

Singapore Management University

Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University

Dissertations and Theses Collection (Open Access)

Dissertations and Theses

7-2023

The (simp)le truth about excessive & obsessive romantic behaviors in men

Daniel HO

Singapore Management University, daniel.ho.2023@phdps.smu.edu.sg

Follow this and additional works at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/etd_coll



Part of the [Applied Behavior Analysis Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology and Interaction Commons](#)

Citation

HO, Daniel. The (simp)le truth about excessive & obsessive romantic behaviors in men. (2023).

Available at: https://ink.library.smu.edu.sg/etd_coll/516

This Master Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Dissertations and Theses at Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses Collection (Open Access) by an authorized administrator of Institutional Knowledge at Singapore Management University. For more information, please email cherylds@smu.edu.sg.

THE (SIMP)LE TRUTH ABOUT EXCESSIVE &
OBSESSIVE ROMANTIC BEHAVIORS IN MEN

DANIEL HO

SINGAPORE MANAGEMENT UNIVERSITY

2023

The (Simp)le Truth about Excessive & Obsessive Romantic
Behaviors in Men

Daniel Ho

Submitted to School of Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the
Degree of Master of Philosophy in Psychology

Master's Thesis Committee:

Kenneth Tan (Supervisor/Chair)
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Singapore Management University

Norman Li
Professor of Psychology
Singapore Management University

Lester Sim
Assistant Professor of Psychology
Singapore Management University

I hereby declare that this Master's thesis is my original work
and it has been written by me in its entirety.

I have duly acknowledged all the sources of information
which have been used in this thesis.

This Master's thesis has also not been submitted for any degree in
any university previously.



Daniel Ho
30 June 2023

Abstract

There has been a growing trend in mainstream media of certain individuals being termed as simps, generally recognized as people who engage in costly or extravagant romantic behaviors toward a romantic interest, but are often met with no reciprocation. It is suggested that simping behaviors appear to be an evolutionarily maladaptive mating strategy where individuals engage in excessive and obsessive behaviors when pursuing a romantic interest. The current research aimed to explore this phenomenon, to identify specific traits and characteristics that are typical of simps and simping behavior. Across a set of two studies comprising an act nomination and act frequency design, it was found that simps are generally perceived as undesirable romantic partners with low mate value, engaging in excessive and obsessive mate pursuit behaviors. They were also perceived to exhibit exploitative tendencies targeted at their romantic interests. Implications and avenues for future research are discussed.

Keywords: simp; simping behavior; relationship initiation; mating strategies; persistent pursuit

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	ii
Introduction.....	1
What are “Simps” and what constitutes “Simping” behaviors?	2
Evolutionary Perspective on Mating Behaviors and Strategies.....	6
The Current Research	11
Hypotheses & Predictions.....	11
Study 1	12
Method	12
Results.....	13
Study 2	16
Method	17
Results.....	18
General Discussion	21
References.....	31
Appendix.....	41

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank God for seeing me through this chapter in my postgraduate journey. I am immensely grateful for His providence and love both in the joyful moments and discouraging setbacks in putting this paper together. My Lord and Redeemer in this life and the one to come, and a loving Father who generously gives good gifts to His children. To Him, whose power shines perfectly in all my weaknesses, be the glory forever and ever, Amen.

To my advisor Prof. Kenneth Tan, thank you for always believing in me even in moments where I doubted myself, and for your consistent support both in my work and as an academic mentor. Your genuine care and thoughtfulness for your students often goes beyond what most see, and for that I am deeply grateful.

To Prof. Norman Li, thank you for your valuable insights and encouragements in this project. I will cherish the sipping brainstorm sessions that were always laughter-filled yet profoundly thought-provoking. Thank you for making this research journey a fruitful and enjoyable one.

To all my friends and colleagues who have heard me speak of this project one too many times, I am grateful for your feedback, support, and friendship.

Thank you for helping me be better at what I do. I sincerely hope you will enjoy reading this paper as much as I did putting it together.

To Sherilyn, I truly appreciate your (costly) care and (persistent) encouragements through this journey, and more. It is simply much more than I could ever ask for. Thank you for your unwavering love, and I pray that we

may continue to support each other in life's challenges with God as our source of strength and hope.

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Introduction

How far will you go to impress a potential partner? How much is ‘*too much*’? These are typical questions we may ask ourselves when pursuing a new romantic interest, where it often feels like engaging in the world’s most nerve-wrecking balancing act of wanting to put our best foot forward while not coming across as too overbearing, or worse, desperate. Is there an optimal amount of effort one can put in to guarantee a successful date? For example, how much time and money should someone invest when courting a potential partner?

