.48 (0.60) B, C, G, I | 3 | 2.48 (0.60) | | 2.48 (0.60) | | .281 | .008 | <.001 | .066 | <.001 |
| UK | 2.66 (0.71) G, H, I | 1 | 2.82 (0.70) | | 2.46 (0.67) | | <.001 | .058 | <.001 | .012 | <.001 |
| Freedom | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.45 (0.85) C, Cz, H, I, J | 2 | 2.50 (0.85) | | 2.35 (0.86) | | <.001 | .064 | <.001 | .096 | <.001 |
| China | 3.05 (0.60) B, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 1 | 3.10 (0.58) | | 2.96 (0.63) | | <.001 | .063 | <.001 | .576 | <.001 |
| Czech Republic | 2.26 (0.79) B, C, G, H, I, J | 2 | 2.29 (0.78) | | 2.21 (0.81) | | <.001 | .044 | <.001 | .117 | <.001 |
| Greece | 2.39 (0.79) C, Cz, H, I, J | 2 | 2.40 (0.77) | | 2.38 (0.81) | | <.001 | .086 | <.001 | .068 | <.001 |
| Hungary | 2.04 (0.78) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, J, UK | 2 | 2.08 (0.78) | | 1.95 (0.79) | | <.001 | .052 | <.001 | .065 | <.001 |
| India | 3.58 (0.79) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 1 | 3.63 (0.73) | | 3.56 (0.81) | | .903 | .002 | <.001 | .092 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.66 (0.71) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 1 | 2.66 (0.75) | | 2.66 (0.68) | | .001 | .038 | <.001 | .036 | <.001 |
| UK | 2.43 (0.76) C, H, I, J | 2 | 2.52 (0.72) | | 2.30 (0.79) | | <.001 | .154 | <.001 | .073 | <.001 |
| Poor capacity to attract mates | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Brazil | 2.32 (0.66) Cz, G, H, I, J | 3 | 2.90 (0.67) | | 2.54 (0.68) | | <.001 | .049 | <.001 | .060 | <.001 |
| China | 2.34 (0.62) G, H, I, J | 3 | 2.71 (0.65) | | 2.67 (0.71) | | <.001 | .110 | <.001 | .014 | <.001 |
| Czech Republic | 2.18 (0.65) B, G, H, I, J | 3 | 2.67 (0.61) | | 2.49 (0.64) | | <.001 | .060 | <.001 | .102 | <.001 |
| Greece | 2.06 (0.63) B, C, Cz, G, I, J, UK | 1 | 2.87 (0.73) | | 2.74 (0.68) | | <.001 | .088 | <.001 | .188 | <.001 |
| Hungary | 1.94 (0.62) B, C, Cz, H, I, J, UK | 3 | 1.87 (0.59) | | 2.09 (0.65) | | <.001 | .100 | <.001 | .103 | <.001 |
| India | 3.28 (0.99) B, C, Cz, G, H, J, UK | 3 | 2.45 (0.87) | | 3.32 (0.97) | | .264 | .014 | <.001 | .127 | <.001 |
| Japan | 2.52 (0.71) B, C, Cz, G, H, I, UK | 2 | 2.48 (0.60) | | 2.48 (0.60) | | <.001 | .086 | <.001 | .052 | <.001 |
| UK | 2.31 (0.64) C, G, H, I, J | 3 | 2.82 (0.70) | | 2.46 (0.67) | | <.001 | .171 | <.001 | .049 | <.001 |

From Table 6 we can see that significant interactions between country and sex and between country and age were produced for all domains and the majority of factors. These findings suggest that the main effects of sex and age uncovered for each domain and factor, were different across countries. Accordingly, we examined significant sex and age effects across domains and factors separately for each country. Starting with factors, we ran a MANCOVA, where the reasons composing a factor were entered as the dependent variables, and the participants' sex was entered as the categorical independent variable; participants' age was entered as the continuous independent variable. The analysis was performed separately for each country. The procedure was performed 12 times, once for each factor, and the results are presented in Table 5. Similarly, in terms of domains, we ran a MANCOVA where the factors composing a domain were entered as the dependent variables, and the participants' sex was entered as the categorical independent variable; participants' age was entered as the continuous independent variable. The analysis was also performed separately for each country. The procedure was performed three times, once for each domain, and the results are presented in Table 6.

