Exploring Mobile Dating Applications: An Exploratory Study of the Psyche Motivating the Use of Technology for Dating

Abby Halston[1], Taylor Lum[1], &Darren Iwamoto[1]

[1]*School of Educational and Behavioral Sciences, Chaminade University of Honolulu, Honolulu, HI*
Corresponding Author: Abby Halston, School of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Chaminade University of Honolulu, Honolulu, HI, USA. Tel: 1-808-739-4641

ABSTRACT: *This study examines that motives of mobile dating applications (i.e. Tinder, Bumble, Coffee Meets Bagels, Grindr, and Hinge). With technology constantly growing and the dating culture changing, the researchers investigated mobile dating application user's motives. Data was gathered with the utilization of Amazon Mechanical Turk. Results indicated that the motives (e.g. Social Approval, Relationship Seeking, Sexual Experience, Flirting/Social Skills, Travel, Ex, Belongingness, Peer Pressure, Socializing, Sexual Orientation, Pass Time/Entertainment, Distraction, Curiosity) were significantly, positively correlated with each other, as measured by Tinder Motives Scale (TMS), which was altered to gather data with other mobile dating applications. Results also revealed that there is a difference between male and female's women's motives, especially with sexual experience, flirting/social skills, belongingness, and distraction. Including, revealing that there is an association with age and motives and people's time spent on their mobile dating applications increases the likelihood of their outcome, such as having a relationship or having a casual relationship. Some of these findings were similar to previous evidence. Limitations include lack of diversity and the utilization of a self-reported survey where people did not complete various questions. However, this study included various ages which was neglected by other studies due to the assumption that emerging adults or college students utilize mobile dating applications compared to adults or older adults.*

KEYWORDS: *Dating Applications, Gender Differences, User Motives, Online Dating, Belongingness*

I.   INTRODUCTION

Dating has tremendously transformed over the years due to technological inventions, such as the Internet, smartphones, and social media. Currently, individuals seek and obtain romantic and other relationships on these technologically savvy websites or smartphone applications (apps). It has increased, and now 15% of the United States (U.S.) adults reported using online dating sites or mobile dating apps (Smith, 2016). Online dating sites are different from mobile dating apps. Online dating sites usually require a fee that asks questions about the individual and other matters such as what the individual seeks in a future partner. The dating sites will match individuals by their expectations and similarities. While, mobile dating apps, such as Tinder, require no fee but the area matches the user and whether they select a specific age range of future contenders. For Tinder, if the user, "swipes left" then s/he rejects the individual but if the user "swipes right" then s/he likes the individual. If both individuals "swipe right" later, they developed a match and can start a conversation (Gatter and Hodkinson, 2016).

Although online dating sites and mobile dating apps are considerably different, they have the same goal of helping individuals seek romantic or other relationships. This expectation could allure various individuals. According to Statista, in 2018, online dating reached 555 million dollars in the U.S. and is expected to increase. Match.com is reportedly the most popular dating site in the U.S. Tinder, and PlentyOfFish is the next favorably used dating sites/apps. Bumble is another popular app that users have a choice to seek romantic relationships or friends. If heterosexual, females are to make the first contact, but if they are same-sex, then either individual can start the first conversation. According to Digital Trends, Grindr, Coffee Meets Bagels, and Hinge are other popular dating mobile applications used in 2019. Grindr is a dating app for gay, bi, trans, or queer individuals. One can make a profile or sign in to their Facebook account. Once signed up, users can access other profiles and talk/message to other users. A Grindr user could also send their location to meet with another user. Grindr users have limitations such as they are allowed to see 100 profiles in their area, but an added fee can provoke this limitation. For Coffee Meets Bagels, one must set up a profile by logging into their Facebook. Once the user has logged in and inputted their preferences, the user will obtain a few "bagels" or profiles that match with their

preferences a day. Then, one has 24 hours if they would like to accept or reject their "bagel." If you want your "bagel" and they like you too, then the users can connect. Hinge is very similar to Tinder by looking like Tinder, but it has different functions. Hinge connects the user by logging onto Facebook and making connections by the user's friends of friends to match users with similar interests. Similar to Tinder, Hinge has questions that the users "swipe left" if they don't do it and "swipe right" if they have done it such as Have you traveled to Hawaii? Hinge users also can only message one another if they have matched. These mobile dating apps are accessible to individuals in 2019.