Even though individuals may differ in the extent to which they engage in romantic gestures when pursuing a romantic interest, most people would generally agree there should be a limit to which someone should go to please the other person. In other words, it appears possible to do “*too much*”. For example, it is not difficult to imagine that incessant displays of affection may tend to put off potential suitors or make them feel uncomfortable, especially when these romantic gestures are made prematurely in the early stages of courtship (e.g., saying “I love you” or offering to move in together with the other person on the first date). Interestingly however, there has been a recent rising trend in the mainstream media of individuals being termed as “simps”, who are recognized for engaging in *excessive* and *obsessive* romantic behaviors targeted at prospective partners, in the hopes of getting their attention or winning them over (Marcus & Bromwich, 2020; Zane & White, 2022). In fact, the word is commonly used derogatively to ridicule these individuals who expend immoderate amounts of effort in pursuing a romantic interest, yet are met with little success (Ward, 2021). Given the apparent distaste and displeasure of prospective partners from receiving these inordinate romantic

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

displays, this naturally leads to the question, who are “sims” and why do they persistently engage in these “simpling” behaviors whilst pursuing a potential romantic interest?

What are “Sims” and what constitutes “Simpling” behaviors?

Originating from the word “simpleton” (i.e., a foolish or gullible person), this involves a person engaging in extremely costly or extravagant romantic gestures that are targeted toward a specific person of interest, often in an overly desperate or obsessive manner, and generally being met with little to no reciprocation from the receiving party (Marcus & Bromwich, 2020; Ward, 2021). Moreover, sims generally appear to persist in these futile attempts despite being consistently rejected or neglected for their romantic efforts (Zane & White, 2022). As previously mentioned, sims are often ridiculed or regarded as foolish because not only do they remain fixated on the person of interest despite little success, but they are also readily willing to invest heavily in this person even though they have barely known them.

Regarding its typical usage in popular media, the top-voted entry on Urban Dictionary defines a simp as “someone who does way too much for a person they like”, while an article from the New York Times describes it as someone who expresses excessive sympathy and attention toward another person, with the intention of pursuing a romantic or sexual relationship (Marcus & Bromwich, 2020). The word has also gradually gained prevalence in the sphere of online gaming and streaming channels (e.g., Twitch, Patreon), where followers and supporters of attractive female personalities are termed “sims” for donating large sums of money in the futile hope of being acknowledged or noticed by these streamers (Bhatnagar, 2020). Other examples of typical

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

“simping” behaviors include spending exorbitant amounts of money on a romantic interest one barely knows, paying for their meals, and being overly caring and considerate.

Are Simps simply “nice guys” or stalkers?

Despite its prominence in the realm of popular culture, no empirical or qualitative work has been published on the topic of simps or simping behavior thus far, which renders this construct relatively unclear and difficult to conceptualize within the context of close relationships and mating behaviors. Indeed, even in mainstream media, people seem to express differing views with regards to what truly defines a simp. While some articles describe simping behaviors as encompassing being overly subservient and submissive to women (e.g., begging or groveling for attention, letting women exploit them, being overtly warm to gain favor of women etc.) (Hall, 2021), other authors suggest that, in certain contexts, conventional acts of kindness (e.g., lending a jacket to a partner who is feeling cold, answering an incoming phone call from a romantic interest etc.) could be perceived as simping as well (Zane & White, 2022).

Furthermore, the current media surrounding the topic of simps offers minimal, if not varied, portrayals on the typical archetype of a simp. Simps have been perceived to be nice guys who are generally kind and respectful (Hayward, 2022; Thompson, 2020), individuals of low self-worth (Hall, 2021) and confidence (Chancy, 2023), or even people who struggle with anxiety and loneliness (Tikvah Lake, 2022). Given the present challenge in defining simps and simping behaviors, the following section presents a brief exploration of past scholarly literature on mating behaviors and strategies to provide insight into

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

the similar and, more importantly, distinct manifestations between simping behaviors and typical romantic behaviors within close relationships.

On the surface, simps appear to share similar characteristics with “nice guys”, who make up a distinct category of individuals that are commonly recognized for their high levels of kindness, considerateness, and attentiveness (Urbaniak & Kilmann, 2003; 2006). Just as nice guys are often perceived to be warm, agreeable, and emotionally expressive (McDaniel, 2005), simps are similarly recognized for their high responsiveness and acts of kindness toward their romantic interests (e.g., giving compliments, holding the door open for someone etc.) (Ryu, 2021; Thompson, 2020). To the extent that elements of warmth and niceness are important determinants of one’s romantic success (Fletcher et al., 1999; Li et al., 2002; Valentine et al., 2020), “nice guys” and simps could possibly share similar strategies or behaviors in the domain of courtship and mate selection, particularly in terms of displaying their compassion and concern toward a target interest to promote greater romantic desirability. Nonetheless, it appears that simping behaviors seem to occur at exaggerated levels to the extent that these “romantic” gestures are perceived negatively and generally undesirable (Zane & White, 2022).

Simping behaviors also appear to resemble unwanted pursuit behaviors (UPB) (Dutton & Winstead, 2006; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000) and obsessive relational intrusion (ORI) behaviors (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000), broadly defined as persistent, undesired pursuit behaviors directed toward an individual whom which the actor is currently not involved in a consensual romantic relationship with. Typical obsessive acts include waiting outside one’s residence or workplace, sending unwanted gifts, and leaving frequent messages

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

on one's answering machine (Cupach & Spitzberg, 2000). Importantly, UPBs, ORI, and stalking behaviors (Davis et al., 2000) have been suggested to share common motivations of restoring a previously dissolved romantic relationship (or beginning a new one) via persistently harassing or threatening the target individual (Davis & Frieze, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2000), which appear to resemble elements of simping behaviors, especially in terms of the obsessive fixation on a romantic interest, and constantly pursuing the target individual despite their lack of reciprocation, or even rejection (Hall, 2021; Marcus & Bromwich, 2020).

