



# Exploring Attitudes Toward “Sugar Relationships” Across 87 Countries: A Global Perspective on Exchanges of Resources for Sex and Companionship

Norbert Meskó<sup>1</sup> · Marta Kowal<sup>2</sup> · András Láng<sup>1</sup> · Ferenc Kocsor<sup>1</sup> · Szabolcs A. Bandi<sup>1</sup> · Adam Putz<sup>1</sup> · Piotr Sorokowski<sup>3</sup> · David A. Frederick<sup>4</sup> · Felipe E. García<sup>5</sup> · Leonardo A. Aguilar<sup>6</sup> · Anna Studzinska<sup>7</sup> · Chee-Seng Tan<sup>8</sup> · Biljana Gjoneska<sup>9</sup> · Taciano L. Milfont<sup>10</sup> · Merve Topcu Bulut<sup>11</sup> · Dmitry Grigoryev<sup>12</sup> · Toivo Aavik<sup>13</sup> · Mahmoud Boussema<sup>14</sup> · Alan D. A. Mattiassi<sup>15</sup> · Reza Afhami<sup>16</sup> · Rizwana Amin<sup>17</sup> · Roberto Baiocco<sup>18</sup> · Hamdaoui Brahim<sup>19</sup> · Ali R. Can<sup>20</sup> · Joao Carneiro<sup>21</sup> · Hakan Çetinkaya<sup>22</sup> · Dimitri Chubinidze<sup>23</sup> · Eliane Deschrijver<sup>24,25,26</sup> · Yahya Don<sup>27</sup> · Dmitrii Dubrov<sup>28</sup> · Izzet Duyar<sup>29</sup> · Marija Jovic<sup>30</sup> · Julia A. Kamburidis<sup>31</sup> · Farah Khan<sup>32</sup> · Hareesol Khun-Inkeeree<sup>33</sup> · Maida Koso-Drljevic<sup>34</sup> · David Lacko<sup>35</sup> · Karlijn Massar<sup>36</sup> · Mara Morelli<sup>37</sup> · Jean C. Natividade<sup>38</sup> · Ellen K. Nyhus<sup>39</sup> · Ju Hee Park<sup>40</sup> · Farid Pazhoohi<sup>41</sup> · Ekaterine Pirtskhalava<sup>42</sup> · Koen Ponnet<sup>43</sup> · Pavol Prokop<sup>44,45</sup> · Dušana Šakan<sup>46</sup> · Singha Tulyakul<sup>47</sup> · Austin H. Wang<sup>48</sup> · Sibebe D. Aquino<sup>38</sup> · Derya D. Atamtürk<sup>29</sup> · Nana Burduli<sup>49</sup> · Antonio Chirumbolo<sup>50</sup> · Seda Dural<sup>51</sup> · Edgardo Etchezahar<sup>52,53</sup> · Nasim Ghahraman Moharrampour<sup>54</sup> · Balazs Aczel<sup>55</sup> · Luca Kozma<sup>1,56</sup> · Samuel Lins<sup>57</sup> · Efsio Manunta<sup>58</sup> · Tiago Marot<sup>59</sup> · Moises Mebarak<sup>60</sup> · Kirill G. Miroshnik<sup>61</sup> · Katarina Misetic<sup>34</sup> · Marietta Papadatou-Pastou<sup>62</sup> · Bence Bakos<sup>63</sup> · Fatima Zahra Sahli<sup>64</sup> · Sangeeta Singh<sup>39</sup> · Çağlar Solak<sup>65</sup> · Tatiana Volkodav<sup>66</sup> · Anna Wlodarczyk<sup>67</sup> · Grace Akello<sup>68</sup> · Marios Argyrides<sup>69</sup> · Ogeday Çoker<sup>70</sup> · Katarzyna Galasinska<sup>71</sup> · Talía Gómez Yepes<sup>72</sup> · Aleksander Kobylarek<sup>73</sup> · Miguel Landa-Blanco<sup>74</sup> · Marlon Mayorga<sup>75</sup> · Barış Özener<sup>29</sup> · Ma. Criselda T. Pacquing<sup>76</sup> · Marc Eric S. Reyes<sup>76</sup> · Ayşegül Şahin<sup>28</sup> · William Tamayo-Agudelo<sup>77</sup> · Gulmira Topanova<sup>78</sup> · Ezgi Toplu-Demirtaş<sup>79</sup> · Belgüzar N. Türkan<sup>70</sup> · Marcos Zumárraga-Espinosa<sup>80</sup> · Simone Grassini<sup>81,82</sup> · Jan Antfolk<sup>83</sup> · Clément Cornec<sup>84</sup> · Katarzyna Pisanski<sup>3,84</sup> · Sabrina Stöckli<sup>85</sup> · Stephanie Josephine Eder<sup>86</sup> · Hyemin Han<sup>87</sup>

Received: 10 February 2023 / Revised: 5 October 2023 / Accepted: 5 October 2023  
© The Author(s) 2023

## Abstract

The current study investigates attitudes toward one form of sex for resources: the so-called sugar relationships, which often involve exchanges of resources for sex and/or companionship. The present study examined associations among attitudes toward sugar relationships and relevant variables (e.g., sex, sociosexuality, gender inequality, parasitic exposure) in 69,924 participants across 87 countries. Two self-report measures of Acceptance of Sugar Relationships (ASR) developed for younger companion providers (ASR-YWMS) and older resource providers (ASR-OMWS) were translated into 37 languages. We tested cross-sex and cross-linguistic construct equivalence, cross-cultural invariance in sex differences, and the importance of the hypothetical predictors of ASR. Both measures showed adequate psychometric properties in all languages (except the Persian version of ASR-YWMS). Results partially supported our hypotheses and were consistent with previous theoretical considerations and empirical evidence on human mating. For example, at the individual level, sociosexual orientation, traditional gender roles, and pathogen prevalence were significant predictors of both ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS. At the country level, gender inequality and parasite stress positively predicted the ASR-YWMS. However, being a woman negatively predicted the ASR-OMWS, but positively predicted the ASR-YWMS. At country-level, ingroup favoritism and parasite stress positively predicted the ASR-OMWS. Furthermore, significant cross-subregional differences were found in the openness to sugar relationships (both ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS scores) across subregions. Finally, significant differences were found between ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS when compared in each subregion. The ASR-YWMS was significantly higher than the ASR-OMWS in all subregions, except for Northern Africa and Western Asia.

Extended author information available on the last page of the article

Published online: 21 December 2023

Springer

**Keywords** Resources for sex · Sugar relationships · Cross-cultural comparison · Human mating

## Introduction

Sex for resources has been common for centuries (e.g., concubine, mistress, paramour; Murdock, 1952; Nelson, 1993; Ringdal, 2007; Sanger, 1858; Scott, 2014). Sugar relationships are one modern version of transactional relationships that include sexual activity and/or companionship. In a sugar relationship, a man with resources (*sugar daddy*) or, less frequently, a woman with resources (*sugar mama*) provides material compensation (money or other assets) for the sexual companionship offered by a partner who is typically younger in age (*sugar baby* or, less frequently, *sugar boy*; Nayar, 2017).

In recent years, the nature of sugar relationships has been addressed in several different disciplinary approaches (Meskó et al., 2021). Sagar et al. (2016) adopt a sociological perspective on university students' motives for working in the sex industry. Mixon (2019) proposes an economic approach to sugar relationships, in which the concept of human capital investment explains the relatively high proportion of young female university students enrolled in expensive programs among the users of specialized dating sites. From a feminist perspective, Cordero (2015) points out the importance of negotiating power and agency by prospective partners in a sugar relationship. Other authors focus on the legal and ethical aspects of sugar relationships. Miller (2011), Motyl (2012), and Motz (2014) question whether sugar relationships should be legally defined as a form of sex work, considering that in countries where sex work (and active support for sex work) is banned, no comparable legal provision restricts the access to web services designed for managing sugar relationships. Ernst et al. (2021) focus on the prejudice, stigmatization, and social exclusion targeted at university students involved in the sex industry, which hinders these students in seeking and receiving emotional support from their social environment.

Wade (2009), the founder and CEO of *Seeking Arrangement* (the US sugar babies dating site), defines sugar relationships as an arrangement where one person provides intimacy, companionship, or other forms of attention in return for personal gain such as financial support or professional advancement. Scull (2020) states that this definition is more inclusive and representative of the diverse range of sugar relationships that exist as it encompasses those that do not involve sex or age disparities. This definition is preferable to academic ones as it is more inclusive and represents the wide range of sugar relationships that exist.

Exchanging sex for resources between young attractive partners and older partners with resources occurs in many present-day societies. The term transactional sex is mostly

used by academics in reference to relationships in African countries to describe trades of sexual accessibility for resources (e.g., Choudhry et al., 2014; Masvawure, 2010; Stoebenau et al., 2016; Wamoyi et al., 2010). The term *compensated date* (Chu, 2018) is typically used in Asia and Eastern Europe, including Hong Kong (Lee & Shek, 2013), Japan (McLellan, 2013), Moscow, Kyiv, and Minsk (Swader & Vorobeva, 2015). Finally, the term *sugar relationship* is most common in North America and Europe (e.g., Birkás et al., 2020; Ipolyi et al., 2021; Láng et al., 2021; Scull, 2022; Upadhyay, 2021). In this research, we will examine sugar relationships as a specific manifestation of the broader phenomenon of “sex for resources” transactions, alongside other known variations of this phenomenon.

Although little is known about the inner nature of sugar relationships, age difference is one of the fundamental and immanent components of this type of transactional relationship. The available data suggest that sugar relationships, unlike prostitution, cannot be seen as a “purely” business transaction by the participants. In sugar relationships, the older party often shares resources related to social capital in addition to material resources (skills, network, know-how, etc.; Ojebode et al., 2010) with the younger party. This age gap is an evolutionarily well-understood part of the human mating strategy (Conroy-Beam & Buss, 2019). Therefore, we considered it important to emphasize the importance of age in the present study.

In a qualitative study of Swedish sugar daddies, men often emphasized the desire for the presence of some degree of emotional intimacy and mutual enjoyment of the relationship and sexual interactions, in addition to the economic transaction. The interactions may include initial dates to facilitate these feelings. Furthermore, to create this atmosphere, the financial transaction is often framed as a “gift” rather than as a “payment for services” (Gunnarsson & Strid, 2022, 2023). This framing is captured well by one participant who described his experience of these relationships: “The women involved in [sugar dating] are more for real, you get to take part of their... real thoughts and real life, compared to being with a prostitute that you get to be with for 30 min or an hour. In some ways, it becomes more for real” (Gunnarson & Strid, 2022, p. 316).

In a sugar relationship, the partners engage in a direct sexual transaction lacking commitment and shared reproductive goals, which is possibly part of a short-term mating strategy (Anderson & Klofstad, 2012; Burtáverde & Ene, 2021; Whyte et al., 2019). In one interview study of 48 women from the United States, several common themes emerged for why they engaged in sugar relationships. The most commonly cited motivations were money (83%), followed by material

items, services, activities, and other expenses (58%), followed by sexual interactions (27%) and the companionship (25%) or hope of finding love (13%), and finally mentorship and access to social networks (8%) and curiosity, boredom, or fun (8%) (Scull, 2022). A qualitative Danish study of sugar babies aged 18–30 showed that the economic motive is dominant when engaging in sugar dating, but this is rarely the only motive (Groes et al., 2021). Additional motives were need for excitement, a wish to explore own sexual boundaries, or a need for appreciation/confirmation.

To measure psychological aspects of mating and their relation to sugar relationships in a standardized way, Birkás et al. (2020) developed an attitudinal measure of young people's openness to engage in sex for material compensation encounters (Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale; ASR-YWMS). Láng et al. (2021) published a complementary measure assessing older people's openness to provide compensation for sex with young partners (Acceptance of Sugar Relationship in Older Men and Women Scale, ASR-OMWS). Birkás et al. (2020) found that young (18–28 years) participants' positive attitude toward sugar relationships (ASR-YWMS) were positively associated with a manipulative, game playing love style (*Ludus*), self-centered sexual motivation, unrestricted sociosexual orientation, and socially aversive personality traits such as Machiavellianism or subclinical psychopathy (two components of the Dark Triad), as well as borderline personality organization. Láng et al. (2021) replicated these psychological correlates in a sample of older people (40–71 years), using the ASR-OMWS. These results were consistent with the idea that openness to sugar relationships is part of a short-term mating strategy aimed at gaining personal benefits rapidly. Birkás and Csathó (2015) found a positive correlation between the Dark Triad traits and present-oriented time perspectives, indicating that individuals with these socially aversive traits tend to prioritize short-term benefits and focus on situations that offer immediate rewards.

The present study examined several factors expected to have universal associations with attitudes toward sex-for-resources encounters. Considered here are potentially important correlates that have not been extensively explored in past research. To this end, a large multinational sample was surveyed for reliable cross-cultural differences in ASR (and, more generally, in openness to sex for resources) and for the universal predictors of these differences, taking into account possible moderators. Given the absence of directly related previous findings, the tested predictors were adopted from studies of related outcome variables such as preferred interpersonal distance (Sorokowska et al., 2017), affective interpersonal touch in close relationships (Sorokowska et al., 2021), and love experiences (Sorokowski et al., 2023). These included (1) individual-level predictors such as sex,

age, sociosexual orientation, and parasite history; and (2) culture-level predictors such as collectivism, gender equality, and social welfare as measured by the Human Development Index (HDI). The sections below summarize the reasons for the focus on these individual and cultural level predictors.

In research, the distinction between individual and cultural context of predictor variables can be unclear (Leung, 1989). Individual-level predictors are directly related to the individual, which can explain differences between individuals. Cultural-level predictors are those variables that can explain why individuals belonging to a certain culture are similar to each other (e.g., have similar preferences, habits, values) and why they are different from individuals belonging to other cultural units. However, these two levels of predictors are not always sharply separated. For example, resistance to pathogens has both an individual dimension (immune system, health behavior, etc.) and a cultural dimension (prevalence of climate-specific parasites, level of health care, etc.). Thus, depending on whether we use a self-report questionnaire (individual aspect) or analyze a public database (cultural aspect), we can methodologically utilize both individual and cultural type data on the same individual (or cultural) level predictor.

## Individual-Level Predictors

### Sex

Previous studies consistently found that men scored higher on openness toward sugar relationships than women did (e.g., Birkás et al., 2020; Ipolyi et al., 2021; Láng et al., 2021; Scull, 2022; Upadhyay, 2021). These findings are in line with the proposed sex difference in prioritization of sexual variety and access among men, who have higher reproductive potential and lower minimum obligatory biological costs of mating, versus women, who have higher obligatory biological costs and might require long-term investment from a mate more consistently than men do (e.g., Buss, 1989; Walter et al., 2020).

### Age

Past research has found no significant associations of age with acceptance of sugar relationships among men or women (Birkás et al., 2020; Ipolyi et al., 2021; Láng et al., 2021). Older people completed the ASR-OMWS, while younger people completed the ASR-YWMS, which had partially different items. Thus, attitudes toward openness to participating in sugar relationships were not directly comparable between the two age groups using this method. To shed more light on this matter, participants in this study completed both versions.