With various online dating sites and mobile dating apps forming, it has increased its notoriety. It also has become culturally accepted. Individuals are discovering that it is a decent way to meet new people. It has also increased among young adults under 25 in addition to individuals in their late 50s and early 60s. For younger adults, it has risen from 10% in 2013 to 27% in 2015 while the latter 50 and early 60-year-old increased to 12% (Smith, 2016). Therefore, various people across different ages and backgrounds, are seeking relationships through cyber platforms, especially mobile dating apps.

In a research study by Bryan and Sheldon (2017), they examined motives for using online dating websites and mobile dating applications by college students completing a questionnaire (N=364). They discovered that the main reasons for using an online dating website and/or mobile dating applications are for "Fun," "Relationship," and "Hook Up." In their results, Fun had the leading mean score (M = 3.76; SD = .90) accompanied by Relationship (M = 3.33; SD = .99) and Hook Up (M = 2.39; SD = .79). Also, they examined the motives between online dating websites and mobile dating applications. Researchers found that individuals using mobile apps were more concerned with hooking up and having more fun than online dating sites. Online dating sites were more intent on acquiring long-term relationships than mobile apps.

In another study by Ranzini and Lutz (2017) studied how Tinder users present themselves, in addition to examining their personality characteristics, demographics, and motives. Researchers conducted online surveys by U.S. participants (N=497) using Amazon Mechanical Turk. The average age of participants was 30.9 years and had a standard deviation of 8.2 years, which is a young representation of the data collected. As for their results of motives, the motives of use include hooking up/sex, friendship, relationship, traveling, self-validation, and entertainment. Researchers discovered that women utilize Tinder for friendship and self-validation. They also found that men use Tinder for hooking up/sex, traveling, and relationship-seeking.

In Sumter, Vandenbosch, and Ligtenberg (2017) study, they examined motivations (i.e., Love, Casual Sex, Ease of Communication, Self-Worth Validation, Thrill of Excitement, and Trendiness) of emerging adults using Tinder. As a result, Love was a more powerful motivation than Casual Sex when using Tinder. Seventeen percent of the participants reported having one night stands while using Tinder. Men users were most likely to use Tinder for Casual Sex and Thrill of Excitement (i.e., one night stands). Besides, they discovered that Love, Casual Sex, and Ease of Communication were positively associated with age. These motivations tended to increase as individuals get older. Researchers stated this could be due to specific changes in development in love style. As individuals get older, they may find more value in Love, Casual Sex, and Ease of Communication. Lastly, they found that emerging adults using Tinder were positively associated with Love (to find a romantic partner), Casual Sex (to achieve one's sexual needs), Self-Worth Validation (to make one feel good about oneself), and Thrill of Excitement (to have fun). Also, in a similar study by Gatter and Hodkinson (2016), they discovered that Tinder users were younger and more sexually permissive than online dating users. They also found than men reportedly use both Tinder and online dating sites to obtain casual sex partners compared to women. Men also scored higher on sexual permissiveness compared to women. Therefore, individuals use Tinder and online dating agencies for various reasons and have different motives to obtain individual relationships.

Due to these motives and the use of mobile dating applications/online dating sites, individuals are actively using various forms of media to seek and complete particular needs (i.e., psychological and social). This is also known as Uses and Gratifications Theory (U&G) (Bryant and Sheldon, 2017; Timmermans and De Caluwé, 2017). These needs are also known as "motives" (Bryant and Sheldon, 2017). For online dating sites, various studies have examined users motives such as looking for fun, seeking sex or romantic partners, meeting new people, curiosity, and more (Bryan and Sheldon, 2017). However, there is limited information on why individuals specifically use mobile dating applications (Bryant and Sheldon, 2017). By using U&G, researchers can gather more information on the specific motives for using mobile dating applications.