From this brief review, it is suggested that simping behaviors exhibit distinct aspects of romantic pursuit that are unique to its own class of behaviors as compared alongside previously established mating behaviors and strategies, which possibly explains why it is recognized as a relatively novel phenomenon in the context of popular media today. In summary, simping behaviors appear to be most prominently characterized by elements of excessive and obsessive behavior toward a particular target of romantic interest, namely in exceeding conventional levels of warmth and kindness which deem these gestures desirable by others, whilst also embodying similar aspects of obsessiveness of UPBs that generally occur when pursuing a romantic interest.

Nonetheless, given the dearth of empirical research in this area, it is unclear whether simps and simping behaviors also encompass other important elements that are unique to this set of behaviors. Moreover, the current evidence from popular media tends to focus on the behaviors and tendencies of simps, while the question remains of what kind of individuals are likely to engage in this class of behaviors? In other words, what does a typical individual who

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

simps look like? Therefore, the current research aims to conceptualize and determine what are some discernable traits or characteristics that define a simp as well as simping behaviors?

Lastly, one article has highlighted the negative implications of simping behaviors, potentially being associated with lower self-esteem, depression, and greater vulnerability to financial and emotional exploitation (Chancy, 2023). The author also asserts that simping could eventually lead to substance abuse as sims attempt to deal with feelings of loneliness and other insecurities. Given the detrimental effects on individuals who simp, the current research would also be profitable in gaining deeper insight into the underlying motivations that these behaviors stem from.

Evolutionary Perspective on Mating Behaviors and Strategies

To better understand the distorted motivations behind the mating behaviors of sims, it would be fruitful to first consider the dynamics of typical mating goals and behaviors. Past research has pointed to the evolutionary perspective to explain why men and women engage in different types of mating strategies and courtship behaviors in the modern world (Buss & Schmitt, 2019; Tooby & Cosmides, 2015). Specifically, with regards to simping behaviors, where individuals engage in forms of costly romantic gestures in hopes of attaining sexual or relationship access, an evolutionary perspective offers possible explanations as to why individuals would resort to these behaviors in navigating this adaptive challenge.

A good starting point would be that men and women differ in their mate preferences and degree of selectiveness for mates. Based on parental investment theory (Trivers, 1972), men and women differ greatly in terms of their costs of

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

reproduction and the raising of offspring, with women generally bearing greater costs than men (Williams, 1975). As a result of this cost asymmetry, women are not only more selective of potential partners, but would also prefer partners exhibiting traits that indicate access to, or the ability to gather, important resources for theirs and their offspring's survival. Naturally, this explains why women generally prefer men of high social status as long-term mates, as this is often indicated that these men, who were in a higher relative position in the social hierarchy, had better access to resources and hence could provide better for their offspring (Buss, 1989; Symons, 1979). Research across both Eastern and Western cultures have shown that women consistently viewed a man's social status as a necessity, or preferred a partner who was at least above average in social status, as compared to other desirable traits like creativity or friendliness (Li et al., 2002, 2011, 2013; Thomas et al., 2020).

Considering these tenets within the domain of social exchanges in courtship, where women are the choosier sex and men's mate preferences are more uncompromisingly intertwined with female (sexual) access, women are generally perceived as the "gatekeepers" of relationships withholding the highly valued resource of sex from men, and having more power to shape and influence the relationship (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004; Ackerman et al. 2011). Because of greater female selectivity and selection pressure for males, men not only tend to be the initiators in romantic courtship (Clark et al., 1999; Laner & Ventrone, 1998), but they also need to be the compensators or negotiators for sexual access, for example in terms of providing financial resources or signaling genuine commitment, which are greatly valued by women. Put simply, within the context of the dating market, women represent the "suppliers" of sexual or

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

relationship access, while men are the “buyers” who exchange other benefits or resources for it. Indeed, Ackerman and colleagues (2011) found that men in relationships (as compared to women) generally tend to say “I love you” and confess their love for their partner first, as a possible function of expressing long-term commitment earlier on in the relationship. Saad & Gill (2003) also suggest that the act of gift-giving reflects a typical male courtship strategy, where they found that men often had more instrumental motives (e.g., making a good impression, displaying long-term interest) when giving gifts, as compared to women.

Importantly, these findings regarding sex differences in mating strategies and behaviors support the notion that men have possibly been adapted to engage in costly romantic initiation behaviors to signal their ability and willingness to invest in a potential relationship as a function of negotiating sexual or relationship access with women. Simping behaviors inherently resemble forms of these costly behaviors that possibly facilitate these mating goals. Specifically, we suggest that this costliness in simping behaviors generally translate into two main facets of excessiveness and obsessiveness.