With respect to factors, there were consistencies but also variations in terms of sex and age effects (Table 5). For example, for the "I prefer to be alone" factor, significant positive age effects were found for almost all countries. However, age did not play a significant role for the UK sample, while the effect was negative for the Indian sample. In the same vein, similarities and differences were found across domains. For instance, for the "Between relationships" domain, significant sex differences were found for most domains. Nevertheless, the size of these differences varied across countries, while there was no significant main effect of sex for both the Indian and the Japanese samples.

Discussion

In the current research, we asked a large cross-cultural sample of single participants to rate how 92 different reasons have led them not to be in a romantic relationship. On the basis of their responses, we classified these reasons in 12 factors. The highest rated factor, was not be able to find the right one, followed by not being good at flirting, and career focus. Significant sex and age effects were found for most factors. The 12 factors were classified in three domains. The first domain reflected poor capacity to attract mates, the second freedom of choice, and the third being between relationships. The domain structure, the relative importance of each factor and domain, as well

as sex and age effects were relative consistent across countries, but there were also important differences.

Consistent with the predictions of our theoretical framework, one of the broad explanations (i.e., domains) for singlehood, was one's perceived poor capacity to attract mates, while one of the highest rated factors (reported by 47% of the respondents) found to reduce this capacity, was the difficulties people encountered in flirting. This domain had the lowest mean score among the three domains, mainly due to low ratings for the personal constraints factor. This is expected, as there were likely to be relatively few people who have constraints such as a serious health problem or a handicap that have restricted their mating endeavors as a whole. The specific domain emerged also in the Greek (Apostolou, 2017) and in the American (Apostolou et al., 2020) cultural contexts, suggesting that difficulties to attract mates constitutes a universal main reason for singlehood in post-industrial societies.

Similarly, in accordance with our predictions, "Freedom," where one indicated that they were single in order to be free to do whatever they wanted, including flirting around with different partners and focusing on their careers, was also found to be an important domain for singlehood. This domain was rated as the second most important, with about 40% of the participants indicating that they were single in order to be free to do whatever they wanted, and about 42% of them choosing to do so in order to focus on their careers. Studies in the Greek (Apostolou, 2017) and in the American (Apostolou et al., 2020) cultural contexts have likewise reported comparable findings.

In line with our theoretical predictions, the "Between relationships" was another domain that emerged in the present study. Respondents indicated that they were single because they have recently broken up and/or they have not gotten over their previous partner. The period of being between relationships was also extended by participants facing difficulties in finding someone they liked, one reason being that they were very picky. The "Between relationships" domain, received the highest mean score, and its sub-factor the "I cannot find the right one," was reported as a reason for being single by about 59% of the participants. However, the scores in this domain may also reflect a bias. People might have felt more comfortable saying to themselves that they were single because they have not yet found the right one, as compared to other factors such as perceived poor flirting skills or looks. Previous studies have identified being in between relationships as a factor, but not as a separate domain (Apostolou et al., 2020). Thus, further research is required in order to determine whether it actually constitutes a separate domain.

Contrary to our original prediction, a fourth domain, reflecting personal constraints such as health issues, did not emerge. Two factors, namely "Personal constraints" and "Sexual and psychological problems" did emerge,

but they were not classified in separate domains, but under the “Poor capacity to attract mates” domain. One possible explanation is that, these factors were important in terms of impairing individuals’ capacity to attract mates. Nevertheless, previous research has classified similar factors in a separate domain (Apostolou et al., 2020), and thus, further research is necessary in order to determine if these factors do indeed constitute facets of perceived poor capacity to attract mates or a separate domain altogether.