## Sociosexual Orientation

Simpson and Gangestad (1991) use the term sociosexuality to describe one's willingness to engage in casual sex, particularly without emotional connection or commitment. Individuals with an unrestricted sociosexual orientation show a higher openness to casual sexual encounters (i.e., a short-term mating strategy) than those with a restricted sociosexual orientation, who are less willing to engage in uncommitted and emotionally detached sex (i.e., they pursue a long-term mating strategy; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991, 1992). Schmitt (2005) conducted a 48-nation study of sociosexuality, which examines the relationship between culture and human mating strategies. He found that sociosexuality, or the willingness to engage in sexual behavior outside of a committed relationship, varied widely across cultures. This is an important finding as it suggests that cultural factors might play a significant role in shaping human mating strategies. Birkás et al. (2020) found that the higher young participants scored on the ASR-YWMS, the more unrestricted sociosexual orientation they reported ( $r = .52$ ), while Láng et al. (2021) observed a comparable positive association between scores on the ASR-OMWS and unrestricted sociosexuality reported by older participants ( $r = .55$ ).

## Parasite History

The external signs of pathogens carried by individuals have been an important source of information to observers since early stages of human evolution (Ewald, 1994). The ability to detect the relevant cues of an infection, combined with motivational systems such as disgust or fear when exposed to these cues provided an adaptive response to avoid close contact with the contagious person, would have likely enhanced survival and reproductive success (Anderson & May, 1991). The highest risk for a human group is posed by highly virulent non-endemic (i.e., previously not common) pathogens (Thornhill & Fincher, 2014, 2015). In addition to the pathogens transmitted in a wide variety of social situations, sexually transmitted infection (STIs) may have exerted further selection pressure on the human mating psychology (Mackey & Immerman, 2000). The feelings of disgust and fear of infection are adaptive emotional responses potentially reducing the risk of contracting an STI (Nesse & Ellsworth, 2009; Rozin et al., 2008). Hlay et al. (2022) found that the intensity of sexual disgust and pathogen disgust were positively associated with a more restricted sociosexual orientation.

## Culture-Level Predictors

### Individualism–Collectivism

Hofstede (1980, 1981) defines culture as the collective programming of the mind distinguishing the members of one group or category of people from others. One fundamental dimension on which cultures differ from each other is individualism–collectivism (IND–COL; Hofstede, 1980, 1981). In societies with high collectivism, people largely depend on close intragroup ties, while those living in societies with high individualism show a high preference for independence and maintain a strong sense of autonomy (Hofstede, 2001). As Nayar (2017) notes, the emergence of modern individualism (accompanied by a decline in collectivist values) shifted courtship and intimacy from the private sphere to the public sphere of recreation and consumerism. Mulvihill and Large (2019) go as far as suggesting that practices of “transactional intimacy” are replacing traditional interpersonal intimacy in individualistic societies. Based on a cross-cultural study, Schmitt (2005) suggests that cultures that value individualism and self-expression tend to have higher levels of sociosexuality. In this perspective, young people engaging in sugar relationships (sugar babies/boys) choose to pursue a financial strategy to cope with their economic and social conditions when offering their older and wealthier prospective partners (sugar daddies/mommies) companionship in return for material compensation (Nayar, 2017). Minkov et al. (2013) found that so-called personal-sexual norms (e.g., participation to sex for resources) strongly correlated with national wealth and individualistic values. The wealthy and individualistic countries scored higher on the justifiability of these behavior, suggesting that individualism is associated with freedom of personal choice in crucially important matters, such as sexual behavior.

### Gender Equality

According to the biosocial role theory (previously known as social role theory), sex differences in human behavior primarily originate in men's and women's different positions in social structures rather than in evolutionary processes resulting in dispositional differences (Eagly & Wood, 1999, 2016; Wood & Eagly, 2012). This perspective assigns primary importance to gender equality, which it considers to depend on whether women can release themselves from men's oppressive power (e.g., Coy, 2012). Consequently, gender equality is not possible as long as women submit themselves to men sexually (and otherwise). Sex for resources (e.g., sugar relationships, prostitution) is the most extreme case of sex-based oppression, since sexuality in this case is not an interaction that takes place between

equal partners but a business transaction in which a man offers money to a woman in return for using her body as a means of sexual satisfaction. In an equality-oriented perspective, sex for resources results from a sexually oppressive patriarchal social order (Miller & Schwartz, 1995; Upadhyay, 2021), which assigns particular importance to differentiated sex roles. The more differentiated sex roles (i.e., common gender-related behavioral norms and beliefs) are in a society, the more intense the pressure for conforming to role expectations (Wood & Eagly, 2012). Since sex for resources is a result of sex-based oppression, it is more frequent in societies where gender inequality is more pronounced (Benoit et al., 2019). According to research by Lippa (2009), there is a positive correlation between the degree of gender equality in a country and the magnitude of gender differences in sexual desire and sociosexuality, indicating that the level of gender equality may influence the size of gender disparities in sexual behavior and human mating strategies. Additionally, Schmitt (2005) found that cultures with greater gender equality tend to have higher levels of sociosexuality, while cultures with greater gender inequality tend to have lower levels of sociosexuality.

### Human Development Index

The HDI is a composite measure including life expectancy (closely related to access to health care and nutrition), education (mean years of schooling completed and expected years of schooling upon entering the education system), and income per capita (Stanton, 2007). Cross-national differences in HDI have been associated with a number of individual-level variables, such as social trust (Özcan & Bjørnskov, 2011; Sorokowski et al., 2023). The relative development of a society presumably impacts the motives for sexual contact between men and women (e.g., Lippa, 2009; Schmitt, 2005). Even though both women and men are receptive to many of the qualities of a potential partner (e.g., place more importance on similarity and on socially appealing personality characteristics such as intelligence, honesty, warmth; Regan et al., 2000), several empirical findings show that there are potential sex differences in sexual preferences. Men generally prefer potential opposite-sex partners who are younger than themselves and physically attractive, while women prefer partners who are older and wealthier than themselves (Buss, 1989; Conroy-Beam et al., 2015; Walter et al., 2021; Zhang et al., 2019). Although no previous studies explored the relationship between openness to sex for resources and HDI, indirect empirical evidence suggests that they should be negatively associated. Specifically, young people living in developing countries are more exposed to sexual exploitation than those living in countries at a higher level of development (e.g., Averdijk et al., 2020; Krisch et al., 2019; LoPiccalo et al., 2016).

### Research Aims and Hypotheses

The study design was informed by the basic methodological principles of cross-cultural research in psychology (see, e.g., Poortinga & Fontaine, 2022), and was part of a larger cross-cultural project (see Kowal et al., 2022, 2023). The aim of the present work was twofold. First (H1), the psychometric properties of the ASR-YWMS (Birkás et al., 2020) and the ASR-OMWS (Láng et al., 2021) were assessed with a large multinational sample. Furthermore, we tested the sex differences obtained in previous studies in both ASR scales (H2) and finally intra- and cross-subregional differences and similarities in both ASR scales (H3). According to our second aim, we (H4) explored the associations of ASR with the predictor variables.

**Hypothesis 1** The first set of hypotheses centered around establishing the validity of the measures across cultures. When we tried to define the geographical unit of analysis, we found that the analysis by country was too fine-grained, while the analysis by 7 world regions seemed too oversimplified. Both would have made interpretation difficult. We therefore chose an intermediate path and proceeded with the analysis by subregions. The sampled regions and subregions were coded in accordance with the standard country or area codes for statistical use published by the Statistics Division of the United Nations Secretariat (1999). Subregional analysis is a common and widespread method for understanding certain socio-economic and health processes (e.g., Nishimura et al., 2022; OECD, 2015; UNICEF & WHO, 2019).

#### Hypothesis 1.1 Cross-linguistic measurement invariance.

It was expected that for each of the individual-level measures we used (ASR-YWMS; the ASR-OMWS; the Three-Item Sociosexual Orientation Inventory, SOI-3; the Gender-Equitable Men Scale, GEMS; and the Individualism–Collectivism scale), measurement invariance would be supported so that the data obtained from these measures would be suitable for further analysis.

#### Hypothesis 1.2 Cross-sexual measurement invariance.

It was expected that our research scales, the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, would measure constructs of interest in a consistent way across men and women. That is, we hypothesized sexual invariance in both measures.

**Hypothesis 2** Cross-sexual differences of the acceptance of sugar relationships.

Based on sex differences obtained in previous analyses on Hungarian samples (men scored higher on both ASR measures; Birkás et al., 2020; Láng et al., 2021), we expected to obtain similar sex differences in the present multicultural analysis, with men scoring higher on both scales (i.e., ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS).

**Hypothesis 3** Intra- and cross-subregional differences and similarities.

We hypothesized that openness to sugar relationships measured by ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS would be articulated differently in different subregions and that this difference is not due to the cultural variation of the instruments.

**Hypothesis 3.1** Cross-subregional measurement invariance.

It was expected that the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS are suitable for comparative analysis of subregions because the scales consistently measure constructs of interest across subregions, and thus are invariant across subregions.

**Hypothesis 3.2** Cross-subregional differences of the acceptance of sugar relationships.

It was expected that there are differences in ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS scores across subregions. That is, people living in different subregions have different attitudes toward openness to sugar relationships compared to each other.

**Hypothesis 3.3** Intra-subregional differences between the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS.

It was expected that there are differences between ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS scores within cultures. It was also expected that the difference between ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS would differ between cultures.

**Hypothesis 4** Associations between individual- and country-level predictors of the acceptance of sugar relationships.

Openness to sugar relationships was expected to be associated with the different individual and country-level predictor variables based on the theoretical introduction.

**Hypothesis 4.1** Individual-level predictors of ASR-YWMS.

At the individual level, ASR-YWMS was expected to be associated positively with being a man, age, unrestricted sociosexual orientation (measured by the SOI-3), traditional gender roles (measured by the GEMS), individualistic values (measured by Collectivism Scale) and pathogen prevalence (measured by the nine-item Pathogen Prevalence Index).

**Hypothesis 4.2** Country-level predictors of ASR-YWMS.

At the country level, ASR-YWMS was expected to be associated positively with gender inequality (measured by the Gender Inequality Index), and parasite stress (measured by the Country-specific zoonotic and non-zoonotic parasite stress). Furthermore, ASR-YWMS was expected to be associated negatively with HDI and collectivism (measured by the 178-nation index of Ingroup Favoritism).

**Hypothesis 4.3** Individual-level predictors of ASR-OMWS.

At the individual level, ASR-OMWS was expected to be associated positively with being a man, age, unrestricted sociosexual orientation (measured by the SOI-3), traditional gender roles (measured by the GEMS), individualistic values (measured by Collectivism Scale), and pathogen prevalence (measured by the nine-item Pathogen Prevalence Index).

**Hypothesis 4.4** Country-level predictors of ASR-OMWS.

At the country level, ASR-OMWS was expected to be associated positively with gender inequality (measured by the Gender Inequality Index), and parasite stress (measured by the Country-specific zoonotic and non-zoonotic parasite stress). Furthermore, ASR-OMWS was expected to be associated negatively with HDI and collectivism (measured by the 178-nation index of Ingroup Favoritism).

## Method

### Participants and Procedure

A total of 118,324 participants from 176 countries completed the survey. After excluding those participants who did not meet the inclusion criteria (passing the attention check) and those linguistic subsamples that did not reach the size of at least 100 participants, the final sample consisted of 69,924 individuals from 87 countries, who completed the survey in one of 37 languages (see details in Supplementary Materials).

The final sample included 45,509 (65.12%) women, 23,449 (33.55%) men, 665 (.91%) non-binary individuals, 264 (.38%) chose “prefer not to say,” and 37 participants who provided no data regarding their gender. Regarding sex at birth 45,745 (66.03%) were female, 23,434 (33.83%) participants’ sex were male, 96 (.14%) were intersex, and 649 did not respond. The participants were aged 18 to 90 years ( $M = 29.68$ ,  $SD = 11.99$ ,  $Mdn = 25$ ). Regarding intimate partner relationship, 17,685 (25.32%) participants were dating someone, 9,050 (12.96%) were in a committed relationship, 14,494 (20.75%) were married, 28,626 (40.98%) single, and 2069 did not respond. Regarding employment, 18,966

(32.86%) participants were students, 3,720 (6.44%) were in full time employment, 4,522 (7.83%) were in part time employment, 4,302 (7.45%) were self-employed, 24,560 (42.55%) were unemployed, 1,652 (2.86%) were retired, and 12,202 did not respond. (See Table S1.A and Table S1.B in Supplementary Materials for demographic data by country.)

The original Hungarian survey was translated into 37 languages, and all translated versions were checked for consistency with the back-translation method (Brislin, 1970, 1983; Hambleton & De Jong, 2003; Muñiz et al., 2013; see Supplementary Materials for the detailed instructions provided for all translation teams). Data were collected online between April and August 2021. Online data collection was conducted via Qualtrics in all but four countries. Due to technical reasons, one Russian collaborator collected data using the Toloka website (a crowdsourcing platform popular in Russia), the Algerian and Moroccan participants provided data in a paper-and-pencil format, and the Iranian participants completed a Google form. The collaborators ensured that all national subsamples were heterogeneous in terms of sex, age, residence (urban vs. rural), and education. The participants were invited to share the link to the survey to their own networks on social media platforms. Approximately 6% of the obtained data were collected with the help of outsourcing companies. The brief descriptive statistics regarding the sample size, sex, and age in each language group is presented in Table S2 in Supplementary Materials for additional information.

## Transparency and Openness

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions, all manipulations, and all measures in the study, and we follow Journal Article Reporting Standards (JARS; Kazak, 2018). All data, analysis code, and research materials are available at [https://osf.io/prdj2/?view\\_only=48e348faec344a59554ad44c7e89482](https://osf.io/prdj2/?view_only=48e348faec344a59554ad44c7e89482). Data were analyzed using R, version 4.0.0 (R Core Team, 2020). See the section Analytic Plan for the detailed analytic methodology. This study's design and its analysis were not pre-registered.