Excessiveness & Obsessiveness of Simping Behavior

Despite the adaptive costliness of male mating behaviors, the increasing prevalence of simping behavior in the modern world still presents an evolutionary puzzle, where these costly behaviors appear to reach exorbitant levels despite sims consistently receiving little or no reciprocation for their romantic efforts. In other words, why do sims engage in romantic pursuit behaviors that incur immense costs and reap no benefits in the long run? Given that it would have been unlikely that the extreme excessiveness and

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

obsessiveness of simping behaviors would have been adaptive in the evolutionary past, we theorize that evolutionary mismatch (Li et al., 2018) could serve as a possible explanation to how these seemingly maladaptive behaviors would have manifested due to evolutionarily novel levels of intense intrasexual competition in the modern world.

Firstly, with regards to excessiveness, individuals were likely evolved to engage in forms of costly behaviors to signal one's sincere commitment or willingness to invest in a potential relationship. Indeed, from a costly signaling perspective (McAndrew, 2019), costly behaviors generally transmit honest signals and information about oneself (e.g., one's abundant resources), given that they are difficult to imitate or feign, potentially making one stand out more competitively as a superior mate. Therefore, these costly behaviors would have been advantageous amidst intrasexual competition to attract potential mates more effectively in the ancestral past. However, given the evolutionarily novel increase in intrasexual competition in the modern world, where individuals now compete for mates against an immensely greater number of equally attractive same-sex rivals (Yong et al., 2017), one's evolved psychological mechanisms assessing intrasexual competition, being unable to process the mismatched input of extremely high mate competition, consequently produces a maladaptive output of excessive simping behaviors that serve to overcompensate and outcompete the large number of rivals.

Secondly, simps appear to be inherently obsessive, or relentlessly persistent in pursuing a romantic interest. Past research has supported the possible adaptiveness of certain persistent pursuit behaviors, where degrees of persistence have been proven to be relatively effective in acquiring new mates

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

(Buss & Schmitt, 1993), including the repeated requesting for dates, and constantly sending gifts. Given the considerable cost in devoted time and resources these behaviors entail, they possibly serve as genuine signals that convey one's commitment and willingness to invest in the potential relationship. Duntley & Buss (2012) also speculated that one's uncompromising determination in spite of repeated rejections are perhaps indicative of their earnestness and emotional investment to start a relationship. In light of the greater intrasexual competition in the modern world, obsessive simping behaviors could follow a similar pathway that (overly) conveys one's costly commitment and investment toward the target individual.

In summary, the inherent excessiveness and obsessiveness of simping behaviors are likely driven by individuals' maladaptive response to the evolutionarily novel intrasexual competition of the modern world. Indeed, where one may fail to outcompete other intrasexual rivals on traits such as high social status, dominance, or physical attractiveness, simping could possibly serve as a compensatory strategy for one to signal (overly) costly commitment and investment in a potential relationship, with the hopes of remaining a fairly attractive and desirable mate. Given this, it is also expected that dispositional or contextual determinants that significantly influence one's perceived success for acquiring mates in this mating competition would likely motivate one's tendencies to engage in simping behaviors. In other words, one's objective or perceived possession of important preferred partner traits like physical attractiveness, social status, and overall mate value, should be associated with the likelihood one would engage in simping behaviors, given that they are generally tied to one's reproductive success (Buss & Schmitt, 1993). Therefore,

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

it is expected that simps, or individuals who tend to engage in simping behaviors would generally comprise men who are low in overall mate value, physical attractiveness, and social status, amongst other desirable partner traits.

The Current Research

The current study aims to explore the construct of simping behavior across two studies, to better understand its underlying traits and characteristics that encompass such behaviors. Specifically, the goal of Study 1 was to collect and nominate a broad range of descriptions regarding the behaviors and tendencies of simps. Following up in Study 2, an act-frequency design was employed to assess the relative frequency of these nominated acts occurring across typical simps. Finally, exploratory factor analyses were conducted to examine how these acts fit together. In summary, these studies would ideally provide a more definitive conceptualization of what comprises simps and simping behaviors, by generating a factor model comprising its unique facets, and highlighting how each facet correlates with the other facets.

Hypotheses & Predictions

Following the evolutionary premise for simps, it is expected that “simpling” or simping behaviors would generally be perceived as a set of behaviors or actions targeted toward a romantic interest that are excessive and obsessive in nature (**H1**). Additionally, with regards to the typical archetype of simps, or individuals who would engage in simping behaviors, it is expected that they would possess traits that are associated with their relative undesirability as a romantic partner or low mating success. This would include factors directly linked to one’s attractiveness as a mate, like self-perceived mate value and social status, as well as other contextual factors like one’s fear of

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

being single. Naturally, it is predicted that individuals who engage in simping behaviors to a greater degree are likely associated with traits like low physical attractiveness, social status, or overall mate value (**H2**).

Study 1

Study 1 comprised an act-nomination design (Buss & Craik, 1983) with the goal of generating a clear definition of how people typically perceive simps and simping behavior. Participants were presented with a list of free-response questions, where they were asked their opinions and perceptions on these behaviors. Subsequently, they also completed a pilot act-frequency questionnaire where they were presented with specific traits and behaviors and asked to rate how accurate each trait or behavior described simps.