Therefore, the purpose of this study is to explore the motives of individuals by using the Amazon Turk Mechanical to gather extensive data from various individuals across the United States. There were many limitations to these studies, such as distinguishing the user's relationship status and sexual orientation. Another limitation was the exploration of other mobile dating applications' motives and examining a more substantial audience/generalizability of the population. These limitations will be explored in our research study. Thus, this study's research question is what are people's motives using mobile dating applications (i.e. Tinder, Coffee Meets Bagels, Bumble, Grindr, and Hinge)?

II.   METHODOLOGY

Participants

Participants were over 24 years old and ages ranged from 24 to 60 and above with participation from males, females, transgender (M-F), and non-binary (*N* = 184). With this sample, 43.5% were females, 55.4% were males, .5% were transgender (M-F), and .5% were non-binary. Participants' ages included 40.2% individuals ranging from 24-29 years old, 29.3% individuals ranging from 30-35 years old, 14.1% individuals ranging from 36-41 years old, 10.3% individuals ranging from 42-47, 4.3% individuals ranging from 54-59, and 1.1% individuals ranging from 60 and above. Participants reported their sexual orientation which included 78.3% participants who identify as heterosexual, 7.1% as homosexual, 13.0% as bisexual, and 1.1% as other. Participants also reported their total number of sexual partners ranged from 0 to 100 sexual partners.

Participants' ethnicities included 8.2% Asians, 9.2% African Americans, 10.3% Hispanics, 7.6% Native Americans, 62.0% Caucasians, and 2.7% two or more ethnicities. There were no participants' that identified as Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander. While, participants' marital status included 53.8% are single, 34.8% are married, 10.3% are divorced, and 1.1% are widowed. Participants reported their high educational degree earned with 18.5% of participants obtained a high school degree, 60.3% achieved a bachelor's degree, 15.8% completed a master's degree, 3.8% fulfilled a doctorate degree, and .5% reported none. Participants also reported their religious affiliation/spiritual preference which included 47.3% Christians, 20.7% Catholics, 1.1% Hindus, .5% Islamic, 1.6% Buddhists, 14.1% Agnostics, 10.3% Atheists, and 4.3% Others. Also, participants' income ranged from $0 to $4,500,000.

Materials

Each participant was given a survey to complete which was completed in about 10 to 15 minutes. The survey included demographics (e.g. sex, ethnicity, age, educational degree, religious affiliation/spiritual preference, and sexual orientation) and questions that asked about their daily hours spent on the mobile dating app(s), how many "matches" they obtained, how many times they've met their "match" in person (face to face), how many have they kept in contact with after meeting with them, how long they have kept in contact with their "matches" (e.g. day(s), week(s), month(s), and year(s), and the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. have a relationship with, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual sexual relationship with, and became friends with).

After, participants completed the Tinder Motives Scales (TMS) which was modified to accommodate for other mobile dating apps, such as Coffee Meets Bagels, Bumble, Hinge, Grindr, and other apps. Based on research literature, the Tinder Motives Scale (TMS) has been chosen as the instrument of quantitative assessment due to the high reliability and validity to assess the relationship between mobile dating application users and their motives. Timmermans & De Caluwé (2017) established a relatively high reliability (range of coefficient alpha = .74 and .95) and validity of the scale is an ongoing process by each study using their assessment. The assessment is consisted of 58 items with 13 reliable Tinder motives (e.g. Social Approval, Relationship Seeking, Sexual Experience, Flirting/Social Skills, Travel, Ex, Belongingness, Peer Pressure, Socializing, Sexual Orientation, Pass Time/Entertainment, Distraction, Curiosity).

Procedure

Participants were recruited for this study through Amazon Mechanical Turk. Amazon Mechanical Turk is a "crowdsourcing marketplace" where individuals can sign up to become workers and participate in human intelligent tasks (HITs), such as completing online surveys. Specifically, to this study, participants were required to be over 24 years old and live in the U.S. After the participants selected the HIT, they were given a Google Forms link where they were asked to read a consent form and complete the questionnaire. Questionnaire included demographics, hours spent utilizing the mobile dating app(s), whether they met their "match" in person, kept in contact with their "match", how long they kept in contact with their "match", the outcome with meeting their "match" (e.g. have a romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual sexual relationship with, and became friends with), and the Tinder Motives Scale (TMS). Other dating apps (e.g. Coffee Meets Bagels, Bumble, Hinge, Grindr, and other apps) were included. After completion, they were given compensation of $0.50 for their efforts.