## Individual-Level Measures

### Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale

The ASR-YWMS (Birkás et al., 2020) is a five-item scale assessing one's willingness to engage in a sugar relationship as the younger partner (sugar baby/boy), who provides sexual companionship for the older partner in return for material compensation (gifts and/or money). Examples of items include: If it would benefit my career, I would think about engaging in a sugar relationship; I would seriously consider

engaging in a sugar relationship if I thought it would help me have a better financial situation. The participants rated each item on a seven-point scale ranging from Absolutely disagree (1) to Absolutely agree (7). (See the 37-language version of the ASR-YWMS and details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

### Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale

The ASR-OMWS (Láng et al., 2021) is a five-item scale assessing one's willingness to engage in a sugar relationship as the older partner (sugar daddy/mommy), who provides material compensation (gifts and/or money) for the younger partner in return for sexual companionship. Examples of items include: "If it would be beneficial for my sex life or for others' judgment of me, I would consider engaging in a sugar relationship"; "I would seriously consider engaging in a sugar relationship if that was the way to find a partner who would meet all my needs." The participants rated each item on a five-point scale ranging from Absolutely disagree (1) to Absolutely agree (7). (See the 37-language version of the ASR-OMWS and details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

### Three-Item Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-3)

The Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R; Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) is a nine-item scale assessing one's sociosexual behavior, attitude, and desire with three items each. Since the present study only focused on the participants' overall sociosexual orientation and due to space constraints, we only used one item of each component: Sociosexual behavior (With how many different partners have you had sexual intercourse without having an interest in a long-term committed relationship with this person?); Sociosexual attitude (I can imagine myself being comfortable and enjoying "casual" sex with different partners); and Sociosexual desire (In everyday life, how often do you have spontaneous fantasies about having sex with someone you have just met?). The participants rated each item on a nine-point scale and ranging from "1 = 0 to 9 = 20 or more" for Sociosexual behavior; ranging from "1 = Strongly disagree" to "9 = Strongly agree" for Sociosexual attitude, and "1 = Never" to "9 = At least once a day" for Sociosexual desire. Higher overall scores indicated a more unrestricted sociosexual orientation. (See details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

### Gender-Equitable Men Scale

The original GEMS (Pulerwitz & Barker, 2008) is a 24-item scale assessing young men's attitudes toward various

sex-related norms. A more recently developed version (Levtov et al., 2014) comprises five subscales (Gender, Violence, Masculinity, Sexuality, and Reproductive Health), of which the Gender subscale was used in the present study to assess the male participants' adherence to traditional gender roles. The subscale comprises three reverse-scored items: A woman's most important role is to take care of her home and cook; Changing diapers, giving kids a bath, and feeding kids are the mother's responsibility; A man should have the final word about decisions in his home. Each was rated on a seven-point scale ranging from Absolutely agree (1) to Absolutely disagree (7). (See details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

### Personal Individualism Measured Using the Collectivism Scale

The items were consistent with the collectivism-to-individualism continuum proposed by Hofstede (1981, 2001). The scale comprises four reverse-scored items as follows: Group welfare is more important than individual rewards; Group success is more important than individual success; Being accepted by the members of the workgroup is very important; and Employees should pursue their goals only after considering the welfare of the group. After analyzing the Collectivism Scale (Wu, 2006), it became evident that the third item may not reliably represent general attitudes toward individualism because it focused specifically on a workplace context where different norms might operate. We performed an exploratory factor analysis and this item loaded onto the individualism attitudes less than did the other items (.37 as compared to .83, .87, and .50), and fell below the usually recommended criterion (i.e., below .40; Costello & Osborne, 2005). We therefore removed that item and used the remaining three items in all subsequent analyses. The participants rated each item on a seven-point scale ranging from Absolutely disagree (1) to Absolutely agree (7). Higher overall scores indicated higher individualism. (See details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

### Parasite History

The 9-item Pathogen Prevalence Index (Murray & Schaller, 2010) was used to measure parasite history. The participants responded to the question, Have you ever contracted (been sick with) any of the following diseases? concerning each of nine infectious diseases, including leishmaniasis, schistosomes, trypanosomes, leprosy, malaria, typhus, filariae, dengue, and tuberculosis, for which Murray and Schaller (2010) calculated the index at a regional level. The response alternatives were Never (0), Once (1), and More than once (2). Higher overall scores indicated more frequent past

experiences with parasites. (See details of internal consistency in Table S3 in Supplementary Materials.)

## Country-Level Measures

### Gender Inequality Index and Human Development Index

Gender Inequality Index (GII) and the HDI of each sampled country (for data on the HDI—Human Development Report, 2021/2022; United Nations Development Programme, 2022) were used for analyses.

### National Collectivism

The 178-nation index of Ingroup Favoritism from Van de Vliert (2011) was used as a proxy for the collectivism score for each country.

### Parasite Load

Country-specific zoonotic and non-zoonotic parasite stress in a given region were analyzed using data reported by Fincher and Thornhill (2012).

## Analysis Plans

### Cross-Linguistic Measurement Invariance Test and Measurement Alignment

In the present study, participants were presented with different survey forms depending on their language. Because we intended to examine the relationship between variables with data collected across different languages, we needed to assure that the survey forms in different languages were measuring the constructs of interest in a consistent manner, particularly when the constructs were measured in terms of latent variables requiring validity checks (Fischer & Karl, 2019).

To be able to assure the requirement for cross-language data analysis, we conducted a measurement invariance test to assess whether the measurement model of each scale in the survey forms was consistently valid across different language versions (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). The measurement invariance test was performed via multi-group confirmatory factor analysis (MG-CFA) in R package, using *lavaan*. Whether measurement invariance was supported for a scale was determined by the changes in the fit quality indicators, that is, root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA), standardized root mean squared residual (SRMR), and comparative fit index (CFI), across different levels of model constraints. The least restrictive level of model invariance is configural invariance, which only assumes an equal measurement model across different groups. Metric invariance assumes equal factor loadings in



addition to configural invariance. Scalar invariance additionally requires equal intercepts. Finally, the most restrictive form of invariance, residual invariance, additionally assumes equal residuals. In cross-group studies involving multiple-group comparisons of latent variables, at least scalar invariance should be supported. If scalar invariance was supported, we assumed that composite scores were possible to use for further analyses.

Whether a specific level of invariance is supported by evidence was determined by examining to what extent RMSEA, SRMR, and CFI change when an additional assumption is added while performing MG-CFA (Putnick & Bornstein, 2016). First, the first level of invariance, configural invariance, is tested by examining the fit indicators when MG-CFA is conducted. We planned to utilize the widely used criteria for this purpose, that is, RMSEA and SRMR  $< .08$ , and CFI  $\geq .90$  (Hu & Bentler, 1999). For metric invariance, we tested  $\Delta$ RMSEA and  $\Delta$ SRMR  $< +.30$ , and  $\Delta$ CFI  $\geq -.01$ , and for scalar and residual invariance,  $\Delta$ RMSEA and  $\Delta$ SRMR  $< +.15$ , and  $\Delta$ CFI  $\geq -.01$ . In all cases, as the observed responses were anchored to ordinary scales, not continuous scales, we used the WLSMV estimator to minimize the potential bias (Li, 2016).

If scalar invariance was not supported by evidence, we conducted measurement alignment to address the non-invariance issue (Tam & Milfont, 2020). Measurement alignment is a psychometric method that adjusts factor loadings and intercepts to absorb the existing non-invariance and achieve scalar invariance for cross-group analysis (Asparouhov & Muthén, 2014). Measurement alignment was performed with an R package, *sirt* (Robitzsh, 2021). After performing measurement alignment, we examined whether  $R^2_{\text{loadings}}$  and  $R^2_{\text{intercepts}}$ , which indicate to what extent the non-invariance in factor loadings and intercepts were absorbed via alignment, respectively, were .75 or higher (Han, 2022b). When these values exceeded .75, we assumed that alignment successfully addressed the non-invariance issue.

Then, Monte Carlo simulations were performed to test whether alignment was able to absorb non-invariance in a consistent and valid manner. We generated simulation datasets with  $N = 100, 200, \text{ and } 500$  with the mean and variance of a scale score of interest in each group (Han et al., 2022). Then, we performed measurement alignment and then the resultant group latent means were significantly correlated with the group latent means estimated from ordinary MG-CFA. Following Han et al. (2022), we examined whether the correlation coefficient was .95 or higher (Muthén & Asparouhov, 2018). For additional information, we also examined the correlation of group variances, although it was not required to be .95 or higher. To speed up the repetitive simulation processes, we employed multiprocessing, which utilized multiple processes, as done in Han et al. (2022). Once measurement alignment was successfully completed,

we calculated latent factors scores of the tested scales with adjusted factor loadings and intercepts for further analyses.

### Comparison of Measurement Invariance Between Men and Women

To be able to compare the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS across two sexes, first, we performed additional data filtering. In this process, we only extracted responses collected from participants who identified their current gender as identical to their sex at birth, and who were not sexually non-binary. Then, we conducted the measurement invariance test by employing the same procedures and criteria that were used to examine cross-linguistic invariance. If scalar invariance was supported and measurement alignment was not required, then we compared the latent mean score between groups of men and women. If scalar invariance was not supported, we conducted measurement alignment and then calculated factor scores with adjusted factor loadings and intercepts. Then, we compared the latent mean score, which was calculated with the adjusted factor scores, between the two groups.

Comparison was performed by both frequentist and Bayesian *t*-tests. Bayesian *t*-test was performed to examine whether our alternative hypothesis, which was whether there was a significant nonzero difference in the variable of interest across two different groups, was supported by evidence directly, instead of testing whether our null hypothesis should be rejected (Wagenmakers et al., 2018a). Given *p*-values are only capable of testing the null hypothesis, not the alternative hypothesis that we were interested in, and likely to lead to inflated false positives, we decided to examine Bayes Factors (BF) additionally (Wagenmakers et al., 2018b).

BFs indicate to what extent an alternative hypothesis is more favored by evidence compared with a null hypothesis. For instance, if BF = 10, it means that evidence ten times more strongly supports an alternative hypothesis versus a null hypothesis. In general, when BF  $\geq 3$ , it is possible to assume that there is significant positive evidence supporting an alternative hypothesis. In the same vein, BF  $\geq 10$  implies strong evidence while BF  $\geq 100$  implies very strong evidence (Han, 2022a; Raftery, 1995). In the present study, Bayesian *t*-test was performed with an R package, *BayesFactor* (Morey et al., 2018). Additionally, we also calculated an effect size indicator, Cohen's *d*.

### Cross-Subregional Comparison of Measurement Invariance

While comparing the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS across fourteen different geographical regions, we first started with the measurement invariance test and measurement alignment similar to the cross-sexual comparison. Once the measurement invariance test and measurement alignment were completed, we examined whether there was a significant

difference in the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS across the subregions via ANOVA. In addition to frequentist ANOVA, we also conducted Bayesian ANOVA with *BayesFactor*. The same BF criteria were used to determine whether an alternative hypothesis was supported. After performing ANOVA, we performed the post hoc test via Tukey's honestly significant difference (HSD) test to examine which pairs of subregions demonstrated the significant difference while controlling for the family-wise error rate.

### Intra-Subregional Comparison of Measurement Invariance

We also compared the ASR-YWMS with ASR-OMWS in each individual subregion. Because two different scales were compared, we employed a method for nonparametric comparison, the Wilcoxon test. When *p*-values were calculated, we performed the false discovery rate correction to prevent potential inflated false positives. In addition to the Wilcoxon test statistics, we also calculated Cohen's *d* to examine the effect sizes.

### Bayesian Multilevel Modeling

To examine the association between individual- and country-level predictors and ASR variables, we conducted Bayesian multilevel modeling. Bayesian multilevel modeling allows to explore whether one model is better supported by evidence compared with another model in terms of a BF (Han, 2022a). For each dependent variable, we compared these four models:

Model 0: DV ~ Intercept (null model)

Model 1: DV ~ Predictors (fixed effect only model)

Model 2: DV ~ Predictors + (1|Country) (random intercept model)

Model 3: DV ~ Predictors + (1+Predictors|Country) (random slope model)

Each model was estimated with *brms* package (Bürkner, 2017). In this process, the default Cauchy prior distribution, Cauchy (0, 1), and the Gaussian family were employed. In addition, for better convergence and interpretation, all variables were standardized. To calculate model BFs, we compared Model 1 versus Model 0 (BF10), Model 2 versus Model 0 (BF20), Model 3 versus Model 0 (BF30). We deemed the model with the highest model BF value as the best model (Dawson et al., 2021).

Once the best model was identified, we examined whether each predictor was significant with the BF of each predictor. For instance, in the case of age, age was hypothesized to be positively associated with ASRs. Then, we assumed:

H0 (null hypothesis):  $b(\text{age}) \leq 0$

H1 (alternative hypothesis)  $b(\text{age}) > 0$

and, calculated BF10 indicating extent to which H1 was more strongly supported by evidence compared with H0. Once  $\text{BF10} \geq 3$ , we deemed that the hypothesis, H1, was positively supported by evidence.

## Results

### Cross-Linguistic Measurement Invariance Test and Measurement Alignment (H1.1)

We examined whether measurement invariance was supported for each individual-level measure that we employed so that the data acquired with such measures are suitable for further analyses. We tested whether scalar invariance, which assumes equal factor loadings and intercepts across language groups, was supported. In this process, the ASR-YWMS, ASR-OMWS, SOI-3, GEMS, and Individualism–Collectivism Scale were tested. The nine-item Pathogen Prevalence Index was not tested for its measurement invariance because in some languages, all participants provided the same response to certain items (e.g., no Dengue infections for participants responding in languages spoken in European countries).

Table 1 demonstrates the results from the measurement invariance tests. In all cases, scalar invariance was not supported, so we performed measurement alignment to address the non-invariance in the measures. In addition, the Persian version of the ASR-YWMS and Individualism–Collectivism Scale were excluded from the tests due to a convergence issue. Table 2 reports the results from measurement alignment as well as Monte Carlo simulations to examine whether the results were reliable and valid. The measurement alignment procedures were able to address the non-invariance issue successfully given more than 75% of the non-invariance in factor loadings as well as intercepts were absorbed via alignment (see  $R^2_{\text{loadings}}$  and  $R^2_{\text{intercepts}}$ ). Also, the results from Monte Carlo simulations support the point that the outcomes were well replicated, so measurement alignment was able to produce reliable and valid outcomes. Thus, for our main analysis, we employed factor scores calculated with the factor loadings and intercepts adjusted via measurement alignment.

Additionally, both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS demonstrated good reliability in terms of McDonald's  $\omega$  in all languages ( $\omega \geq .80$ ). In the cases of the SOI-3 and collectivism scales,  $\omega$  values were higher than .60 in all languages indicating at least acceptable reliability. The GEMS reported acceptable reliability ( $\geq .60$ ) in all languages except Arabic. In general, languages reported acceptable to good reliability ( $\geq .70$ ) in the case of the Pathogen Prevalence Index; however, Arabic, Spanish, and Portuguese were exceptions ( $< .60$ ). See Table S3 in Supplementary Materials for full information.

**Table 1** Cross-lingual measurement invariance tests

	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	$\Delta$ RMSEA	$\Delta$ SRMR	$\Delta$ CFI
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale (ASR-YWMS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.052	.010	.994	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.073	.029	.977	.021	.018	– .016
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale (ASR-OMWS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.065	.014	.990	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.084	.033	.971	.018	.019	– .019
<i>Three-Item Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-3)</i>						
Configural invariance	.000	.000	1.000	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.066	.026	.976	.066	.026	– .024
<i>Gender-Equitable Men Scale (GEMS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.000	.000	1.000	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.069	.021	.977	.069	.021	– .023
<i>Individualism–Collectivism Scale</i>						
Configural invariance	.000	.000	1.000	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.059	.021	.987	.059	.021	– .013

The Persian version of the ASR-YWMS and IND-COL were excluded due to the convergence issue

**Table 2** Measurement alignment and Monte Carlo simulation results

	$R^2_{\text{loadings}}$	$R^2_{\text{intercepts}}$	Monte Carlo Simulation											
			$N=100$				$N=200$				$N=500$			
			cor (mean)		cor (var)		cor (mean)		cor (var)		cor (mean)		cor (var)	
			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
SOI-3	.96	.98	.97	.03	.51	.15	.97	.02	.49	.13	.98	.01	.46	.12
GEMS	.99	.95	.98	.01	.89	.19	.98	.01	.94	.07	.98	.01	.95	.02
IND-COL	1.00	1.00	.97	.01	.91	.05	.97	.01	.94	.04	.97	.01	.96	.01
ASR-YWMS (by language)	.99	.99	.95	.06	.95	.04	.96	.05	.94	.04	.97	.04	.94	.03
ASR-YWMS (by subregion)	.99	1.00	.99	.00	.98	.01	1.00	.00	.98	.01	1.00	.00	.98	.01
ASR-OMWS (by language)	.99	.99	.97	.02	.96	.01	.97	.01	.96	.01	.97	.01	.95	.01
ASR-OMWS (by sex)	1.00	1.00	1.00	.00	.97	.24	1.00	.00	.98	.18	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
ASR-OMWS (by subregion)	.99	1.00	.99	.01	.97	.02	.99	.01	.97	.02	1.00	.00	.96	.02

### Cross-Sexual Measurement Invariance Test of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships Scales (H1.2)

Before conducting the cross-sexual comparison of the acceptance for sugar relationships between men and women, we tested whether our scales, the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, measured the constructs of interest across sexes in a consistent manner via the measurement invariance test. Table 3 reports the results from the measurement invariance test. The most restrictive invariance, residual invariance, which assumes the equal loadings, intercepts, and residuals, was supported in the case of the ASR-YWMS. However, scalar invariance was not

supported in the ASR-OMWS, so we performed measurement alignment. As shown in Table 2, the non-invariance was successfully absorbed in a reliable and valid manner. The outcome suggests that both scales can be used for cross-language investigations after performing measurement alignment.