Method

Participants

116 participants (59 men and 57 women) were recruited via the Connect Cloud Research online platform for this study. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 71 years ($M = 38.18$, $SD = 11.77$). Previous act nomination studies suggested that the procedure should ideally generate 100 distinct acts for the target construct to adequately cover the sample space of manifested acts in simping behaviors (Buss, 2021; Buss & Craik, 1983). Accounting for repeated and vague responses, the current sample size (with each participant contributing an average of 5-10 responses) was sufficient to generate a comprehensive list of distinct acts of simping behavior.

Materials and Procedure

The study was conducted via an online questionnaire. In the first section of the study, participants were provided with a definition to frame what a simp

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

may look like (e.g., *A “simp” is loosely defined as someone, typically male, who pursues a romantic interest in an excessive or obsessive manner, often not receiving any immediate reciprocation for their efforts.*). Following which, they were then instructed to list traits and characteristics that would typically describe simps or simping behaviors, based on their own opinions and experiences. Participants were given 5 minutes to provide as many responses as they could in this section.

In the subsequent section, participants were presented with a separate list of traits that typically described a simp or simping behaviors, where they were tasked to rate on a 7-point scale the extent to which they agreed each trait accurately characterized simps or simping behaviors (1 = *Strongly Disagree*, 7 = *Strongly Agree*). The list was compiled by the principal investigator as an exploratory pilot study, mainly based on the PI’s anecdotal experiences and informal discussions with friends and colleagues regarding perceptions of simping behaviors. Examples of these traits included “exploitative of others”, “popular/well-liked by the opposite sex”, and “narcissistic”, amongst other items (Refer to Appendix A for the full list of traits used in Study 1). After which, participants were debriefed and remunerated with USD\$1 after completing the study.

Results

After collecting the participant responses, a preliminary list was first created by removing redundancies from each response and extracting specific descriptions or traits (e.g., responses like “*simps are not assertive and feel threatened by others’ achievements and accomplishments*” were reorganized into two separate entries of “*not assertive*” and “*feel[s] threatened by others’*”

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

achievements and accomplishments”). Repeated descriptions nominated between participants were removed from the list. Following this, the principal investigator and two other research assistants worked independently to categorize each distinct act or description of a simp, where similar acts and descriptions were grouped together into a category that best represented the underlying characteristic or behavior relating to simps (e.g., responses like “*worshipping a significant other*” and “*putting a woman on a pedestal*” were grouped into the category of “*idolizing a partner*”). Finally, following a similar classification procedure from Bleske & Buss (2000), the principal investigator and the two research assistants then compared their respective lists to validate the extent of agreement and similarity between the lists for each categorized descriptions and the final list of categories generated. A description or act was retained in its category if two out of the three judges agreed on its fit within the category. Additionally, categories that were evaluated as similar were also combined (e.g., “*low self-worth*” and “*low self-esteem*” were combined into a single category of “*low self-esteem*”).

A final list of 71 unique categories describing characteristics and behaviors typical of simps was generated from this nomination process, including being desperate for attention, being perceived as a generally undesirable mate, exhibiting low levels of social dominance, and having poor social skills (refer to Appendix B for full list of categories). Importantly, the nomination process also highlighted three distinct categories that resembled traits of excessiveness (i.e., excessive affection and care, excessive spending, and an excessive sexual desire) and three categories resembling traits of obsessiveness (i.e., obsessive and fixated [on a partner], idolizing a

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

partner/romantic interest, and being defensive of a romantic interest). The former categories on excessiveness comprised items such as “*spend[ing] money they don't have on women that don't want them*” and “*bends over backwards for their love interest*”, while the latter category on obsessiveness comprised items such as “*fixated on the other person to the exclusion of everyone else*” and “*unhealthily obsessed with a person who does not care about them*”.

Additionally, the pilot act-frequency questionnaire revealed that the top three traits that were rated as most accurate in describing simps are “desperate” ($M = 6.24$), “excessive” ($M = 5.87$), and “submissive” ($M = 5.73$). Evidently, the emergence of these categories appears to provide preliminary support for the predictions on the typical characteristics of simps and simping behavior, where simps are likely perceived to exhibit excessive and obsessive behaviors toward their romantic interests.

Moreover, several categories pertaining to the mate value and mating success of simps also emerged in the nomination procedure. Specifically, simps were not only perceived to be typically low in mate value (items include “*disgusting human beings*” and “*typically losers*”), but also physically unattractive, being low in confidence, social dominance, and being inexperienced with women (i.e., “*not very good at picking up women*” and “*do not know how to go about pursuing a relationship in a normal manner*”). Given this, the current study provides initial evidence for the predictions regarding the mate value of simps, where simps are expected to be perceived as relatively undesirable as mates and have relatively low mating success.