III.   DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to examine the motives and utilization of mobile dating apps with a more comprehensive sample by the utilization of Amazon Mechanical Turk. This study analyzed thirteen different motives which included social approval, relationship seeking, sexual experience, flirting/social skills, travel, ex, belongingness, peer pressure, socializing, sexual orientation, pass time/entertainment, distraction, and curiosity. Most studies analyzed a younger population of participants in which they discovered that most younger individuals utilize mobile dating apps to find a romantic partner, casual sex (hooking up), self-worth validation,

thrill of excitement (having fun), and sexual permissiveness (Bryan and Sheldon, 2017; Sumter, Vandenbosch, and Ligtenberg, 2017). Results revealed that there was a difference with motives especially, sexual experience, flirting/social skills, belongingness, and distraction, among males and females. Due to lack of diversity with sexes, transgender and participants who identified as "other" weren't included in the analysis to display the difference between sexes. Results also revealed that on average men scored higher than women in these categories. Therefore, males tend to utilize mobile dating apps for a sexual experience, flirting/social skills, belongingness, and distraction motives more than females.

In regards to age, results revealed differences in age with their motives to use mobile dating apps. It displayed that there was difference in flirting/social skills and belongingness among ages. The average age for people who use mobile dating apps in this study is people ages 30 to 35. This finding is similar toRanzini and Lutz (2017) whose average of participants that utilized mobile dating apps were 30.9 years old. Specifically, people who are between 42 to 47 years old used mobile dating apps for flirting/social skills more than people who are between 24 to 29 years old. Also, people who are 36 to 41 years old used mobile dating apps for belongingness more than people who are 24 to 29 years old.

There were various associations displayed in this study's results with individual's motives to utilize mobile dating apps. These findings revealed that each motive was positively associated with each other. For instance, if someone has a strong motive to use mobile dating apps for social approval then s/he is more likely to also use the mobile dating app for relationship seeking as well. These findings also established a positive relationship with how often one uses the mobile dating apps and their motives. For instance, if one may have a strong desire to seek a sexual experience with mobile dating apps then they may utilize more hours of mobile dating apps. Therefore, individuals have multiple motives when using mobile dating apps.

There were also associations with the individual's outcomes (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and their daily hours spent, met in person, and kept in contact after meeting their "matches" while using mobile dating apps. Findings revealed small, positive relationships that individuals who spent longer daily hours on Tinder and "Other" apps were more likely to experience a stronger outcome, such as experiencing a romantic relationship with someone. There were also small to medium, positive relationships with individuals who met their "match" in person had a stronger outcome with someone when utilizing Tinder, Coffee Meets Bagels, Bumble, Hinge, Grindr, and "Other" apps. Similarly, individuals kept in contact with their "match" after meeting with them were likely to experience a strong outcome with their match on all of the selected apps for this study. Therefore, individuals spending hours daily on the apps, met their match in person, or kept in contact after meeting their match tend to experience stronger outcomes (e.g. romantic relationship).

In summary, some of these findings support previous evidence with people's motives to utilize mobile dating apps. Previous studies lacked the differences in age groups due to the increased trend and normality of mobile dating apps as most studies analyze motives among college students or emerging adults. Limitations included the lack of diversity with the sample and the self-reported measure. Due to the limitation of having one transgender and one non-binary participant, researchers had to eliminate these participants. Researchers analyzed data from males and females. Also, there was a researcher error with not including the age group 48-53 on the demographic's questionnaire. With the utilization of self-reported measure, data was missing thereby potentially affecting the results of the data. Therefore, further research is needed to better understand and confirm these findings. Further research could replicate and include a more diverse, comprehensive sample. It could also include a component where participants could only receive their compensation once they completely responded to all questions in the survey. These future studies could assist in confirming mobile dating app users' motives across all ages.