### Cross-Sexual Comparison of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships (H2)

First, we utilized the multigroup CFA, which was already implemented while testing the measurement invariance, to compare the ASR-YWMS scores between men and women. Because scalar invariance was supported in this case,

**Table 3** Cross-sexual measurement invariance tests

	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	$\Delta$ RMSEA	$\Delta$ SRMR	$\Delta$ CFI
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale (ASR-YWMS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.043	.008	.996	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.035	.011	.996	– .007	.004	.000
Scalar invariance	.046	.016	.991	.010	.005	– .005
Residual invariance	.051	.023	.987	.005	.006	– .004
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale (ASR-OMWS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.064	.013	.990	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.041	.014	.995	– .023	.001	.004
Scalar invariance	.057	.020	.986	.016	.007	– .008

**Table 4** Cross-subregional measurement invariance tests

	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	$\Delta$ RMSEA	$\Delta$ SRMR	$\Delta$ CFI
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale (ASR-YWMS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.048	.010	.995	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.075	.025	.978	.027	.016	– .017
<i>Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale (ASR-OMWS)</i>						
Configural invariance	.068	.014	.990	–	–	–
Metric invariance	.082	.030	.974	.013	.017	– .016

zmeasurement alignment was not required for the cross-group comparison. When the latent mean was compared between the two groups, men reported the significantly higher ASR-YWMS mean score compared with women,  $t(45,106) = 33.06$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = .27$ , 95% CI [.25, .29],  $\log(\text{BF}) = 553.62$ .

Second, we compared the factor score of the ASR-OMWS, which was calculated with the factor loadings and intercepts adjusted via measurement alignment, because scalar invariance was not supported for this scale. The comparison result indicated that men demonstrated the significantly higher ASR-OMWS mean score compared with women,  $t(43,445) = 46.50$ ,  $p < .001$ , Cohen's  $d = .39$ , 95% CI [.34, .45],  $\log(\text{BF}) = 1118.45$ .

### Cross-Subregional Measurement Invariance Test of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships Scales (H3.1)

<sup>1</sup>As in the case of the cross-sexual comparison, we also conducted the measurement invariance test to assure that the

<sup>1</sup> Following an anonymous reviewer's suggestion, we also conducted tests for H3s at the country level. First, we were able to achieve scalar invariance required for cross-country comparisons via measurement

scales measured the constructs of interest consistently across different subregions. Table 4 reports the results from the test of both scales. Scalar invariance was not supported for both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS. Hence, we performed measurement alignment to address the non-invariance issue. As shown in Table 2, the non-invariance was successfully absorbed in a consistent manner for both scales. For the planned cross-subregional comparison, we used the factor scores calculated with the factor loadings and intercepts adjusted via measurement alignment.


### Cross-Subregional Comparison of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships (H3.2)

We visualized the mean score, which was calculated in terms of the latent mean score via measurement alignment, of the


Footnote 1 (continued)

alignment (relevant to H3.1). Second, both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS reported significant cross-country differences as shown at the subregional level (relevant to H3.2). Third, we also examined the difference between the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS in each country (relevant to H3.3). See "Additional Country-wise Analyses" section in our online supplementary material at [https://osf.io/4umga?view\\_only=48e348faec344a59554ad44c7e89482](https://osf.io/4umga?view_only=48e348faec344a59554ad44c7e89482) or our OSF repository for further details.

**Fig. 1** Mean Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale by subregion. The darker shade indicates higher scores (white areas indicate a lack of data for a given region). *Note:* Colored figures available in electronic version only



**Fig. 2** Mean Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Women and Men Scale by subregion. The darker shade indicates higher scores (white areas indicate a lack of data for a given region). *Note:* Colored figures available in electronic version only



ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS in each subregion in Figs. 1 and 2, respectively.

ANOVA indicated that there were significant differences in the ASR-YWMS scores across different subregions,  $F(13, 10, 148) = 183.49, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19, \log(\text{BF}) = 1,251.88$ . We also performed post hoc analysis via Tukey's honestly significant different (HSD) test to control for the family-wise error rate. The result of the post hoc analysis is reported in the upper diagonal of Fig. 3.

A similar trend was found when the ASR-OMWS was examined. The result from ANOVA suggests that there were significant cross-subregional differences in the ASR-OMWS scores across subregions,  $F(13, 10, 126) = 160.04, p < .001, \eta^2 = .17, \log(\text{BF}) = 1090.74$ . The result from the post hoc test is demonstrated in the lower diagonal of Fig. 3.

### Intra-Subregional Comparison Between the Acceptance of Receiving versus Giving Sugar Relationships (H3.3)

We compared the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS in each subregion. Table 5 summarizes the descriptive statistics of ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, and the result of the comparison between them in each subregion. The comparison results are visualized in Fig. 4. After the false discovery rate correction, except for Northern Africa and Western Asia, the ASR-YWMS was significantly higher than the ASR-OMWS in all subregions. In Northern Africa, we found the opposite trend. There was no significant difference between the two scales in Western Asia.

	-0.21*	-0.11	-0.21***	-0.04	-0.13	0.16**	-0.31***	0.07	-0.05	-0.42***	0.30***	-0.39***	-0.39***	Australia and New Zealand
-0.14		0.12	-0.00	0.15**	0.12	0.35***	-0.10	0.27***	0.15	-0.21***	0.49***	-0.19***	-0.16**	Central Asia
-0.09	0.05		-0.11***	0.05	-0.01	0.27***	-0.21***	0.17***	0.05	-0.32***	0.44***	-0.30***	-0.28***	Eastern Asia
-0.10	0.04	-0.01		0.16***	0.11***	0.37***	-0.09***	0.28***	0.15**	-0.19***	0.54***	-0.18***	-0.15***	Eastern Europe
0.14*	0.27***	0.23***	0.25***		-0.06	0.21***	-0.25***	0.11***	-0.01	-0.36***	0.37***	-0.34***	-0.31***	Latin America
0.26***	0.40***	0.36***	0.36***	0.10***		0.29***	-0.22***	0.19***	0.06	-0.32***	0.49***	-0.30***	-0.29***	Northern Africa
0.05	0.19***	0.14***	0.15***	-0.09***	-0.20***		-0.46***	-0.09**	-0.21***	-0.58***	0.16***	-0.55***	-0.53***	Northern America
-0.29***	-0.14	-0.20***	-0.17***	-0.41***	-0.55***	-0.33***		0.37***	0.25***	-0.10***	0.63***	-0.09***	-0.06	Northern Europe
0.00	0.14*	0.09*	0.10***	-0.14***	-0.25***	-0.05	0.28***		-0.12	-0.49***	0.25***	-0.46***	-0.44***	South-eastern Asia
0.07	0.20**	0.17**	0.17***	-0.08	-0.19***	0.02	0.36***	0.07		-0.36***	0.35***	-0.33***	-0.32***	Southern Asia
-0.24***	-0.10	-0.15***	-0.14***	-0.38***	-0.51***	-0.29***	0.04	-0.24***	-0.31***		0.76***	0.01	0.05	Southern Europe
0.45***	0.57***	0.59***	0.62***	0.35***	0.26***	0.43***	0.78***	0.48***	0.39***	0.77***		-0.72***	-0.71***	Sub-Saharan Africa
-0.18**	-0.04	-0.10***	-0.08***	-0.32***	-0.44***	-0.23***	0.09***	-0.18***	-0.25***	0.05	-0.68***		0.03	Western Asia
-0.22***	-0.07	-0.13***	-0.11***	-0.35***	-0.49***	-0.27***	0.07	-0.22***	-0.30***	0.03	-0.74***	-0.02		Western Europe
Australia and New Ze	Central Asia	Eastern Asia	Eastern Europe	Latin America	Northern Africa	Northern America	Northern Europe	South-eastern Asia	Southern Asia	Southern Europe	Sub-Saharan Africa	Western Asia	Western Europe	

**Fig. 3** Cross-subregional differences between ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS. *Note:* Each cell demonstrates the Cohen's  $d$  value resulting from each pair of comparison. Upper diagonal: comparisons of the ASR-YWMS. Lower diagonal: comparisons of the ASR-OWMS

### Multilevel Modeling to Examine the Associations Between Individual- and Country-Level Predictors of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships (H4)

We conducted Bayesian multilevel modeling to identify which model is the best among four candidates: the null model, fixed-effect model, random-intercept model, and random-slope model. The results of the model selection are presented in Table 6. For both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, the random-slope model including all fixed effects, random intercepts, and random slopes was found to be best.

The results from Bayesian MLM are reported in Table 7.<sup>2</sup> When the ASR-YWMS was examined as an outcome variable,

<sup>2</sup> One anonymous reviewer raised a concern about the possibility that the associations between several predictors at the individual level (e.g., collectivism) and dependent variables not supporting the hypothesis may be attributable to the shared variance across the individual and country levels. To examine whether that was the case, we tested the regression models without random slopes. The additional analyses reported that for both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS as dependent variables, the exclusion of the random slopes did not alter the analysis results regarding the individual-level predictors. Plus, the exclusion of ingroup favoritism at the country level also did not alter the results as well. See “Additional Analyses related to Multilevel Modeling” section in our online supplementary material at [https://osf.io/4umga?view\\_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482](https://osf.io/4umga?view_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482) or our OSF repository for further details). Hence, we shall conclude that the potential shared variance across the different levels would not be a serious concern while interpreting the findings in Table 7.

we found several individual- and country-level predictors significantly predicting the dependent variable. At the individual level, sociosexual orientation (measured by the SOI-3), traditional gender roles (measured by the GEMS), and pathogen prevalence (measured by the nine-item Pathogen Prevalence Index) were positively associated with the ASR-YWMS.<sup>3</sup> Interestingly, we found that being a woman positively predicted higher ASR-YWMS scores, while age negatively predicted it, opposite to our hypothesis. Collectivistic tendencies (measured by the Collectivism Scale) did not significantly predict the ASR-YWMS (H4.1).

At the country level, both gender inequality (measured by the Gender Inequality Index) and parasite stress (measured by the Country-specific zoonotic and non-zoonotic parasite stress) positively predicted the outcome variable. Collectivism (measured by the 178-nation index of Ingroup Favoritism) was negatively associated with the variable which was consistent with our hypothesis. However, the HDI was positively associated with the variable, contrary to our hypothesis (H4.2).


<sup>3</sup> Given that the SOI-3 consists of only three items and it demonstrated strong correlation ( $r \geq .50$ ) with the variables of interest, we examined its incremental validity in the models via additional MLMs following one reviewer's suggestion. The results indicated that the inclusion of the SOI-3 significantly improved the regression models, so its incremental validity was also significant. See “Incremental Validity of the Sociosexual Orientation” section in our online supplementary material at [https://osf.io/4umga?view\\_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482](https://osf.io/4umga?view_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482) or our OSF repository for further details.

**Table 5** Results from intra-subregional comparisons of Acceptance of Sugar Relationships

Subregion	<i>N</i>	ASR-YWMS			ASR-OMWS			Wilcoxon test		
		<i>M</i>	SD	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>M</i>	SD	<i>Mdn</i>	<i>z</i>	<i>p</i> value (FDR)	Cohen's <i>d</i>
Australia and New Zealand	580	16.33	8.97	16.00	15.18	8.86	14.00	4.61	.000	.19
Central Asia	774	14.30	8.31	13.00	13.53	8.49	11.00	4.83	.000	.17
Eastern Asia	2888	15.16	7.14	15.00	14.08	7.28	13.00	12.49	.000	.23
Eastern Europe	13474	14.60	8.79	12.00	13.98	8.56	11.00	12.66	.000	.11
Latin America and the Caribbean	8103	16.50	9.18	15.00	15.96	9.27	15.00	12.44	.000	.14
Northern Africa	4395	15.05	7.60	18.00	17.03	8.97	20.00	− 32.69	.000	− .49
Northern America	4125	17.60	9.30	18.00	15.68	9.01	14.00	18.87	.000	.29
Northern Europe	4219	13.74	8.43	11.00	12.39	7.84	10.00	14.79	.000	.23
South-Eastern Asia	3325	17.09	9.36	17.00	15.43	8.84	14.00	16.44	.000	.29
Southern Asia	799	16.06	9.09	15.00	15.61	9.10	15.00	3.65	.000	.13
Southern Europe	10466	12.89	8.19	10.00	12.86	8.25	10.00	3.13	.002	.03
Sub-Saharan Africa	1829	18.99	11.00	18.00	18.76	11.20	18.00	3.69	.000	.09
Western Asia	9391	12.90	8.87	10.00	13.13	9.00	10.00	− 1.17	.242	− .01
Western Europe	4664	13.21	7.88	11.00	12.96	7.82	10.00	4.42	.000	.06

ASR-YWMS, Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Young Women and Men Scale; ASR-OMWS, Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale

**Fig. 4** Cohen's *d* of (ASR-YWMS—ASR-OMWS) within each subregion (white areas indicate a lack of data for a given region). *Note:* Colored figures available in electronic version only



We also found several significant outcomes when the ASR-OMWS was analyzed. At the individual level (H4.3), sociosexual orientation, traditional gender roles, and pathogen prevalence were positively associated with the ASR-OMWS as hypothesized. Consistent with the hypothesis, women were less accepting of sugar relationships from the perspective of older resource providers. In contrast to the hypothesis, older people reported less acceptance of sugar

relationships from both perspectives (ASR-OMWS and ASR-YWMS). Collectivism was not significantly associated with either score.

At the country-level (H4.4) parasite stress positively predicted the ASR-OMWS as we hypothesized. However, the HDI and ingroup favoritism were positively associated with the variable contrary to the hypothesis. The gender inequality did not show any significant association.

**Table 6** Model comparisons for Bayesian multilevel modeling

logBFs	ASR-YMWS	ASR-OMWS
Fixed effects only versus null	10,256.52	9117.87
Random intercepts versus null	12,344.81	11,122.24
Random slopes versus null	12,644.30	11390.10

## Discussion

The present study expands the existing knowledge of relationships involving exchanges of sex for resources in human mating. We contribute a cross-cultural comparative analysis of acceptance of sugar relationships across demographic, psychological, and cultural dimensions. Although many empirical studies of sex for resources have been conducted with geographically and culturally diverse samples, the present study is the first to provide comparative data on ASR scales (designed to explore attitudes from both the perspectives of potential companionship providers and resource providers) for 87 countries. Furthermore, we also examined and validated the ASR scales across different languages through the measurement invariance test and alignment. Researchers who intend to conduct cross-cultural and cross-national studies on the topic may employ the scales with measurement alignment. The study revealed several novel findings, which are discussed below.

## Cross-Linguistic and Cross-Sexual Construct Equivalence, Internal Consistency (H1)

One aim was assessing the psychometric properties of the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS with a large multinational sample. In order to compare the ASR scales with other psychometric instruments on a multilingual sample, it was necessary to test the linguistic invariance of all the scales used. The findings demonstrate that all 37 translated versions of the two measures (except for the Persian version of the ASR-YWMS) show adequate psychometric properties in terms of factor structure, explained variance, internal consistency, and cross-linguistic construct equivalence. All translated versions of the two measures were expected to show cross-linguistic construct equivalence with the respective original measures and adequate psychometric properties in terms of factor structure, explained variance, and internal consistency (H1.1). Our findings suggest that the contents of the two five-item scales (and one exception each of their translated versions) adequately reveal the universal human mating psychology underlying the cultural diversity of ASR, and therefore may provide useful instruments in further cross-cultural comparative analyses. Our results also support the measurement invariance of the other instruments (the SOI-3, the GEMS, and the Individualism–Collectivism scale). These results support Hypothesis 1.1.