Study 2

Following the open-response act nomination design from the previous study that served to generate a comprehensive list of nominated acts and descriptions encompassing simping behaviors, Study 2 aims to supplement these qualitative findings via a quantitative approach. Specifically, the current study followed an act-frequency design (Buss & Craik, 1983), where participants were instructed to rate the extent to which the list of categories generated from the previous study accurately characterized a simp or simping behaviors. Following which, a factor analysis was conducted to extract the underlying components that constitute simping behaviors. Essentially, the act frequency design paired with the factor analysis serve to determine the factor structure of a “simp”, highlighting the various unique characteristics that are perceived to be prototypical of sims and simping behaviors.

To determine the most appropriate number of factors to extract, the maximum likelihood (ML) extraction method was employed. Considering the exploratory premise of the current work on sims, which crucially lacks prior empirical support for an established factor model, ML presents itself as an efficient extraction method to systematically analyse and compare the relative model fits between two models with different number of factors (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). Specifically, ML allows for researchers to determine if there would be a significant improvement in model fit when additional factors are considered in the overall model. Additionally, although we only initially hypothesized that sims would likely exhibit aspects of excessive and obsessive behaviors, we were also interested to examine other distinct characteristics or traits that were prevalent amongst sims, as preliminarily captured within the

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

qualitative responses of the act nomination (Study 1). Therefore, we investigated multiple factor solutions as well, with the goal of capturing other unique traits of simps in the current analyses, apart from their excessive/obsessive behaviors.

Method

Participants

A new group of 299 participants (151 men and 147 women; one participant did not indicate their gender) was recruited via the Connect Cloud Research online platform for this study. The age of the participants ranged from 18 to 77 years ($M = 39.17$, $SD = 11.79$). When considering the appropriate sample size to achieve adequate statistical power for an exploratory factor analysis, previous work have suggested that larger sample sizes are generally better for more stable factor loadings and greater generalisability of results (Boateng et al., 2018), with a sample of 200-300 participants being a fair estimate (Comrey & Lee, 1992; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). Therefore, the collected sample size was deemed appropriate for the present study.

Materials and Procedure

Similar to the previous study, the current study was conducted via an online questionnaire. Participants were presented with a list containing the 71 distinct categories describing simps or simping behaviors, as generated from Study 1. They were then instructed to rate on a 7-point scale how accurately each category described simps or simping behavior, where a rating of “1” on the scale indicated that the category was a poor descriptor of simps or simping behavior while a rating of “7” indicated that the category was a good descriptor

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

of simps or simping behavior. After which, participants were debriefed and remunerated with USD\$1 after completing the study.

Results

Exploratory Factor Analysis

Initial analyses. Descriptive statistics of the study items can be found in Table 1. Based on initial analyses, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy (KMO-MSA) was 0.90, indicating that the data was appropriate for factor analysis as there was sufficient common variance across items ($MSA >.05$) (Dziuban & Shirkey, 1974; Kaiser, 1974). Additionally, Bartlett's test of sphericity was also significant ($p <.001$). Subsequently, after examining the squared multiple correlations (SMC) of all 71 items, one item ("*a simp is someone who is avoidant*") was dropped due to having a low SMC ($<.300$) (Beavers et al., 2013), suggesting it correlated weakly with the rest of the items.

Factor extraction, rotation, and interpretation. The ML extraction method was employed, and all solutions were promax (oblique) rotated. Items with low factor loading ($<.400$) and substantial cross-loading ($>.300$) were removed for each solution (Howard, 2016; Peterson, 2000).

Firstly, a 1-factor solution was extracted, with 31 items loading onto the main factor. However, the factor solution exhibited a poor model fit (RMSEA = 0.086) and was relatively uninterpretable with the items appearing to reflect a broad array of traits encompassing relative undesirability as a mate (e.g., having "low social skills" and being "inexperienced with women" as the two items with the highest loadings).

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Subsequently, a 2-factor solution that was extracted exhibited an improved model fit (RMSEA = 0.067), with 30 items loaded onto the first factor and 19 items loaded onto the second factor. Notably, the first factor resembled that of the undesirability factor from the 1-factor solution, while the new second factor appeared to encompass degrees of warmth and authenticity (e.g., being “warm/sensitive toward a romantic interest” and being “gentle” as the two items with the highest loadings). Following which, a 3-factor solution was extracted, with 30 items loaded onto the first factor, 11 items loaded onto the second factor, and 5 items loaded onto the third factor. This solution exhibited a further (albeit marginal) improvement in model fit (RMSEA = 0.056). Interestingly, while the first factor resembled that of the previous 1- and 2-factor solutions (i.e., undesirability), the second factor appeared to differ from that of the previous solution, instead containing items that encompassed aspects of simps being exploitative and having a superiority complex (e.g., being “manipulative”, “narcissistic”, “entitled”, and “sexist” were the four items with the highest loadings). The third factor contained items that appeared to encompass degrees of competency and efficaciousness. Items on this factor included being “wealthy” and “highly intelligent”, while also including items like being “carefree”, "optimistic" and “authentic”.