IV. FINDINGS

Table 1
Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Category	*n*	%
Gender		
Female	80	43.5
Male	102	55.4
Transgender	1	.5
Non-binary	1	.5
Age		
24-29	74	40.2
30-35	54	29.3
36-41	26	14.1
42-47	19	10.3

54-59	8	4.3
60 and above	2	1.1
Ethnicity		
Asian	15	8.2
African American	17	9.2
Hispanic	19	10.3
Native American	14	7.6
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	0	0
Caucasian	114	62.0
Two or more ethnicities	5	2.7
Sexual Orientation		
Heterosexual	144	78.3
Homosexual	13	7.1
Bisexual	24	13.0
Other	2	1.1
Marital Status		
Single	99	53.8
Married	64	34.8
Divorced	19	10.3
Widowed	2	1.1
Education		
High School Degree	34	18.5
Bachelor's Degree	111	60.3
Master's Degree	29	15.8
Doctorate Degree	7	3.8
None	1	.5
Religion		
Christian	87	47.3
Catholic	38	20.7
Hindu	2	1.1
Islamic	1	.5
Buddhist	3	1.6
Agnostic	26	14.1
Atheist	19	10.3
Other	8	4.3

Note. *N* =184. Participants were on average in the age range 24-29, heterosexual, single, and Caucasian.

An independent –samples t-test was conducted to compare the motives of utilizing mobile dating apps for females and males. Transgender and non-binary participants were not included in this analysis due to lack of participants who identified as transgender or non-binary. There was a significant difference in sexual experience scores for males (*M* = 27.12, *SD* = .959) and females (*M* = 19.06, *SD* = 1.167; *t* (180) = -5.381, *p* = .000, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -8.055, 95% *CI*: -11.009 to -5.101) was very small (eta squared = .005). There was also a fairly significant difference in flirting/social skills for males (*M* = 25.44, *SD* = .891) and females (*M* = 22.70, *SD* = 1.070; *t* (180) = -1.983, *p* = .049, two-tailed). The magnitude of the difference in the means (mean difference = -2.741, 95% *CI*: -5.469 to -.013) was very small (eta squared = .005). With the motive, belongingness, there was a significant difference for males (*M* = 14.08, *SD* = .636) and females (*M* = 11.79, *SD* = .797; *t* (180) = -2.274, *p* = .024, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -2.291, 95% *CI*: -4.279 to -.303) was very small (eta squared = .005). With the motive, distraction, there was a significant difference for males (*M* = 11.77, *SD* = .537) and females (*M* = 10.00, *SD* = .607; *t* (180) = -2.191, *p* = .030, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = -1.775, 95% *CI*: -3.372 to -.177) was very small (eta squared = .005).

All participants were included with this analysis. A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of age on individuals' motives to utilize mobile dating applications, as measured by Tinder Motives Scale (TMS). Participants were divided into six groups according to their age (Group 1: 24 yrs to 29 yrs; Group 2: 30 yrs to 35 yrs; Group 3: 36 yrs to 41 yrs; Group 4: 42 yrs to 47 yrs; Group 5: 54 yrs to 59 yrs; Group 6: 60 yrs and above). There was a statistically significant difference at the *p*< .05 level in flirting/social skills *F* (5, 177) = 3.235, *p* = .008 and belongingness *F* (5,177) = 3.649, *p* = .004 among the age groups. Despite reaching statistical significance, the actual difference in mean scores between the groups was quite small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared was .09. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group 4 (*M* = 20.16, *SD* = 10.248) statistically different from Group 1 (*M* = 26.93, *SD* = 9.796) for flirting/social skills motive. Group 3 (*M* = 9.96, *SD* = 5.611) was statistically different from Group 1 (*M* = 15.16, *SD* = 6.409) for the motive, belongingness.

Table 2.