**Table 7** Results from Bayesian multilevel modeling

	Acceptance of sugar relationships in young women and men scale					Acceptance of sugar relationships in older men and women scale				
	<i>b</i>	SE	95% Bayesian CI		BF (H1 vs. H0)	<i>b</i>	SE	95% Bayesian CI		BF (H1 vs. H0)
			Lower	Upper				Lower	Upper	
Intercept	-.04	.03	-.10	.02	.00	.02	.03	-.03	.07	
Individual-level predictors										
Sex (Ref: men)	.03	.01	.02	.05	.00	-.06	.01	-.08	-.05	<b>Infinite</b>
Age	-.16	.00	-.17	-.15	.00	-.11	.00	-.11	-.10	.00
Sociosexual orientation	.33	.01	.30	.35	<b>Infinite</b>	.29	.01	.27	.31	<b>Infinite</b>
Traditional gender roles	.08	.01	.06	.10	<b>Infinite</b>	.08	.01	.06	.10	<b>Infinite</b>
Collectivism scale	.00	.01	-.02	.01	2.65	.01	.01	-.01	.02	2.94
Pathogen prevalence	.03	.01	.02	.04	<b>3999.00</b>	.03	.01	.01	.04	<b>Infinite</b>
Country-level predictors										
HDI	.07	.05	-.03	.18	.09	.06	.05	-.03	.16	.11
Gender inequality	.06	.05	-.05	.16	<b>6.45</b>	.02	.05	-.07	.11	1.77
Ingroup favoritism	-.04	.03	-.10	.02	.12	.04	.03	-.02	.09	<b>8.59</b>
Parasite stress	.09	.04	.01	.18	<b>56.97</b>	.10	.04	.02	.17	<b>152.85</b>

Bolded data are Bayes Factors when they exceeded 3, which represented the presence of evidence positively supporting each hypothesis



As there was no sex variance in the original ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS measures, it was necessary to control for sexual invariance in the actual multicultural sample. When testing for sexual invariance, we found that both ASR scales are consistent measures across men and women. These results support Hypothesis 1.2.

### Sex Differences of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships (H2)

The previously obtained sex differences in scores on ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS (men consistently being more accepting than women) were replicated in the present study. Men scored significantly higher on both measures (ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS) than women did. According to H2, the previously obtained cross-sex construct equivalences were expected with higher male scores on both ASR measures. Even though these results confirm Hypothesis 2, an interesting contradiction arises here that needs to be clarified. Indeed, in the theoretical introduction it was stated that “women prefer partners who are older and wealthier than themselves,” which implies that women should be more open to sugar relationships from a companionship provider perspective (ASR-YWMS) than men. What could be the reason for this contradiction? The answer is probably multi-causal, as is the way the sex-for-resources encounter works. Our data confirm that participants perceive sugar relations as part of short-term mating (positive correlation with unrestricted sociosexuality). This may explain why men are more open to it, as several studies have found marked gender differences in sexual drive in the same direction (e.g., Buss & Schmitt, 1993, 2019; Frankenbach et al., 2022; Meskó et al., 2022a, 2022b, 2022c; Trivers, 1972; Walter et al., 2020). However, it should be noted that women who engage in sugar relationships also face significant peer stigma (e.g., Ernst et al., 2021; Grittner & Walsh, 2020; Johansson Wilén & Gunnarsson, 2023; Scull, 2022), which is also likely to play a role in the higher rejection of this sexual activity among women compared to men. For a broader understanding of this phenomenon, it is worth considering that openness to sugar relationships is also associated with psychological variables such as egocentric sexual motivation, Ludus (playful) love style, higher subclinical psychopathy, and Machiavellianism scores (Birkás et al., 2020), which are associated with short-term mating strategy. We can probably better understand these sex differences in the acceptance of sugar relationships if we can consider individual differences in mating strategies and contextual influences (Gangestad & Simpson, 2000).

### Intra- and Cross-Subregional Differences and Similarities (H3)

The socioeconomic context in which individuals form their attitudes and make their mating decisions is likely to affect their openness to sugar relationships. Since data from 87 countries were analyzed by 14 geographic subregions, we first confirmed measurement invariance across subregions in the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS. These results support Hypothesis 3.1.

Since cultural factors may influence individuals' mating attitudes in different ways, we hypothesized that the degree of openness to sugar relationships may also vary by subregion. We found significant variation across subregions both in ASR-YWMS and in ASR-OMWS. These results support Hypothesis 3.2.

Given that each participant, irrespective of their actual age, completed both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS in the present study, the obtained data allowed for the exploration of possible subregional differences in the relative preferences for being a companionship provider (ASR-YWMS) vs. resource provider (ASR-OMWS). The related results consistently revealed significantly higher preference for being a companionship (vs. resource) provider, except in Western Asia where no difference was found between the two perspectives, and in North Africa where higher relative preference for being a resource provider was found. Finding a valid explanation for the results raises several difficulties. For example, the mean age of the Dutch sample was 49.50 years, while that of the Thai sample was 21.13 years (see Table S2 in Supplementary Materials). At the same time, the Dutch participants' mean scores on the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, respectively, were 13.95 and 13.40, while the respective scores were 23.90 and 23.88 in the Thai sample. That is, the differences are presumably due to cultural differences between the Thai and Dutch samples rather than to a lack of construct equivalence between the two translated versions of either the ASR-YWMS or the ASR-OMW (Brodeur et al., 2018; Krisch et al., 2019). These results support Hypothesis 3.3.

All these hypotheses (H3.1–3.3) were tested at the country level as shown in the online Supplementary Materials. The results at the country level were in general similar to those already found at the subregional level.

The first main set of questions (H1–3) of the present study dealt with the psychometric analysis of the ASR-YWMS and the ASR-OMWS. This revealed that both measures are characterized by reliability and measurement invariance in linguistic, sexual, and regional terms. The second main set of research questions (H4) was aimed at the associations between openness to sugar relationships and individual and cultural level predictor variables.

## Associations with Individual- and Culture-Level Predictors (H4)

The Bayesian multilevel models revealed the predictive power of, and interactions among, regional, demographic, economic and cultural variables for the ASR-YWMS and the ASR-OMWS. According to H4, both ASR measures were expected to be associated positively with male sex, higher age, unrestricted sociosexuality, and higher parasite history, but negatively associated with individualism, gender equality, and social welfare. Overall, our results partially supported Hypothesis 4: there were some cases where we found no significant associations between the target and predictor variables, and in some cases, we found associations in directions opposite to the expected.

### Individual-Level Predictors on Acceptance of Sugar Relationships with Younger Women and Men Scale

Openness to sugar relationships as sexual companionship provider (ASR-YWMS) was positively associated with unrestricted sociosexual orientation, identification with traditional gender roles, and prevalence of pathogens at the individual level. Contrary to our hypothesis, we found that being woman positively and age negatively predicted openness to sugar relationships. The collectivism variable (collectivistic personal values) did not significantly predict ASR-YWMS. These results partly support Hypothesis H4.1.

Previous research on ASR (Ipolyi et al., 2021; Láng et al., 2021; Birkás et al., 2020) had a methodological assumption that younger (18–28 years old) male participants could only complete the ASR-YWMS (due to their age). It is possible that the previous research unnecessarily constrained itself with this assumption. Indeed, it is possible that young men who completed the ASR-YWMS assumed that their current or decades older selves would pay for sex (and did not consider which side of this sexual transaction was targeted by the questionnaire offered to them). The method used in the present study (each participant completing both ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS) allowed respondents to judge the two aspects independently. That is, they could compare and decide which attitude (paying for sex or sex for payment) was more characteristic of them. Our results showed that women were more accepting of being the younger partner in a sugar relationship (ASR-YWMS), but less accepting of being the older partner (ASR-OMWS), as expected. It is possible that these results reflect the typical age gap in the sugar relationship scenario: men are typically older, and women are typically much younger. This means that women might have a more positive attitude toward the role of “sugar baby” than men toward the role of “sugar boy”. At the same time, women might have more negative attitudes toward the role of “sugar

mommy” than men toward the role of “sugar daddy”. Overall, although these results only partially support the hypotheses formulated based on previous research, they are in fact well interpretable in terms of the psychological functioning of sugar relationships. This expectation is based on the view that engaging in sex for resources is a general preference that is an essential part of the psychology of human mating. Women are more likely to prefer men who are older and wealthier than themselves, whereas men are more likely to prefer younger women (Walter et al., 2020, 2021).

### Country-Level Predictors on Acceptance of Sugar Relationships with Younger Women and Men Scale

Openness to sugar relationships as sexual companionship provider (ASR-YWMS) was positively associated with both gender inequality and parasite stress at the country-level. Collectivism (collectivistic value by countries) was negatively associated with openness to sugar relationships, which is in line with our hypothesis. Contrary to our hypothesis, we found that HDI was positively associated with openness to sugar relationships. These results partly support Hypothesis H4.2.

The result on HDI shows that material well-being (higher HDI), rather than being negatively related to young people's openness to sugar relationships, was in fact positively related to it. This unexpected association raises some considerations. Although in the US-American and Danish studies (Groes et al., 2021; Scull, 2022) the most important motivation reported by participants in sugar relationships was money, our findings suggest that material resources may not be the most important motivation for being open to sugar relationships. Nevertheless, it is possible that material wealth may predict the extraction of material goods in countries with high HDI. Our results suggest that economic rationale may be significantly associated with individual decisions to buy and sell sex as a commodity (Mensah et al., 2022; Van der Veen, 2001). Whether individuals are driven by extrinsic or intrinsic motivations may also play a role. Ipolyi et al. (2021) found that scores on both the ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS were positively associated with extrinsic motivation focused on external values (e.g., financial success, social status, reputation, attractive appearance).

### Individual-Level Predictors on Acceptance of Sugar Relationships with Older Men and Women Scale

Openness to sugar relationships as a resource provider (ASR-OMWS) was positively associated with unrestricted sociosexual orientation, identification with traditional gender roles, and prevalence of pathogens at the individual level. Consistent with our hypothesis, we found that being men positively predicted openness to sugar relationships.

Collectivism (collectivistic personal values) did not significantly predict ASR-OMWS, not confirming our hypothesis. Contrary to our hypothesis, age negatively predicted openness to sugar relationships. These results partly support Hypothesis H4.3.

Collectivistic personal values showed no correlation with either ASR-YWMS or ASR-OMWS scores. A possible explanation is methodological. In this research, we used a collectivism scale (Wu, 2006) that can be measured primarily in the context of employment. Individualistic/collectivistic values in the work context are unlikely to be transposed one-to-one to the mating context. Future studies will be needed to test this explanation.

### Country-Level Predictors on Acceptance of Sugar Relationships with Older Men and Women Scale

Openness to sugar relationships as a resource provider (ASR-OMWS) was positively associated with parasite stress as hypothesized. However, HDI and ingroup favoritism was positively associated with the openness to sugar relationships, contrary to the hypothesis. Gender inequality index did not show any significant association. These results partly support Hypothesis H4.4.

The most striking positive association is between pathogen saturation and openness to sugar relationships. Both individual-level and country-level measures support the hypotheses on both ASR scales. These results support previous findings. Since sexual contact is an important route of human-to-human transmission of pathogens, promiscuous sexual behavior plays an explicit role in the spread of infections (Richard et al., 2017). The greater the prevalence of pathogens within a community, the greater the threat to that community's viability (Mackey & Immerman, 2000).

Cross-culturally, pathogen stress levels correlate within a culture and the prevalence of polygynous marriage systems, and monogamous mating systems are less common in cultures with high pathogen stress (Low, 1990; White & Burton, 1988). Research by Marlowe (2003) has also suggested that monogamy is more prevalent in forager cultures with low pathogen levels and where men contribute a significant proportion of calories to the local diet.

The most contradictory results come from the analysis between collectivism and ASR. While the personal collectivism value (collectivism scale) showed no association with any of the ASR scales, country-level collectivism (ingroup favoritism) showed a negative association only with ASR-YWMS (as expected), but a positive association with ASR-OMWS. So, while collectivism is negatively correlated with young people's openness to participate in sex-for-resources, for older people it is positively correlated. This may relate to the differing typical age range for men and women in sugar relationships: the restrictive effect of collectivist values on

female sex-for-resources behavior is well documented. For example, Li et al. (2022) found that female Chinese sex workers who faced stigma because of their activities were able to reduce the distress caused by stigma by attenuating their personal networks, which emphasized collectivist values. However, there is a paucity of literature on the collectivist norms associated with the purchase of sex.

An alternative explanation is that women's openness to engage in sex for resources in patriarchal societies is part of the "staying alive" strategy (Campbell, 1999). Since women's overt aggression in the competition for limited resources is usually disapproved (Benenson et al., 2022; Bleske-Rechek & Deaner, 2022; Campbell, 1999), they may employ alternative strategies. That is, survival motives may also have contributed to the emergence of female promiscuity (gaining men's resources by adapting to male promiscuity).

### Limitations and Future Directions

Although we addressed possible explanations for the observed associations between openness to sex for resources and the tested predictors, due to the exploratory nature of the study, the findings cannot offer a full picture of the mechanisms via which the studied factors exert influence on one's attitude toward sugar relationships.

Moreover, because the sampling was convenience-based, disproportionalities sometimes emerged (e.g., the Dutch sample was on average twice as old as the Thai sample). These suggest that our results have limited validity when comparing national samples. Further studies will be needed to paint a more accurate picture.

One of the main questions of this research is whether openness to sugar relationships is related to promiscuity. The results show that both ASR scales are positively related to the SOI-3, thus replicating previous similar findings (Birkás et al., 2020; Láng et al., 2021). However, it should be noted that other research (e.g., Chu, 2023; Motyl, 2012) also reports that some sugar relationships are long-term relationships. In this respect, our results are of limited, as we found no evidence for a long-term strategy.

One anonymous reviewer of the manuscript suggested that when we decided to use a culturally specific term (sugar relationship) in the research rather than the broader concept of "sex for resources" we may have made it difficult for some participants to understand the questionnaire. Although the results of the statistical analysis do not support this concern, we should consider the possibility that data are drawn from multiple countries, some of them might have already incorporated the idea of resource exchange into their mainstream understandings of relationships.

In this research, we did not take into account cultural differences in the acceptability of the explicitness of transactions described in ASR scales. Many intimate arrangements

cross-culturally and throughout history were also about an exchange of resources, irrespective of the form of relationship. Our research does not focus on the question of how these other arrangements relate to the sugar relationships or what distinctions can be drawn between them. At the same time, there can be significant differences between cultures depending on the extent to which they have incorporated the "sex for resources" aspect into their mating rituals. Some cultures have long preferred marriages/ relationships that occur between individuals of similar social class or socioeconomic status; others have allowed for more mobility. Further, some cultures allow for an explicit consideration and discussion of the resources exchanged in a match (economic/financial/status in exchange for companionship/reproductive capacity, etc.) while others prefer not to speak of such considerations directly. However, these culturally embedded norms can also have an impact on attitudes measured on the ASR scales. These possible effects need to be clarified in future research.

## Conclusions

The current research represents the largest investigation of predictors of openness to sugar relationships, testing the psychometric properties of ASR-YWMS and ASR-OMWS, based on data from 69,924 participants across 87 countries. As such, it takes an important step toward understanding the opening attitude toward participating in sex for resources, across cultures or demographic groups, alongside factors operating at the individual level. The main strength of this research is its cross-cultural nature and large sample size, which allows a systematic examining of the impact of individual and cultural variables and the factors that explain the greatest variation in openness to sugar relationships. We believe that a more nuanced understanding of the phenomenon of openness to sugar relationships will provide fundamental insights into the psychology of human mating and may translate into developing more effective ways to counteract the possible negative psychological consequences of participating in sex-for-resources type of encounters.