Where sex differences are concerned, men were predictably found to be more likely than women to indicate that they were single in order to be able to flirt around, while women indicated that they were more likely than men to be single because they were choosy and that they could not find the right one. The largest sex difference was with regard to the factor pertaining to the apprehension about getting hurt, where women gave higher scores than men. In terms of domains, the largest sex difference, as predicted by the evolutionary mismatch problem, pertains to one’s perceived poor capacity to attract mates, with men giving higher scores than women. Although sex differences were found in all factors and domains, the effect sizes indicated that these differences were generally small, indicating that men and women were single for similar reasons.

In terms of age, younger people were predictably more likely than older ones to report that they were single because they wanted to flirt around, to be free to do what they have desired to do, and because they felt they lacked good flirting skills. The largest age effect was for the “Personal constraints” factor. This is expected, as this factor is composed of reasons such as having offspring from former relationships and health problems, which are strongly predicted by age. Among the largest effects was in regard to the “Poor looks” factor, where younger participants gave higher scores than older ones. This finding suggests that younger people possibly ascribe more importance to the appearance of a prospective partner, and hence, younger people who felt they were not attractive, might report it to be a more relevant reason for being single than older ones.

Moving on, there were apparent similarities in the importance attributed to the reasons for singlehood across different countries. Both the domain structure and the hierarchy of reasons were relatively similar across different cultural samples. For instance, the “I am not good at flirting” factor, ranked near the top of the hierarchy of reasons for most countries, while the “Personal constraints” factor was found at the bottom of the hierarchy in most countries. There were also general consistencies in the direction and the significance of all the sex and age effects. For instance, in relation to the “Poor looks” factor, age was significant in all countries, while a significant sex

difference was found in all countries in relation to the “Poor achievement record” factor, with men giving higher scores than women.

Nonetheless, there were also notable country differences in the level of importance attributed to each domain and factor. For instance, participants in Greece and Brazil, were similar with regard to the attribution of higher scores to the “Between relationships” domain, but participants in China and Japan were more similar to each other in assigning the highest scores to the “Freedom” domain. In contrast to participants in other countries, participants in Japan gave the highest score for the “Poor capacity to attract mates” domain. There was also considerable variation in the effect sizes of the sex and age differences. As indicated earlier, the largest sex differences were found over the “Poor capacity to attract mates” domain, and these were observed from participants from countries like the UK, China, and Japan, but only relatively moderate sex differences were found for participants in Brazil and Czech Republic. Similarly, the largest age effects were found for the “Poor capacity to attract mates” domain, with the largest difference observed in respondents in Greece, and the smallest in respondents in China.

The differences between different cultural groups, are most probably a reflection of both sample and actual cultural differences. We could use China as an example. Chinese participants were more likely to indicate the “Freedom” domain as the most important reasons for singlehood than those of other countries with the exception of India. One possible reason is that this domain is perceived to be more important for younger individuals than for older ones, and the Chinese sample is younger than those of other samples in this current study. In addition, Chinese parents are believed to be more hands-on where their children’s daily activities and issues are concerned, than those of other countries, and this is arguably where many parents-children conflicts arise (Chen-Gaddini et al., 2020). Consequently, when young adults reach an age when they are ready to enter a university, they might try to seek more personal space than people from other cultures.

Although the current study has sought to examine cross-cultural similarities and consistencies in regard to the reasons for singlehood, it is beyond its scope to identify the cultural factors responsible for the observed differences. The complexity of the phenomenon, along with the many cultural differences that are likely to exist between countries, mean that additional research dedicated to this endeavor is needed.

One limitation of the current work is that it was based on self-report data, which tended to be susceptible to several biases. For instance, in order to protect their self-esteem, people may be unwilling to admit, even to themselves, that they were single because they have experienced some difficulties with flirting, and they might be more likely to indicate that they were single

because they have preferred it to be that way instead. In addition, our analysis was based on non-probability samples, so our findings may not readily generalize to the wider population. Moreover, although we have employed a large list of possible reasons for being single, there may well be other more culture-specific reasons which have not been adequately captured by the current scale. For instance, people may be taking time to select a mate so as to make better choices, and the length of this time period can be affected by cultural factors.