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations between Frequency, Outcome, and Motives of using Dating App(s)

		n	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1.	How often do you use the apps?	184	3.11	1.789	-														
2.	Outcome (e.g. Romantic relationship, Kissed with, Had a sexual interaction with, Had a casual relationship with, or Became friends)	184	3.27	1.852	.215**	-													
3.	Social Approval	184	23.62	9.889	.285**	2.78**	-												
4.	Relationship Seeking	184	22.86	8.342	.312**	.402**	.338**	-											
5.	Sexual Experience	184	23.51	10.794	.290**	.270**	.654**	.206**	-	.									
6.	Flirting/Social Skills	184	24.17	9.387	.307**	.287**	.678**	.374**	.667**	-									.
7.	Travel	184	16.51	8.691	.292**	.133	.461**	.280**	.509**	.596**	-								
8.	Ex	184	10.35	5.918	.154*	.302**	.512**	.395**	.495**	.506**	.468**	-							
9.	Belongingness	184	13.06	6.838	.342**	.278**	.658**	.185*	.635**	.710**	.662**	.545**	-	.					
10.	Peer Pressure	184	10.42	5.457	.299**	.204**	.534**	.268**	.508**	.621**	.612**	.576**	.785**	-	.				
11.	Socializing	184	17.71	6.157	.409**	.238**	.444**	.470**	.386**	.558**	.581**	.315**	.433**	.443**	-				
12.	Sexual Orientation	184	12.00	5.446	.215**	.042	.446**	.306**	.401**	.441**	.312**	.324**	.388**	.422**	.409**	-			
13.	Pass Time/Entertainment	184	30.47	9.995	.323**	.203**	.575**	.220**	.639**	.683**	.426**	.423**	.546**	.484**	.550**	.479**	-		
14.	Distraction	184	10.97	5.489	.310**	.221**	.523**	.156*	.616**	.695**	.617**	.528**	.716**	.606**	.449**	.416**	.708**	-	
15.	Curiosity	184	4.86	1.787	.274**	.150*	.377**	.330**	.350**	.493**	.272**	.227**	.271**	.309**	.574**	.338**	.578**	.381**	-

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
Motives for using mobile dating app(s):

The relationship between all of the motives (as measured by the Tinder Motives Scale) was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a strong, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .710, *n* = 184, *p* < .000, with increased motive for belongingness associated with the increased motive for flirting/social skills.

Motives to use dating apps and the outcome of their "matches":

The relationship between the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and one's motives to use the mobile dating apps (as measured by the Tinder Motives Scale) was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a medium, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .402, *n* = 184, *p* < .000, with increased motive for relationship seeking associated with increased level of outcome (i.e. romantic relationship).

Frequency of using dating apps and outcome of their "matches":

The relationship between the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and how often one uses the mobile dating apps was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a small, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .215, *n* = 184, *p* < .003, increased duration of keeping in contact with their "matches" associated with increased level of outcome (i.e. romantic relationship).

Table 3.
Correlations with Daily Hours Spent, Met in Person, Kept in Contact, and Outcome of their "Match" with Utilizing Mobile Dating App(s)

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18
1. Outcome	-																	
2. Daily hours spent on Tinder	.240**	-																
3. Daily hours spent on Coffee Meets Bagels	.171*	.565**	-															
4. Daily hours spent on Bumble	.114	.558**	.737**	-														
5. Daily hours spent on Hinge	.083	.535**	.785**	.727**	-													
6. Daily hours spent on Grindr	.077	.505**	.706**	.682**	.714**	-												
7. Daily hours spent on "Other" apps	.209**	.274**	.506**	.414**	.432**	.558**	-											
8. Met in person with Tinder	.417**	.461**	.263**	.298**	.243**	.178*	.168*	-										
9. Met in person with Coffee Meets Bagels	.253**	.460**	.855**	.637**	.641**	.603**	.543**	.371**	-									
10. Met in person with Bumble	.226**	.364**	.570**	.798**	.525**	.490**	.378**	.436**	.689**	-								
11. Met in person with Hinge	.228**	.491**	.727**	.668**	.786**	.641**	.486**	.400**	.792**	.689**	-							
12. Met in person with Grindr	.184*	.459**	.613**	.589**	.570**	.812**	.534**	.301**	.672**	.556**	.738**	-						
13. Met in person with "Other" apps	.294**	.193**	.411**	.311**	.333**	.466**	.807**	.143	.488**	.340**	.440**	.507**	-					
14. Kept in contact with Tinder	.359**	.524**	.504**	.455**	.462**	.438**	.347**	.677**	.597**	.503**	.617**	.520**	.308**	-				
15. Kept in contact with Coffee Meets Bagels	.254**	.459**	.844**	.663**	.697**	.637**	.577**	.310**	.940**	.660**	.773**	.683**	.499**	.568**	-			
16. Kept in contact with Bumble	.260**	.418**	.700**	.732**	.706**	.595**	.472**	.332**	.769**	.765**	.804**	.618**	.402**	.564**	.816**	-		
17. Kept in contact with Hinge	.248**	.476**	.714**	.663**	.761**	.639**	.515**	.330**	.739**	.638**	.917**	.679**	.419**	.545**	.762**	.794**	-	
18. Kept in contact with Grindr	.229**	.452**	.672**	.604**	.627**	.826**	.604**	.274**	.691**	.559**	.752**	.871**	.550**	.502**	.730**	.700**	.749**	-