**Supplementary Information** The online version contains supplementary material available at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-023-02724-1>.

**Acknowledgements** The authors are thankful to Mikhail Kozlov for his comments on the previous drafts of this manuscript.

**Author Contributions** Conception and design of the study and drafting the original manuscript: N.M. Project administration and resources: M.K. Formal analyses and visualization: H.H. Further editing of the manuscript: A.L., F.K., S.A.B., A.P. Data collection, revising and approving the manuscript: N.M., M.K., A.L., A.P., P.S., D.A.F., F.E.G., L.A.A., A.S., C-S.T., B.G., T.L.M., M.T.B., D.G., T.A., M.B., A.D.A.M., R.Af., R.Am, R.B., H.B., A.R.C., J.C., H.Ç., D.C., E.D., Y.D., D.D., I.D., M.J., J.A.K., F.K., H.K-I., M.K-D., D.L., K.Ma., M.Mo., J.C.N., E.K.N., J.H.P., F.P., E. P., K.Po., P.P., D.Š., S.T., A.H.W., S.D.A., D.D.A., N.B., A.C., S.D., E.E., N.G.M., B.A., L.K., S.L., E.M.C., T.M., M.Me., K.G.M., K.Mi., S.S.O.,

M.P-P., B.B., F.Z.S., S.Si., Ç.S., T.V., A.W., G.A., M.A., O.Ç., K.G., T.G.Y., A.K., M.L-B., M.May., B.Ö., M.C.T.P., M.E.S.R., A.Ş., W.T-A., G.T.T., E.T-D., B.N.T., M.Z-E, S.G., J.A., C.C., K.Pi., S.St., S.J.E., H.H.

**Funding** Open access funding provided by University of Pécs. The work of Norbert Meskó has been supported by the Hungarian Scientific Research Fund (OTKA; Grant Nos. K125437, K143254, K146338) and the University of Pécs (Grant No. 008\_223\_PTE\_RK/12). The work of Dmitrii Dubrov has been supported within the framework of the Basic Research Program at the National Research University Higher School of Economics (HSE University). Coordinating the research team and data collection in Poland by Marta Kowal and Piotr Sorokowski were made possible by the funding from the IDN Being Human Lab (University of Wrocław, Poland).

**Data Availability** All data and Supplementary Materials have been made publicly available at the Open Science Framework (OSF) and can be accessed at [https://osf.io/prdj2/?view\\_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482](https://osf.io/prdj2/?view_only=48e348faeac344a59554ad44c7e89482).

## Declarations

**Competing interest** The authors declare no competing interests.

**Ethical Approval** The research plan was licensed by the Research Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Education and Psychology of the Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary, under Reg. No. ELTE PPK KEB 2021/250. The ethics committee fully observed the relevant international ethical guidelines and regulations for research with human participants in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (Rickham, 1964) and with the Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct published by the American Psychological Association (APA, 2002). Each collaborator fully observed the ethical guidelines adopted by the competent Institutional Review Board (that of the Principal Investigator's or their own institution). All participants gave informed consent to participation in the survey.

**Informed Consent** All participants gave informed consent to participation in the survey.

**Open Access** This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons licence, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons licence, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons licence and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this licence, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>.

## References

- American Psychological Association. (2002). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 57(12), 1060–1073. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.57.12.1060>
- Anderson, R. C., & Klofstad, C. A. (2012). For love or money? The influence of personal resources and environmental resource pressures on human mate preferences. *Ethology*, 118(9), 841–849. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1439-0310.2012.02077.x>

- Anderson, R. M., & May, R. M. (1991). *Infectious disease of humans: Dynamics and control*. Oxford University Press.
- Asparouhov, T., & Muthén, B. (2014). Multiple-group factor analysis alignment. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 21(4), 495–508. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705511.2014.919210>
- Averdijk, M., Ribeaud, D., & Eisner, M. (2020). Longitudinal risk factors of selling and buying sexual services among youths in Switzerland. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 49(4), 1279–1290. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-019-01571-3>
- Benenson, J. F., Webb, C. E., & Wrangham, R. W. (2022). Self-protection as an adaptive female strategy. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 45, e128. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X21002417>
- Benoit, C., Smith, M., Jansson, M., Healey, P., & Magnuson, D. (2019). “The prostitution problem”: Claims, evidence, and policy outcomes. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 48(7), 1905–1923. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-018-1276-6>
- Birkás, B., & Csathó, Á. (2015). Size the day: The time perspectives of the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 86, 318–320. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.06.035>
- Birkás, B., Meskó, N., Zsidó, A. N., Ipolyi, D., & Láng, A. (2020). Providing sexual companionship for resources: Development, validation, and personality correlates of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale (ASR-YWMS). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 1135. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.01135>
- Bleske-Rechek, A., & Deaner, R. (2022). Societies also prioritize female survival. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 45, e131. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X22000528>
- Brislin, R. W. (1970). Back-translation for cross-cultural research. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 1(3), 185–216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/135910457000100301>
- Brislin, R. W. (1983). Cross-cultural research in psychology. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 34(1), 363–400. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.ps.34.020183.002051>
- Brodeur, A., Lekfuangfu, W. N., & Zylberberg, Y. (2018). War, migration and the origins of the Thai sex industry. *Journal of the European Economic Association*, 16(5), 1540–1576. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jeaa/jvx037>
- Bürkner, P.-C. (2017). brms: An R package for Bayesian multilevel models using Stan. *Journal of Statistical Software*. <https://doi.org/10.18637/jss.v080.i01>
- Burtäverde, V., & Ene, C. (2021). The influence of environmental and social characteristics on women’s mate preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 175, 110736. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2021.110736>
- Buss, D. M. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(1), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00023992>
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100(2), 204–232. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.100.2.204>
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (2019). Mate preferences and their behavioral manifestations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 70, 77–110. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010418-103408>
- Campbell, A. (1999). Staying alive: Evolution, culture, and women’s intrasexual aggression. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 22(2), 203–252. <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0140525x99001818>
- Choudhry, V., Östergren, P. O., Ambresin, A. E., Kyagaba, E., & Agardh, A. (2014). Giving or receiving something for sex: A cross-sectional study of transactional sex among Ugandan university students. *PLoS ONE*, 9(11), e112431. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0112431>
- Chu, C. S. K. (2018). *Compensated dating: Buying and selling sex in cyberspace*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-6974-1>
- Chu, C. S. K. (2023). Commercial sex or romance? Men’s sexual scripts in compensated dating. *Deviant Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.2023.2248339>
- Conroy-Beam, D., & Buss, D. M. (2019). Why is age so important in human mating? Evolved age preferences and their influences on multiple mating behaviors. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 13(2), 127–157. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000127>
- Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Pham, M. N., & Shackelford, T. K. (2015). How sexually dimorphic are human mate preferences? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 41(8), 1082–1093. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215590987>
- Cordero, B. D. (2015). *Sugar culture and SeekingArrangement.com participants: What it means to negotiate power and agency in sugar dating*. Master’s thesis, California State University. CSU Institutional Repository. Retrieved November 25, 2022, from <https://dspace.calstate.edu/bitstream/handle/10211.3/159309/B.CorderoThesis2015Fall.pdf?sequence=1>.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*. <https://doi.org/10.7275/jyj1-4868>
- Coy, M. (2012). *Prostitution, harm and gender inequality: Theory, research and policy*. Routledge.
- Dawson, K. J., Han, H., & Choi, Y. R. (2021). How are moral foundations associated with empathic traits and moral identity? *Current Psychology*, 42(13), 10836–10848. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-021-02372-5>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54(6), 408–423. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.54.6.408>
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (2016). Social role theory of sex differences. In N. Naples, R. C. Hoogland, M. Wickramasinghe, & W. C. A. Wong (Eds.), *The Wiley Blackwell encyclopedia of gender and sexuality studies* (pp. 1–3). Wiley. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118663219.wbegs183>
- Ernst, F., Romanczuk-Seiferth, N., Köhler, S., Amelung, T., & Betzler, F. (2021). Students in the sex industry: Motivations, feelings, risks, and judgments. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 586235. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.586235>
- Ewald, P. W. (1994). *Evolution of infectious disease*. Oxford University Press.
- Fincher, C. L., & Thornhill, R. (2012). Parasite-stress promotes in-group assortative sociality: The cases of strong family ties and heightened religiosity. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 35(2), 61–79. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X11000021>
- Fischer, R., & Karl, J. A. (2019). A primer to (cross-cultural) multi-group invariance testing possibilities in R. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 10, 1507. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.01507>
- Frankenbach, J., Weber, M., Loschelder, D. D., Kilger, H., & Friese, M. (2022). Sex drive: Theoretical conceptualization and meta-analytic review of gender differences. *Psychological Bulletin*, 148(9–10), 621–661. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000366>
- Gangestad, S. W., & Simpson, J. A. (2000). The evolution of human mating: Trade-offs and strategic pluralism. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 23(4), 573–587. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X0000337X>
- Grittner, A. L., & Walsh, C. A. (2020). The role of social stigma in the lives of female-identified sex workers: A scoping review. *Sexuality & Culture*, 24(5), 1653–1682. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-020-09707-7>
- Groes, C., Bjønnes, J., & Bræmer, M. H. (2021). *Sugardating blandt danske unge i alderen 18–30 år: Et kvalitativt studie* (Working paper). Roskilde Universitet. Retrieved November 25, 2022, from [https://psy.au.dk/fileadmin/site\\_files/filer\\_rusmiddelforskning/](https://psy.au.dk/fileadmin/site_files/filer_rusmiddelforskning/)

- dokumenter/rapporter/2021/Sugardating\_blandt\_danske\_unge\_... Foreloebig\_rapport.pdf.
- Gunnarsson, L., & Strid, S. (2022). Chemistry or service? Sugar daddies' (re)quest for mutuality within the confines of commercial exchange. *Journal of Sex Research*, 59(3), 309–320. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2021.1952155>
- Gunnarsson, L., & Strid, S. (2023). Varieties of sugar dating in Sweden: Content, compensation, motivations. *Social Problems*, 70, 1044–1062. <https://doi.org/10.1093/socpro/spab063>
- Hambleton, R. K., & De Jong, J. H. (2003). Advances in translating and adapting educational and psychological tests. *Language Testing*, 20(2), 127–134. <https://doi.org/10.1191/0265532203lt247xx>
- Han, H. (2022a). Trust in the scientific research community predicts intent to comply with COVID-19 prevention measures: An analysis of a large-scale international survey dataset. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 150, e36. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268822000255>
- Han, H. (2022b). Testing the validity of the modified vaccine attitude question battery across 22 languages with a large-scale international survey dataset: Within the context of COVID-19 vaccination. *Human Vaccines & Immunotherapeutics*, 18(1), 2024066. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21645515.2021.2024066>
- Han, H., Blackburn, A. M., Jeftić, A., Tran, T. P., Stöckli, S., Reifler, J., & Vestergren, S. (2022). Validity testing of the Conspiratorial Thinking and Anti-Expert Sentiment Scales during the COVID-19 pandemic across 24 languages from a large-scale global dataset. *Epidemiology and Infection*, 150, e167. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0950268822001443>
- Hlay, J. K., Albert, G., Batres, C., Waldron, K., Richardson, G., Placek, C., Arnocky, S., Senveli, Z., Lieberman, D., & Hodges-Simeon, C. R. (2022). Disgust sensitivity predicts sociosexuality across cultures. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 43(5), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2022.04.005>
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1981). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management and Organizations*, 10(4), 15–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00208825.1980.11656300>
- Hofstede, G. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions and organizations across nations*. Sage.
- Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1–55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Ipolyi, D., Csányi, E., Láng, A., & Meskó, N. (2021). Attachment avoidance moderates the relationship among acceptance of sugar relationships, motivation, and self-esteem. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 7711199. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.711199>
- Johansson Wilén, E., & Gunnarsson, L. (2023). Who knows? On the epistemic status of experience in sugar-dating research. *Feminist Theory*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14647001231186525>
- Kazak, A. E. (2018). Editorial: Journal article reporting standards. *American Psychologist*, 73(1), 1–2. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000263>
- Kowal, M., Sorokowski, P., Dinić, B. M., Pisanski, K., Gjonjeska, B., Frederick, D., Pfuhl, G., Milfont, T. L., Bode, A., Aguilar, L., García, F. E., Villaverde, B. A., Kavčič, T., Miroshnik, K. G., Ndukaihe, I. L. G., Šafářová, K., Valentova, J. V., Aavik, T., Blackburn, A. M., ... Sternberg, R. (2023). Validation of the Short Version (TLS-15) of the Triangular Love Scale (TLS-45) across 37 Languages. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-023-02702-7>
- Kowal, M., Sorokowski, P., Pisanski, K., Valentova, J. V., Varella, M. A., Frederick, D. A., Al-Shawaf, L., García, F. E., Giammusso, I., Gjonjeska, B., Kozma, L., Otterbring, T., Papadatou-Pastou, M., Pfuhl, G., Stöckli, S., Studzinska, A., Toplu-Demirtaş, E., Touloumakos, A. K., Bakos, B. E., ... Zumárraga-Espinosa, M. (2022). Predictors of enhancing human physical attractiveness: Data from 93 countries. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 43(6), 455–474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.evolhumbehav.2022.08.003>
- Krisch, M., Averdijk, M., Valdebenito, S., & Eisner, M. (2019). Sex trade among youth: A global review of the prevalence, contexts and correlates of transactional sex among the general population of youth. *Adolescent Research Review*, 4, 115–134. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-019-00107-z>
- Láng, A., Birkás, B., Zsidó, A. N., Ipolyi, D., & Meskó, N. (2021). It takes two to tango: Development, validation, and personality correlates of the Acceptance of Sugar Relationships in Older Men and Women Scale (ASR-OMWS). *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, 592138. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.592138>
- Lee, T. Y., & Shek, D. T. L. (2013). Compensated dating in Hong Kong: Prevalence, psychosocial correlates, and relationships with other risky behaviors. *Journal of Pediatric and Adolescent Gynecology*, 26(3), S42–S48. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpjag.2013.03.014>
- Leung, K. (1989). Cross-cultural differences: Individual-level vs. culture-level analysis. *International Journal of Psychology*, 24(6), 703–719. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00207598908247840>
- Levtov, R. G., Barker, G., Contreras-Urbina, M., Heilman, B., & Verma, R. (2014). Pathways to gender-equitable men: Findings from the International Men and Gender Equality Survey in eight countries. *Men and Masculinities*, 17(5), 467–501. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X14558234>
- Li, C.-H. (2016). Confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data: Comparing robust maximum likelihood and diagonally weighted least squares. *Behavior Research Methods*, 48(3), 936–949. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13428-015-0619-7>
- Li, Y., Slopen, N., Sweet, T., Nguyen, Q., Beck, K., & Liu, H. (2022). Stigma in a collectivistic culture: Social network of female sex workers in China. *AIDS and Behavior*, 26, 297–309. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10461-021-03383-w>
- Lippa, R. A. (2009). Sex differences in sex drive, sociosexuality, and height across 53 nations: Testing evolutionary and social structural theories. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 38(5), 631–651. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-006-9151-2>
- LoPiccolo, K., Robinson, J., & Yeh, E. (2016). Income, income shocks, and transactional sex. In S. Cunningham & M. Shah (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of the economics of prostitution* (pp. 188–209). Oxford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199915248.013.21>
- Low, B. S. (1990). Marriage systems and pathogen stress in human societies. *American Zoologist*, 30(2), 325–340. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icb/30.2.325>
- Mackey, W. C., & Immerman, R. S. (2000). Sexually transmitted diseases, pair bonding, fathering, and alliance formation: Disease avoidance behaviors as a proposed element in human evolution. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 1(1), 49–61. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.1.1.49>
- Marlowe, F. W. (2003). The mating system of foragers in the standard cross-cultural sample. *Cross-Cultural Research*, 37(3), 282–306. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069397103254008>
- Masvavure, T. (2010). 'I just need to be flashy on campus': Female students and transactional sex at a university in Zimbabwe. *Culture, Health & Sexuality*, 12(8), 857–870. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691050903471441>
- McLellan, G. (2013). An examination of the causes and consequences of compensated dating (Enjo-Kosai) in contemporary Japanese society. *Journal of Human Environmental Studies Electronic Edition*, 6, 25–37. [https://doi.org/10.24648/uehoka.6.0\\_25](https://doi.org/10.24648/uehoka.6.0_25)
- Mensah, E., Aboh, R., & Nsebot, U. (2022). When sugar is no longer sweet: The discourse of regret in sugar relationships among female youth in Nigeria. *Sexuality & Culture*, 26, 1380–1402. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-022-09948-8>