Furthermore, many different factors are likely to play a moderating role, but in the current research we have assessed only the effects of sex and age. For example, spending long hours at work where there may be institutional constraints on romantic encounters may be such a factor. Similarly, parents may impose selection limitations on mate choice, especially on daughters, even in developed countries (Apostolou et al., 2015). Such limitations may effectively reduce the pool of available mates, increasing the probability of being single. Accordingly, it would be fruitful for future research to examine how the degree of parental influence over mating affects the reasons for being single. Such degree is also influenced by cultural factors, and considerable cross-cultural variation is expected. For instance, in our sample, parents are more likely to interfere and impose limitations to their children in India and in China than in the UK and the Czech Republic.

In addition, another important factor which is likely to affect the reasons for being single is sexual orientation. More specifically, across cultures, same-sex attraction is generally not socially approved (Fone, 2000), so homosexual people may prefer to be single rather than enter into a socially acceptable relationship. This reason is captured by the “Personal constraints” factor, which includes reasons such as “Because of my sexual orientation” and because “My relationship may not be socially acceptable.” However, other reasons may be affected by sexual orientation. For example, heterosexual people are more likely to have children than homosexual people, so children from previous relationships may be less likely to be a constraint for the latter in forming an intimate relationship. Accordingly, future research needs to specifically examine the effect of sexual orientation on the reasons for being single.

Singlehood is a fascinating and complex phenomenon, with many facets and contingencies. Although future research should expectedly add to this gradually expanding body of evidence by exploring other yet-to-examined aspects of singlehood, the current findings does provide more clarity about a phenomenon that has enormous implications on a societal (e.g., given the chronic issue of low birth rates in many high-income countries) and

economical level (e.g., the financial implications of a gradually shrinking local population) for countries across the globe.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: Dr. Peter Karl Jonason's research was supported by a grant from the National Science Centre of Poland (2019/34/B/HS6/00682).

References

- Apostolou, M. (2007). Sexual selection under parental choice: The role of parents in the evolution of human mating. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *28*, 403–409.
- Apostolou, M. (2010). Sexual selection under parental choice in agropastoral societies. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, *31*, 39–47.
- Apostolou, M. (2012). Sexual selection under parental choice: Evidence from sixteen historical societies. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *10*, 504–518.
- Apostolou, M. (2015). Past, present and why people struggle to establish and maintain intimate relationships. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, *9*, 257–269.
- Apostolou, M. (2017). Why people stay single: An evolutionary perspective. *Personality Individual Differences*, *111*, 263–271.
- Apostolou, M. (2019). Why men stay single: Evidence from Reddit. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *5*, 87–97.
- Apostolou, M., Kasapi, K., & Arakliti, A. (2015). Will they do as we wish? An investigation of the effectiveness of parental manipulation on mating behavior. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *1*, 28–36.
- Apostolou, M., Papadopoulou, I., & Georgiadou, P. (2019). Are people single by choice: Involuntary singlehood in an evolutionary perspective. *Evolutionary Psychological Science*, *5*, 98–103.
- Apostolou, M., O, J., & Esposito, G. (2020). Singles' reasons for being single: Empirical evidence from an evolutionary perspective. *Frontiers in Psychology*, *11*, Article 746.
- Apostolou, M., & Wang, Y. (2019). The association between mating performance, marital status, and the length of singlehood: Evidence from Greece and China. *Evolutionary Psychology*, *17*(4), 147470491988770. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704919887706>
- Buss, D. M. (2017). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating* (4th ed.). Basic Books.
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 204–232.

- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (2019). Mate preferences and their behavioral manifestations. *Annual Review of Psychology, 70*, 77–110.
- Buss, D. M., Goetz, C., Duntley, J. D., Asao, K., & Conroy-Beam, D. (2017). The mate switching hypothesis. *Personality and Individual Differences, 104*, 143–149.
- Chen-Gaddini, M., Liu, J., & Nucci, L. (2020). “It’s my own business!”: Parental control over personal issues in the context of everyday adolescent–parent conflicts and internalizing disorders among urban Chinese adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 56*, 1775–1786.
- Cherlin, A. J. (2009). *The marriage-go-round*. Alfred A. Knopf.
- Coontz, S. (2005). *Marriage, a history: From obedience to intimacy, or how love conquered marriage*. Viking.
- Crawford, C. (1998). Environments and adaptations: Then and now. In C. Crawford & D. Krebs (Eds.), *Handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 275–302). Erlbaum.
- DePaulo, B. M., & Morris, W. L. (2005). Singles in society and in science. *Psychological Inquiry, 16*, 57–83.
- Fletcher, G. J., Simpson, J. A., Campbell, L., & Overall, N. C. (2015). Pair-bonding, romantic love, and evolution: The curious case of Homo sapiens. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 10*, 20–36.
- Fone, B. (2000). *Homophobia: A history*. Picador.
- Goetz, C. D., Pillsworth, E. G., Buss, D. M., & Conroy-Beam, D. (2019). Evolutionary mismatch in mating. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10*, Article 2709.
- Li, N. P., van Vugt, M., & Colarelli, S. M. (2017). The evolutionary mismatch hypothesis: Implications for psychological science. *Current Directions Psychological Science, 27*, 38–44.
- Perilloux, C., Cloud, J. M., & Buss, D. M. (2013). Women’s physical attractiveness and short-term mating strategies. *Personality and Individual Differences, 54*, 490–495.
- Pew Research Center. (2013). *Online dating & relationships*. <https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2013/10/21/online-dating-relationships/>
- Puts, D. A. (2010). Beauty and the beast: Mechanisms of sexual selection in humans. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 31*, 157–175.
- Puts, D. A. (2016). Human sexual selection. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 7*, 28–32.
- Rosenfeld, M. J., Reuben, J. T., & Falcon, M. (2015). *How couples meet and stay together, waves 1, 2, and 3: Public version 3.04, plus wave 4 supplement version 1.02 and wave 5 supplement version 1.0* [Computer files]. Stanford University Libraries.
- Stewart-Williams, S., & Thomas, A. G. (2013). The ape that thought it was a peacock: Does evolutionary psychology exaggerate human sex differences? *Psychological Inquiry, 24*, 137–168.
- Thomas, A., Jonason, P., Blackburn, J., Kennair, L., Lowe, R., Malouff, J., Stewart-Williams, S., Sulikowski, D., & Li, N. (2020). Mate preference priorities in the East and West: A cross-cultural test of the mate preference priority model. *Journal of Personality, 88*, 606–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12514>

Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man: 1871-1971* (pp. 136–179). Aldine.

Author Biographies

Professor Menelaos Apostolou is currently working at the University of Nicosia, Cyprus. He was born in Athens, Greece, and he completed his post-graduate and graduate studies in the United Kingdom. He has published several peer-reviewed papers, books, and chapters in books in the area of evolutionary psychology.

Béla Birkás, PhD, is an associate professor in the Department of Behavioural Sciences at the Medical School of University of Pécs, Hungary. His research interests focus on the study of personality correlates of life history strategies and associations between time perspectives and personality traits. He also conducted studies on maladaptive personality traits and personality functioning.

Caio Santos Alves da Silva is a Psychologist, with a master's degree in theory and behavior research from the Federal University of Pará, Brazil. He is currently a PhD student in Experimental Psychology at the University of São Paulo, Brazil, focusing on the study of female sexuality and orgasm through an evolutionary perspective.

Gianluca Esposito is an Associate professor with a joint appointment at the Nanyang Technological University (Singapore) and the University of Trento (Italy). He is a Developmental Clinical Psychologist qualified to advance the ongoing investigations on child socio-cognitive development contributing strengths in human electrophysiology and neuroimaging, complex data modeling, and comparative physiological assessment with the aim of studying Social Interaction.