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Daily hours spent on the dating app(s) and outcome of their "matches":

The relationship between the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and daily hours spent on the mobile dating

apps was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a small, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .240, n = 184, p< .001, with increased daily hours spent on Tinder associated with increased likelihood of outcome (i.e. romantic relationship).

Met in person using the dating app(s) and outcome of their "matches":

The relationship between the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and met in person with their "match" through their mobile dating app(s) was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a medium, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .417, n = 184, p< .000, with increased met in person associated with increased likelihood of outcome (i.e. romantic relationship).

Kept in contact after meeting their "matches" and outcome of their "matches":

The relationship between the outcome of their "matches" (e.g. romantic relationship, kissed with, had a sexual interaction with, had a casual relationship with, or became friends) and kept in contact after meeting their "match" was investigated by using Spearman Rank Order Correlation. Preliminary analyses were performed to ensure no violation of the assumptions of normality, linearity and homoscedasticity. There was a medium, positive correlation between the two variables, rho = .359, n = 184, p< .000, with increased contact after meeting with "match" associated with increased likelihood of outcome (i.e. romantic relationship).

V.   CONCLUSION

With mobile dating apps becoming more impactful in the dating culture, various ages and demographics are utilizing mobile dating apps. With these findings, future research can expand and fine tune the details replicate and expand this evidence. It seems that not only emerging adults or college students utilize mobile dating applications for their benefit. Through this research, these findings can assist mobile dating apps to determine mobile dating app users' motives and how they can better assist users in their motives to "match" with their best possible suitor.

REFERENCES

[1]. Bryant, K. & Sheldon, P. (2017). Cyber dating in the age of mobile apps: Understanding motives, attitudes, and characteristics of users. American Communication Journal, 19(2), 1-15.

[2]. Gatter, K., & Hodkinson, K. (2016). On the differences between Tinder™ versus online dating agencies: Questioning a myth An exploratory study. Cogent Psychology, 3(1).

[3]. Ranzini, G., & Lutz, C. (2017). Love at first swipe? Explaining Tinder self-presentation and motives. Mobile Media & Communication, 5(1), 80–101. https://doi.org/10.1177/2050157916664559

[4]. Smith, Aaron (2016, February 11). 15% of american adults have used online dating sites or mobile dating apps. https://www.pewresearch.org/internet/2016/02/11/15-percent-of-american-adults-have-used-online-dating-sites-or-mobile-dating-apps/

[5]. Sumter, R.S., Vandenbosch, L., &Ligtenberg, L. (2017). Love me Tinder: Untangling emerging adults' motivations for using the dating tinder. Telematics Informatics, 34 (1), 67-78.

[6]. Timmermans, E. & De Caluwé, E. (2017). To Tinder or not to Tinder, that's the question: An individual differences perspective to Tinder use and motives. Personality and Individual Differences, 110, 74-79. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.01.026

[7]. This text provides general information. Statista assumes no liability for the information given being complete or correct. Due to varying update cycles, statistics can display more up-to-date data than referenced in the text. (n.d.). Topic: Online dating in the United States. Statista. Retrieved September 16, 2019, from https://www.statista.com/topics/2158/online-dating/.

[8]. Vogels, E. A. (2020, June 4). 10 facts about Americans and online dating. Pew Research Center. Retrieved September 16, 2021, from https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2020/02/06/10-facts-about-americans-and-online-dating/.