- Meskó, N., Birkás, B., & Láng, A. (2021). Editorial: Biopsychosocial approaches to transactional sex. *Frontiers in Psychology, 12*, 729276. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.729276>
- Meskó, N., Óry, F., Happ, Z., & Zsidó, A. N. (2022a). Sex differences in predictors of relationship satisfaction: The effects of dyadic coping, love, sexual motivation and having children. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships, 16*(2), 277–294. <https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.7217>
- Meskó, N., Szatmári, D., Láng, A., Meston, C. M., & Buss, D. M. (2022b). Why Hungarians have sex (YSEX?-HSF). *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 51*, 465–489. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-021-02072-y>
- Meskó, N., Zsidó, A. N., Birkás, B., Meston, C. M., & Buss, D. M. (2022c). Why Hungarians have sex: Development and validation of a brief 15-item instrument (YSEX?-15H). *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 51*, 4007–4022. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-022-02380-x>
- Miller, A. (2011). Sugar dating: A new take on an old issue. *Buffalo Journal of Gender, Law & Social Policy, 20*, 33–68.
- Miller, J., & Schwartz, M. D. (1995). Rape myths and violence against street prostitutes. *Deviant Behavior, 16*, 1–23. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01639625.1995.9967984>
- Minkov, M., Blagoev, V., & Hofstede, G. (2013). The boundaries of culture: Do questions about societal norms reveal cultural differences? *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 44*(7), 1094–1106. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022112466942>
- Mixon, F. G. (2019). Sugar daddy u: Human capital investment and the university-based supply of ‘romantic arrangements.’ *Applied Economics, 51*(9), 956–971. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2018.1524129>
- Morey, R. D., Rouder, J. N., Jamil, T., Urbanek, K., & Ly, A. (2018). Package ‘BayesFactor.’ 0.9.12-4.2. [Computer software]. *Comprehensive R Archive Network*. Retrieved October 30, 2022, from <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/BayesFactor/BayesFactor.pdf>.
- Motyl, J. (2012). Trading sex for college tuition: How sugar daddy dating sites may be sugar coating prostitution. *Penn State Law Review, 117*(3), 927–957.
- Motz, T. (2014). Sugar daddy website has coeds justifying prostitution. *New York Post*. Retrieved November 13, 2022, from <https://nypost.com/2014/02/09/sugar-daddy-website-has-coeds-ratio-nalizing-prostitution/>.
- Mulvihill, N., & Large, J. (2019). Consuming authenticity: Pleasure, benefit and harm in ‘transactional intimacy’ and ‘slum tourism.’ *Justice, Power and Resistance, 3*(2), 103–124.
- Muñiz, J., Elosua, P., & Hambleton, R. (2013). Directrices para la traducción y adaptación de los tests: Segunda edición. *Psicothema, 25*(2), 151–157. <https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2013.24>
- Murdock, G. P. (1952). Anthropology and its contribution to public health. *American Journal of Public Health and the Nations Health, 42*(1), 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.2105/ajph.42.1.7>
- Murray, D. R., & Schaller, M. (2010). Historical prevalence of infectious diseases within 230 geopolitical regions: A tool for investigating origins of culture. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 41*(1), 99–108. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022109349510>
- Muthén, B., & Asparouhov, T. (2018). Recent methods for the study of measurement invariance with many groups: Alignment and random effects. *Sociological Methods & Research, 47*(4), 637–664. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0049124117701488>
- Nayar, K. I. (2017). Sweetening the deal: Dating for compensation in the digital age. *Journal of Gender Studies, 26*(3), 335–346. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09589236.2016.1273101>
- Nelson, E. D. (1993). Sugar daddies: “Keeping” a mistress and the gentleman’s code. *Qualitative Sociology, 16*(1), 43–68. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00990073>
- Nesse, R. M., & Ellsworth, P. C. (2009). Evolution, emotions, and emotional disorders. *American Psychologist, 64*(2), 129–139. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0013503>
- Nishimura, Y., Nishimura, M. F., Fajgenbaum, D. C., van Rhee, F., Sato, Y., & Otsuka, F. (2022). Global public awareness of Castleman disease and TAFRO syndrome between 2015 and 2021: A Google Trends analysis. *Ejhaem, 3*(3), 748–753. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jha2.459>
- OECD. (2015). Doctorate holders. In *OECD science, technology and industry scoreboard 2015: Innovation for growth and society*. OECD Publishing. [https://doi.org/10.1787/sti\\_scoreboard-2015-10-en](https://doi.org/10.1787/sti_scoreboard-2015-10-en).
- Ojebode, A., Togunde, D., Adelakun, A., Runestad, P., Ayub, N., Abrar, M., et al. (2010). Beyond money and gifts: Social capital as motivation for cross-generational dating among tertiary school female students in South West Nigeria. *International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences: Annual Review, 5*(4), 169–182. <https://doi.org/10.18848/1833-1882/CGP/v05i04/51673>
- Özcan, B., & Bjørnskov, C. (2011). Social trust and human development. *Journal of Socio-Economics, 40*(6), 753–762. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socec.2011.08.007>
- Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(5), 1113–1135. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1113>
- Poortinga, Y. H., & Fontaine, J. R. (2022). Principles and practices of methodology and methods in cross-cultural psychology. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 53*(7–8), 847–859. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00220221221093811>
- Pulerwitz, J., & Barker, G. (2008). Measuring attitudes toward gender norms among young men in Brazil: Development and psychometric evaluation of the GEM scale. *Men and Masculinities, 10*(3), 322–338. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1097184X06298778>
- Putnick, D. L., & Bornstein, M. H. (2016). Measurement invariance conventions and reporting: The state of the art and future directions for psychological research. *Developmental Review, 41*, 71–90. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2016.06.004>
- R Core Team. (2020). *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- Raftery, A. E. (1995). Bayesian model selection in social research. *Sociological Methodology, 25*, 111–163. <https://doi.org/10.2307/271063>
- Regan, P. C., Levin, L., Sprecher, S., Christopher, F. S., & Gate, R. (2000). Partner preferences: What characteristics do men and women desire in their short-term sexual and long-term romantic partners? *Journal of Psychology & Human Sexuality, 12*(3), 1–21. [https://doi.org/10.1300/J056v12n03\\_01](https://doi.org/10.1300/J056v12n03_01)
- Richard, M., Knauf, S., Lawrence, P., Mather, A. E., Munster, V. J., Müller, M. A., Smith, D., & Kuiken, T. (2017). Factors determining human-to-human transmissibility of zoonotic pathogens via contact. *Current Opinion in Virology, 22*, 7–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.coviro.2016.11.004>
- Rickham, P. P. (1964). Human experimentation. Code of ethics of the World Medical Association. Declaration of Helsinki. *British Medical Journal, 2*(5402), 177. <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.2.5402.177>
- Ringdal, N. J. (2007). *Love for sale: A world history of prostitution*. Grove/Atlantic, Inc.
- Robitzsh, A. (2021). Package “sirt”. [Computer software].
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C. R. (2008). Disgust. In M. Lewis, J. M. Haviland-Jones, & L. F. Barrett (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (3rd ed., pp. 757–776). The Guilford Press.
- Sagar, T., Jones, D., Symons, K., Tyrie, J., & Roberts, R. (2016). Student involvement in the UK sex industry: Motivations and

- experiences. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 67(4), 697–718. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12216>
- Sanger, W. W. (1858). *The history of prostitution: Its extent, causes, and effects throughout the world*. Harper & Brothers.
- Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 28(2), 247–275. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X05000051>
- Scott, G. R. (2014). *A history of prostitution: From antiquity to the present day*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315828091>
- Scull, M. T. (2020). “It’s its own thing”: A typology of interpersonal sugar relationship scripts. *Sociological Perspectives*, 63(1), 135–158. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0731121419875115>
- Scull, M. T. (2022). From seeking financialships to satisfying curiosity: Women’s motivations for entering sugar relationships. *Sexuality & Culture*, 26(1), 222–248. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-021-09888-9>
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 60(6), 870–883. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.60.6.870>
- Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1992). Sociosexuality and romantic partner choice. *Journal of Personality*, 60(1), 31–51. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1992.tb00264.x>
- Sorokowska, A., Saluja, S., Sorokowski, P., Frackowiak, T., Karwowski, M., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Asao, K., Atama, C. S., Duyar, D. A., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., Boussena, M., ... Croy, I. (2021). Affective interpersonal touch in close relationships: A cross-cultural perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 47(12), 1705–1721. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167220988373>
- Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Hilpert, P., Cantarero, K., Frackowiak, T., Ahmadi, K., & Pierce, J. D. (2017). Preferred interpersonal distances: A global comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 48(4), 577–592. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022117698039>
- Sorokowski, P., Kowal, M., Sternberg, R. J., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhababha, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Asao, K., Atama, C. S., Duyar, D. A., Ayebare, R., Conroy-Beam, D., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., Boussena, M., Buss, D. M., ... Sorokowska, A. (2023). Modernization, collectivism, and gender equality predict love experiences in 45 countries. *Scientific Reports*, 13(1), 773. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-022-26663-4>
- Stanton, E. (2007). *The human development index: A history* (Working Papers No. 127). Political Economy Research Institute, University of Massachusetts at Amherst. Retrieved September 15, 2022, from <https://ideas.repec.org/p/uma/periwp/wp127.html>.
- Statistics Division of the United Nations Secretariat. (1999). *Standard country or area codes for statistical use (M49)*. Retrieved July 20, 2023, from <https://unstats.un.org/unsd/methodology/m49/>.
- Stoebenu, K., Heise, L., Wamoyi, J., & Bobrova, N. (2016). Revisiting the understanding of “transactional sex” in sub-Saharan Africa: A review and synthesis of the literature. *Social Science & Medicine*, 168, 186–197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2016.09.023>
- Swader, C. S., & Vorobeve, I. D. (2015). Receiving gifts for sex in Moscow, Kyiv, and Minsk: A compensated dating survey. *Sexuality & Culture*, 19(2), 321–348. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12119-014-9269-7>
- Tam, K.-P., & Milfont, T. L. (2020). Towards cross-cultural environmental psychology: A state-of-the-art review and recommendations. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 71, 101474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvp.2020.101474>
- Thornhill, R., & Fincher, C. L. (2014). The parasite-stress theory of sociality, the behavioral immune system, and human social and cognitive uniqueness. *Evolutionary Behavioral Sciences*, 8(4), 257–264. <https://doi.org/10.1037/ebs0000020>
- Thornhill, R., & Fincher, C. (2015). The parasite-stress theory of sociality and the behavioral immune system. In V. Zeigler-Hill, L. Welling, & T. Shackelford (Eds.), *Evolutionary perspectives on social psychology: Evolutionary psychology* (pp. 419–437). Springer. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12697-5\\_32](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-12697-5_32)
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In B. Campbell (Ed.), *Sexual selection and the descent of man: The Darwinian pivot* (pp. 136–179). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315129266-7>
- UNICEF & WHO. (2019). *UNICEF-WHO low birthweight estimates: Levels and trends 2000–2015*. World Health Organization. Retrieved July 20, 2023, from <https://www.unicef.org/reports/UNICEF-WHO-low-birthweight-estimates-2019>.
- United Nations Development Programme. (2022). *Human development report 2021–22: Uncertain times, unsettled lives: Shaping our future in a transforming world*. Retrieved July 20, 2023, from <https://hdr.undp.org/content/human-development-report-2021-22>.
- Upadhyay, S. (2021). Sugaring: Understanding the world of sugar daddies and sugar babies. *Journal of Sex Research*, 58(6), 775–784. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2020.1867700>
- Van de Vliert, E. (2011). Climato-economic origins of variation in ingroup favoritism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 42(3), 494–515. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022110381120>
- Van der Veen, M. (2001). Rethinking commodification and prostitution: An effort at peace making in the battles over prostitution. *Rethinking Marxism*, 13(2), 30–51. <https://doi.org/10.1080/089356901101241686>
- Wade, B. (2009). *Seeking arrangement: A definitive guide to sugar daddy and mutually beneficial relationships*. Bush Street Press.
- Wagenmakers, E.-J., Love, J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., Selker, R., Gronau, Q. F., Droppedmann, D., Boutin, B., Meerhoff, F., Knight, P., Raj, A., van Kesteren, E.-J., van Doorn, J., Šmíra, M., Epskamp, S., Etz, A., Matzke, D., ... Morey, R. D. (2018a). Bayesian inference for psychology. Part II: Example applications with JASP. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25, 58–76. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1323-7>
- Wagenmakers, E.-J., Marsman, M., Jamil, T., Ly, A., Verhagen, J., Love, J., Selker, R., Gronau, Q. F., Šmíra, M., Epskamp, S., Matzke, D., Rouder, J. N., & Morey, R. D. (2018b). Bayesian inference for psychology. Part I: Theoretical advantages and practical ramifications. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 25, 35–57. <https://doi.org/10.3758/s13423-017-1343-3>
- Walter, K. V., Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhababha, M. M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C. S., AtamtürkDuyar, D., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., ... Zupančič, M. (2020). Sex differences in mate preferences across 45 countries: A large-scale replication. *Psychological Science*, 31(4), 408–423. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797620904154>
- Walter, K. V., Conroy-Beam, D., Buss, D. M., Asao, K., Sorokowska, A., Sorokowski, P., Aavik, T., Akello, G., Alhababha, M., Alm, C., Amjad, N., Anjum, A., Atama, C., Duyar, D., Ayebare, R., Batres, C., Bendixen, M., Bensafia, A., Bizumic, B., ... Zupančič, M. (2021). Sex differences in human mate preferences vary across sex ratios. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B*, 288(1955), 20211115. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2021.1115>
- Wamoyi, J., Wight, D., Plummer, M., Mshana, G. H., & Ross, D. (2010). Transactional sex amongst young people in rural northern Tanzania: An ethnography of young women’s motivations and negotiation. *Reproductive Health*, 7, 2. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1742-4755-7-2>
- White, D. R., & Burton, M. L. (1988). Causes of polygyny: Ecology, economy, kinship, and warfare. *American Anthropologist*, 90(4), 871–887. <https://doi.org/10.1525/aa.1988.90.4.02a00060>