Rafael Ming Chi Santos Hsu is a PhD Student in the Institute of Psychology at the University of São Paulo, Brazil. His research interests focus on the study of Evolutionary Psychology and Anthropology, and Human Ethology. His research interests are mainly for (and also related topics): non-verbal behavior, psychology of physical activities—sports, exercises, and body/movement practices (mainly in motivations for practice—currently working on), neuroscience and physical activities (mainly relations with social isolation)

Peter Karl Jonason is an Associate Professor at the University of Padua (Italy) and the University of Cardinal Stefan Wyszyński (Poland) where he leads researchers from around the world in understanding how the dark side of human nature might be adaptive and decision-making in the initial stages of courtship. He specializes in the adoption of psychometric and evolutionary approaches to his research. In 2014 he won the iGnobel award in Psychology for his work on the dark side of personality and lives in Italy with his dog (and master) Pedro.

Konstantinos Karamanidis has recently graduated from the University of Nicosia, and he currently aims to pursue post-graduate studies. His research interests include individual differences, mating behavior, and cognitive processes.

Jiaqing O is a Lecturer at the Department of Psychology at Aberystwyth University. Trained in clinical psychology, he is also regarded as an evolutionary-focused researcher who is primarily involved in research work concerning mental wellbeing and relationship functioning, while also demonstrating a preference for cross-cultural examination of such topics.

Yohsuke Ohtsubo is an associate professor of social psychology at the University of Tokyo. His research interests include cooperation (via reputation and punishment), reconciliation (via apology and forgiveness), and emotions.

Ádám Putz, PhD, is a Senior Lecturer in the Institute of Psychology at the University of Pécs, Hungary. His research interests focus on the study of human mate choice preferences from an evolutionary perspective; as well as on the effect of beauty-stereotypes on social cognition in both economic decision making and juristic judgments of sexual assault crimes.

Daniel Sznycer is assistant professor of psychology at the University of Montreal. His work focuses on emotion, cooperation, and morality. He has conducted research on shame, pride, compassion, and envy, and their roles in altruism, cooperation, social exclusion, and conflict.

Andrew G. Thomas is a Senior Lecturer at Swansea University, UK. His research focuses on using evolutionary perspectives to understand sex differences, mate preferences, and romantic relationship wellbeing.

Jaroslava Varella Valentova obtained her PhD in Anthropology at the Charles University in Prague, Czech Republic, and is now an assistant professor at the Department of Experimental Psychology, University of Sao Paulo, Brazil. Her research is focused on human sexuality, mate preferences, sexual orientation, relationship satisfaction, personality, and cross-cultural comparisons.

Marco A. C. Varella is a biologist, with MSc and PhD in Experimental Psychology; currently as postdoctoral researcher and visiting professor at the Institute of Psychology from University of São Paulo, Brazil. His research interests focus on evolution of human sexuality and mating mind, evolution of human artisticity, evolution of psychological roadblocks to Evolution education, and evolution of pandemic leadership and (non)compliance with pandemic pro-health measures. In 2020 had coauthored articles awarded with “The Margo Wilson Award” and the Ig Nobel Prize in Economics.

Karel Kleisner is an associate professor of theoretical biology at the Charles University (Prague, Czechia). His theoretical and empirical research focuses on a broad span of eco-morphological phenomena from cross-cultural perception of human faces to ecology of ultraviolet patterns on butterfly wings.

Jaroslav Flegr is an evolutionary biologist and evolutionary psychologist affiliated to Faculty of Science Charles University and National Institute of Mental Health, Czechia. He is a discoverer of the effects of latent toxoplasmosis and Rh factor on human behavior, personality, and mental and physical health, as well as an author of

theories of frozen plasticity and frozen evolution. He has published five books and about 170 research articles.

Yan Wang is a professor in Fudan University, China. She obtained the PhD from the Chinese University of Hong Kong. Her current research mainly focuses on young people's mating behaviors and parenting in Chinese family.