Despite this, the large number of items clustered in the first factor for the previous factor solutions still rendered it relatively uninterpretable given the convoluted mixture of predisposed traits and actual behaviors of simps. Therefore, a 4-factor solution was considered. This new solution found 16 items loaded onto the first factor, 9 items loaded onto the second factor, 9 items loaded onto the third factor, and 5 items loaded onto the fourth factor. Notably, the 4-

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

factor solution also exhibited relative improvement in goodness-of-model fit, with an RMSEA of 0.047 suggesting a close fit (Fabrigar & Wegener, 2012). Upon closer inspection of the overall factor structure and their respective item loadings, the 3 factors found in the previous solution similarly emerged (Undesirability, Exploitative/Superiority Complex, and Competent/Efficacious emerged as Factors 1, 2 and 4 respectively.). Importantly, when interpreting the new factor (Factor 3), it contained items such as “idolises their partner or romantic interest”, “displays excessive affection and care”, and “spends excessive amounts of money on a romantic interest”, all of which appear to generally encompass elements of excessive and obsessive behaviors in line with our predictions. Finally, a 5-factor solution was extracted but insufficient (i.e., less than 3) items loaded onto the fifth factor, thus the solution was not considered. Therefore, it was concluded that the 4-factor model was the most appropriate solution, given that it exhibited relative goodness of model fit and clear, interpretable factors, as compared to all tested solutions.

The final 4-factor solution and corresponding factor loadings of each item across the four factors together with the factor correlation matrix are presented in Tables 2 and 3 respectively. In summary, the items accounted for total variance of 42.73% in the 4-factor solution, with three out of the four factors exhibiting high inter-item reliability. The four factors were named accordingly: Undesirability/Low Mate Value (Factor 1, accounting for 23.67% of the variance, 16 items, $\alpha = 0.92$), Exploitative/Superiority Complex (Factor 2, accounting for 9.39% of the variance, 9 items, $\alpha = 0.86$), Obsessive/Excessive Behaviors (Factor 3, accounting for 5.69% of the variance, 9 items, $\alpha = 0.81$) and Competent/Efficacious (Factor 4, accounting for 3.98% of the variance, 5

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

items, $\alpha = 0.63$). The factor analysis also highlighted that some of these factors are moderately correlated with each other ($|r|$ ranging from .06 to .48). Specifically, it was found that Factors 1, 2 and 3 were positively related to each other, and these factors were negatively related to Factor 4. Overall, from these findings, it suggests that people generally perceive simps to be individuals characterised by their general undesirability as a romantic partner (or low mate value), displaying aspects of being exploitative, engaging in obsessive and excessive behaviors, whilst possessing some degree of self-efficacy and competence. Moreover, to the extent that individuals perceive simps as being undesirable partners, exploitative, excessive, and obsessive, they also would view simps as being less competent and efficacious.

General Discussion

The present set of studies serves to establish a concrete definition of a simp in today's context, particularly in terms of the typical characteristics surrounding simps, and also the manifestations of their simping behaviors. Specifically, in line with our predictions, it was found that simps were generally perceived to be individuals who engage in forms of excessive and obsessive behaviors targeted toward the pursuit of a romantic interest. Moreover, initial predictions regarding the perception of the relative undesirability of simps as romantic partners were also confirmed, in terms of simps having traits encompassing low overall mate value and attractiveness. Considering that one's low mate value and undesirability as a romantic partner surfaced as a defining factor of simps, it is suggested that these individuals may be engaging in significantly greater levels of simping behaviors as compared to individuals

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

higher in romantic desirability, as confirmed by the positive association between the factors on undesirability and obsessive & excessive behaviors.

Importantly, this also provides initial evidence for the evolutionary mismatch perspective on simping behaviors, where a majority of individuals engaging in these simping behaviors are likely to be of lower mate value (and perceive themselves to lose out in the intrasexual competition for mates), possibly engaging in these costly behaviors in a compensatory manner to outcompete same-sex rivals in the mating market. Especially in an environment with (perceived) intense mating competition, engaging in overtly costly behaviors could be one's "last-ditch" effort in increasing their relative desirability and thus secure a mate, albeit being detrimental to oneself in the short run (i.e., over-investing resources or not receiving immediate reciprocation from target).

Overall, the current findings from the two studies provide preliminary empirical support for our conceptual definition of simping behaviors, as well as the predicted motivations behind it. Nonetheless, given the correlational nature of the current findings, additional work must be conducted with individuals who actually engage in these behaviors in real-world romantic contexts to confirm if they are indeed of lower mate value. Future research could also consider experimentally manipulating perceived contexts of mate competition across individuals (i.e., salience of sex ratio imbalances, number of proximal intrasexual rivals etc.) to determine if simping behavior is a response to perceived fluctuations in intrasexual competition (Weir et al., 2011).