- Whyte, S., Brooks, R. C., & Torgler, B. (2019). Sexual economic theory and the human mating market. *Applied Economics*, 51(57), 6100–6112. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00036846.2019.1650886>
- Wood, W., & Eagly, A. H. (2012). Biosocial construction of sex differences and similarities in behavior. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 55–123. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-394281-4.00002-7>
- Wu, M. (2006). Hofstede's cultural dimensions 30 years later: A study of Taiwan and the United States. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 15(1), 33–42.
- Zhang, L., Lee, A. J., DeBruine, L. M., & Jones, B. C. (2019). Are sex differences in preferences for physical attractiveness and good earning capacity in potential mates smaller in countries with greater gender equality? *Evolutionary Psychology*, 17(2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/1474704919852921>

**Publisher's Note** Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

## Authors and Affiliations

Norbert Meskó<sup>1</sup>  · Marta Kowal<sup>2</sup>  · András Láng<sup>1</sup>  · Ferenc Kocsor<sup>1</sup>  · Szabolcs A. Bandi<sup>1</sup>  · Adam Putz<sup>1</sup>  · Piotr Sorokowski<sup>3</sup>  · David A. Frederick<sup>4</sup> · Felipe E. García<sup>5</sup> · Leonardo A. Aguilar<sup>6</sup> · Anna Studzinska<sup>7</sup> · Chee-Seng Tan<sup>8</sup> · Biljana Gjoneska<sup>9</sup> · Taciano L. Milfont<sup>10</sup> · Merve Topcu Bulut<sup>11</sup> · Dmitry Grigoryev<sup>12</sup> · Toivo Aavik<sup>13</sup> · Mahmoud Boussema<sup>14</sup> · Alan D. A. Mattiassi<sup>15</sup> · Reza Afhami<sup>16</sup> · Rizwana Amin<sup>17</sup> · Roberto Baiocco<sup>18</sup> · Hamdaoui Brahim<sup>19</sup> · Ali R. Can<sup>20</sup> · Joao Carneiro<sup>21</sup> · Hakan Çetinkaya<sup>22</sup> · Dimitri Chubinidze<sup>23</sup> · Eliane Deschrijver<sup>24,25,26</sup> · Yahya Don<sup>27</sup> · Dmitrii Dubrov<sup>28</sup> · Izzet Duyar<sup>29</sup> · Marija Jovic<sup>30</sup> · Julia A. Kamburidis<sup>31</sup> · Farah Khan<sup>32</sup> · Hareesol Khun-Inkeeree<sup>33</sup> · Maida Koso-Drljevic<sup>34</sup> · David Lacko<sup>35</sup> · Karlijn Massar<sup>36</sup> · Mara Morelli<sup>37</sup>  · Jean C. Natividade<sup>38</sup>  · Ellen K. Nyhus<sup>39</sup> · Ju Hee Park<sup>40</sup> · Farid Pazhoohi<sup>41</sup> · Ekaterine Pirtskhalava<sup>42</sup> · Koen Ponnet<sup>43</sup> · Pavol Prokop<sup>44,45</sup> · Dušana Šakan<sup>46</sup> · Singha Tulyakul<sup>47</sup> · Austin H. Wang<sup>48</sup>  · Sibebe D. Aquino<sup>38</sup>  · Derya D. Atamtürk<sup>29</sup> · Nana Burduli<sup>49</sup> · Antonio Chirumbolo<sup>50</sup> · Seda Dural<sup>51</sup> · Edgardo Etchezahar<sup>52,53</sup> · Nasim Ghahraman Moharrampour<sup>54</sup> · Balazs Aczel<sup>55</sup> · Luca Kozma<sup>1,56</sup> · Samuel Lins<sup>57</sup> · Efisio Manunta<sup>58</sup> · Tiago Marot<sup>59</sup>  · Moises Mebarak<sup>60</sup> · Kirill G. Miroshnik<sup>61</sup> · Katarina Misetic<sup>34</sup> · Marietta Papadatou-Pastou<sup>62</sup> · Bence Bakos<sup>63</sup> · Fatima Zahra Sahli<sup>64</sup> · Sangeeta Singh<sup>39</sup> · Çağlar Solak<sup>65</sup> · Tatiana Volkodav<sup>66</sup>  · Anna Włodarczyk<sup>67</sup> · Grace Akello<sup>68</sup> · Marios Argyrides<sup>69</sup> · Ogeday Çoker<sup>70</sup> · Katarzyna Galasinska<sup>71</sup> · Talía Gómez Yepes<sup>72</sup> · Aleksander Kobylarek<sup>73</sup> · Miguel Landa-Blanco<sup>74</sup> · Marlon Mayorga<sup>75</sup> · Barış Özener<sup>29</sup> · Ma. Criselda T. Pacquing<sup>76</sup> · Marc Eric S. Reyes<sup>76</sup> · Ayşegül Şahin<sup>28</sup>  · William Tamayo-Agudelo<sup>77</sup> · Gulmira Topanova<sup>78</sup>  · Ezgi Toplu-Demirtaş<sup>79</sup> · Belgüzar N. Türkan<sup>70</sup> · Marcos Zumárraga-Espinosa<sup>80</sup> · Simone Grassini<sup>81,82</sup> · Jan Antfolk<sup>83</sup> · Clément Corneć<sup>84</sup> · Katarzyna Pisanski<sup>3,84</sup> · Sabrina Stöckli<sup>85</sup> · Stephanie Josephine Eder<sup>86</sup> · Hyemin Han<sup>87</sup> 

✉ Norbert Meskó  
meskonorbert@me.com

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of Pécs, Pécs 7624, Hungary

<sup>2</sup> IDN Human Being Lab, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland

<sup>3</sup> Institute of Psychology, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland

<sup>4</sup> Crean College of Health and Behavioral Sciences, Chapman University, Orange, CA, USA

<sup>5</sup> Departamento de Psiquiatría y Salud Mental, Facultad de Medicina, Universidad de Concepción, Concepción, Chile

<sup>6</sup> School of Psychology, Central University of Venezuela, Caracas, Venezuela

<sup>7</sup> Department of Humanities, Icam, Toulouse, France

<sup>8</sup> Department of Psychology and Counselling, Universiti Tunku Abdul Rahman, Kampar, Malaysia

<sup>9</sup> Macedonian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Skopje, North Macedonia

<sup>10</sup> School of Psychology, University of Waikato, Tauranga, New Zealand

<sup>11</sup> Clinical Addiction Research Unit, Lund University, Malmö, Sweden

<sup>12</sup> Center for Sociocultural Research, HSE University, Moscow, Russian Federation

<sup>13</sup> Institute of Psychology, University of Tartu, Tartu, Estonia

<sup>14</sup> Department of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Mohamed Lamine Debaghine, University Setif2, Setif, Algeria

<sup>15</sup> Department of Education, Languages, Interculture, Literatures and Psychology, University of Florence, Florence, Italy

<sup>16</sup> Department of Art Studies, Tarbiat Modares University, Tehran, Iran

<sup>17</sup> Department of Professional Psychology, Bahria University, Islamabad, Pakistan

<sup>18</sup> Department of Developmental and Social Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy

<sup>19</sup> Department of Sociologie, University of Ibn Tofail, Kenitra, Morocco

<sup>20</sup> Department of Anthropology, Hatay Mustafa Kemal University, Hatay, Turkey

- 21 Department of Social Psychology, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal
- 22 Department of Psychology, Yaşar University, Izmir, Turkey
- 23 Psychological Set Research and Correction Center, Tbilisi State Medical University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 24 Department of Experimental Psychology, Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
- 25 School of Psychology, University of New South Wales, Sydney, Australia
- 26 School of Psychology, University of Sydney, Sydney, Australia
- 27 School of Education, Universiti Utara Malaysia, Kedah, Malaysia
- 28 HSE University, Moscow, Russian Federation
- 29 Department of Anthropology, Istanbul University, Istanbul, Turkey
- 30 Department of Marketing Management and Public Relations, Faculty of Organizational Sciences, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, Serbia
- 31 Department of General, Experimental and Genetic Psychology, Sofia University, Sofia, Bulgaria
- 32 Institute of Education & Research, Women University Mardan, Mardan, Pakistan
- 33 Psychology and Counselling, Prince of Songkla University, Pattani, Thailand
- 34 Department of Psychology, University of Sarajevo, Sarajevo, Bosnia and Herzegovina
- 35 Interdisciplinary Research Team on Internet and Society, Faculty of Social Studies, Masaryk University, Brno, Czech Republic
- 36 Work and Social Psychology, Maastricht University, Maastricht, The Netherlands
- 37 Department of Dynamic and Clinical Psychology, and Health Studies, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy
- 38 Department of Psychology, Pontifical Catholic University of Rio de Janeiro, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- 39 Department of Management, University of Agder, Kristiansand, Norway
- 40 Department of Child and Family Studies, Yonsei University, Seoul, Korea
- 41 Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
- 42 Department of Psychology, Ivane Javakhishvili Tbilisi State University, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 43 Faculty of Social Sciences, Imec-Mict-Ghent University, Ghent, Belgium
- 44 Department of Environmental Ecology and Landscape Management, Comenius University, Bratislava, Slovakia
- 45 Institute of Zoology, Slovak Academy of Sciences, Bratislava, Slovakia
- 46 Department of Psychology, Faculty of Legal and Business Studies Dr Lazar Vrkatić, Union University, Novi Sad, Serbia
- 47 Department of Health and Physical Education, Thaksin University, Songkhla, Thailand
- 48 Political Science, University of Nevada, Las Vegas, Las Vegas, NV, USA
- 49 Department of Psychology, University of Georgia, Tbilisi, Georgia
- 50 Department of Psychology, Sapienza University of Rome, Rome, Italy
- 51 Department of Psychology, Izmir University of Economics, Izmir, Turkey
- 52 Education Universidad Internacional de Valencia, Valencia, Spain
- 53 Ciipme Conicet, Buenos Aires, Argentina
- 54 School of Psychological Sciences, University of Melbourne, Melbourne, Australia
- 55 Institute of Psychology, ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 56 Division of Psychology, School of Education and Social Sciences, University of the West of Scotland, Paisley, Scotland, UK
- 57 Department of Psychology, University of Porto, Porto, Portugal
- 58 CLLE, Université de Toulouse, Toulouse, France
- 59 Department of Administration, Getúlio Vargas Foundation, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
- 60 Department of Psychology, Universidad del Norte, Puerto Colombia, Colombia
- 61 Department of Psychology, Saint Petersburg State University, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation
- 62 Department of Primary Education, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens, Athens, Greece
- 63 ELTE Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Hungary
- 64 Institute of Sports Professions, Ibn Tofail University, Kenitra, Morocco
- 65 Department of Psychology, Manisa Celal Bayar University, Manisa, Turkey
- 66 Department of Pedagogy and Psychology, Kuban State University, Krasnodar, Russian Federation
- 67 Escuela de Psicología, Universidad Católica del Norte, Antofagasta, Chile
- 68 Mental Health, Gulu University, Gulu, Uganda
- 69 Department of Psychology, Neapolis University Pafos, Paphos, Cyprus
- 70 Department of Psychology, Pamukkale University, Denizli, Turkey
- 71 Department of Psychology, Center For Research On Biological Basis of Social Behavior, SWPS University of Social Sciences and Humanities, Warsaw, Poland
- 72 Department of Education, International University of Valencia, Valencia, Spain
- 73 Institute of Pedagogy, University of Wrocław, Wrocław, Poland

- <sup>74</sup> School of Psychological Sciences, National Autonomous University of Honduras, Tegucigalpa, Honduras
- <sup>75</sup> Escuela de Psicología, Pontificia Universidad Católica del Ecuador-Ambato, Ambato, Ecuador
- <sup>76</sup> Department of Psychology, University of Santo Tomas, Manila, Philippines
- <sup>77</sup> Faculty of Psychology, Universidad Cooperativa de Colombia, Medellín, Colombia
- <sup>78</sup> Department of Theoretical and Practical Psychology, Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan
- <sup>79</sup> Department of Psychological Counseling and Guidance, Mef University, Istanbul, Turkey
- <sup>80</sup> Carrera de Psicología, Universidad Politécnica Salesiana, Quito, Ecuador
- <sup>81</sup> Department of Psychosocial Science, University of Bergen, Bergen, Norway
- <sup>82</sup> Cognitive and Behavioral Neuroscience Lab, University of Stavanger, Stavanger, Norway
- <sup>83</sup> Faculty of Arts, Psychology and Theology, Åbo Akademi University, Turku, Finland
- <sup>84</sup> ENES Bioacoustics Research Lab, CRNL, CNRS, Inserm, University of Saint-Etienne, Saint-Etienne, France
- <sup>85</sup> Department of Business Administration, University of Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
- <sup>86</sup> Department of Neurosciences and Developmental Biology, University of Vienna, Vienna, Austria
- <sup>87</sup> Educational Psychology Program, University of Alabama, Tuscaloosa, AL, USA

## Terms and Conditions

Springer Nature journal content, brought to you courtesy of Springer Nature Customer Service Center GmbH (“Springer Nature”).

Springer Nature supports a reasonable amount of sharing of research papers by authors, subscribers and authorised users (“Users”), for small-scale personal, non-commercial use provided that all copyright, trade and service marks and other proprietary notices are maintained. By accessing, sharing, receiving or otherwise using the Springer Nature journal content you agree to these terms of use (“Terms”). For these purposes, Springer Nature considers academic use (by researchers and students) to be non-commercial.

These Terms are supplementary and will apply in addition to any applicable website terms and conditions, a relevant site licence or a personal subscription. These Terms will prevail over any conflict or ambiguity with regards to the relevant terms, a site licence or a personal subscription (to the extent of the conflict or ambiguity only). For Creative Commons-licensed articles, the terms of the Creative Commons license used will apply.

We collect and use personal data to provide access to the Springer Nature journal content. We may also use these personal data internally within ResearchGate and Springer Nature and as agreed share it, in an anonymised way, for purposes of tracking, analysis and reporting. We will not otherwise disclose your personal data outside the ResearchGate or the Springer Nature group of companies unless we have your permission as detailed in the Privacy Policy.

While Users may use the Springer Nature journal content for small scale, personal non-commercial use, it is important to note that Users may not:

1. use such content for the purpose of providing other users with access on a regular or large scale basis or as a means to circumvent access control;
2. use such content where to do so would be considered a criminal or statutory offence in any jurisdiction, or gives rise to civil liability, or is otherwise unlawful;
3. falsely or misleadingly imply or suggest endorsement, approval, sponsorship, or association unless explicitly agreed to by Springer Nature in writing;
4. use bots or other automated methods to access the content or redirect messages
5. override any security feature or exclusionary protocol; or
6. share the content in order to create substitute for Springer Nature products or services or a systematic database of Springer Nature journal content.

In line with the restriction against commercial use, Springer Nature does not permit the creation of a product or service that creates revenue, royalties, rent or income from our content or its inclusion as part of a paid for service or for other commercial gain. Springer Nature journal content cannot be used for inter-library loans and librarians may not upload Springer Nature journal content on a large scale into their, or any other, institutional repository.

These terms of use are reviewed regularly and may be amended at any time. Springer Nature is not obligated to publish any information or content on this website and may remove it or features or functionality at our sole discretion, at any time with or without notice. Springer Nature may revoke this licence to you at any time and remove access to any copies of the Springer Nature journal content which have been saved.

To the fullest extent permitted by law, Springer Nature makes no warranties, representations or guarantees to Users, either express or implied with respect to the Springer nature journal content and all parties disclaim and waive any implied warranties or warranties imposed by law, including merchantability or fitness for any particular purpose.

Please note that these rights do not automatically extend to content, data or other material published by Springer Nature that may be licensed from third parties.

If you would like to use or distribute our Springer Nature journal content to a wider audience or on a regular basis or in any other manner not expressly permitted by these Terms, please contact Springer Nature at

[onlineservice@springernature.com](mailto:onlineservice@springernature.com)