Distinction between Excessiveness & Obsessiveness

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

It is worthwhile to note that, even though elements of Excessiveness and Obsessiveness were initially postulated as two distinct facets of simping behaviors, the final factor model revealed that these two aspects were collated into a single factor (Factor 3). These findings possibly suggest that people may perceive simping behaviors as a general compilation of behaviors that greatly exceed conventional levels of affection or care in romantic courtship, as opposed to a clear distinction between excessiveness and obsessiveness. For example, individuals may view sims as simply being *overly* extravagant in giving gifts (excessiveness) and *overly* fixated on a romantic interest (obsessiveness), as compared to the average person. While both these acts could be said to be distinct behaviors, they are not necessarily mutually exclusive in contributing to one's perception of a simp doing "too much" for a romantic interest. Future research could involve more intricate investigations on specific simping behaviors to determine if this distinction between excessiveness and obsessiveness is an accurate dimension of how individuals perceive simping behaviors in the real world.

Exploitativeness & Efficacy of Sims

Beyond our expected findings, the current work also revealed that sims are generally perceived as being exploitative and having superiority complexes, which appears contrary to their portrayal in popular media of sims being warm and kind individuals (Linde, 2023). These findings offer valuable insight into the underlying motivations of sims and simping behaviors, who possibly engage in these excessive pursuit behaviors under the guise of "acts of kindness" as a means of attaining relationship or sexual access from a potential partner. It is certainly interesting that people's perceptions of sims also

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

highlighted their ability to discern the apparent inauthenticity of these simping behaviors, which could suggest why prospective targets of simps generally find their advances undesirable and uncomfortable (Zane & White, 2022), given their exploitative nature. Future work could potentially examine specific aspects or cues present in excessive and obsessive simping behaviors that inherently highlight the ulterior motives of simps, as compared to typical relationship-initiation behaviors of an individual in a romantic context. Further research in this area would serve to better distinguish the conceptual differences between simping behaviors and genuine relationship pursuit behaviors.

Lastly, another unexpected finding was the fourth factor in the final model, which highlighted that simps were efficacious individuals who had access to substantial resources. Some of the items within the factor included “wealthy”, “old” and “highly intelligent”, which could possibly be associated with one’s social status, namely one’s wealth and older age (Cameron et al., 1977; Kenrick & Keefe, 1992). Evidently, these results are contrary to our initial predictions of simps being low in social status. A possible explanation for this could be, by considering simping behaviors from a resource perspective, perhaps the individual first needs to have substantial resources to effectively “simp” and engage in (financially) excessive behaviors. For example, a simp would require a sizeable income to constantly shower a romantic interest with luxurious gifts and expensive meals, and this would likely be characteristic of an individual of relatively high social status (e.g., high-paying respectable job).

Nonetheless, it is important to note that this factor on efficacy and competence was negatively associated with the other three factors, suggesting that simps are generally perceived to be of lower social status and less wealthy

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

whilst being undesirable romantic partners who are also exploitative, excessive, and obsessive.

Alternative Explanation: “Nice guy” Simps vs. “Bad boy” Simps & “Rich man” Simps

Apart from the offered explanations thus far, the factors on exploitativeness and efficacy of simps in the 4-factor model appear to not only be unexpected, but arguably contradictory to our initial predictions on the characteristics of the simp archetype, which typically resembles a “nice” guy high in warmth and compassion (Urbaniak & Kilmann, 2006; Zane & White, 2022). With regards to the Exploitativeness factor (Factor 2), although a simp may come across as inauthentic as he engages in excessive displays of warmth and kindness, it is difficult to imagine this same person as also being highly manipulative, narcissistic, sexist, and aggressive. In fact, these items in the Exploitative factor appear to be more characteristic of individuals high on traits of the Dark Triad (Paulhus & Williams, 2002), which generally encompass elements of low empathy (Larson & Buss, 2006) and prosociality, high exploitativeness and individualism (Jonason et al., 2009; 2010).

Considering the stark contrast between these two facets of excessiveness and exploitativeness within the construct of simping, an alternative explanation for the present findings is that there could exist multiple “subtypes” of simps, each of which engage in similar but unique classes of simping behaviors. In other words, while there are simps who are distinctly high in excessive and obsessive behaviors which come across as warm and genuine (i.e., “nice guy” simps), there could also be simps who are distinctly high in exploitative tendencies when pursuing a romantic interest (i.e., “bad boy” simps). Indeed, a

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

recent study conducted on love bombing highlighted that narcissistic individuals are more likely to engage in excessive flattery and communication to secure the approval of a target interest and increase their relative importance in their lives, in hopes of the target reciprocating the affirmation and reliance on the love bomber (Strutzenberg et al., 2017). Given its resemblance to the excessive aspects of simping behaviors, it is possible that certain simps could similarly be using these strategies to exploit and take emotional advantage of their targets.

Additionally, with regards to the Efficacy factor (Factor 4) that comprised items relating to a simp's social status and available resources, this facet could possibly be describing another class of simps, namely individuals who are older and wealthier men (i.e., "rich man" simps). As previously acknowledged, certain simping behaviors would require individuals to have substantial amount of money available to spend on their target interest. Therefore, just as the typical "nice guy" simp engages in excessive flattery and affection to win his target over, the "rich man" simp could represent a distinct type of simp that is able to capitalise on their abundant resources to spend exorbitantly on their romantic interests. Possible archetypes that fit this subtype of simps could be Sugar Daddies, whose behaviors appear to be inherently "simpy" in nature (e.g., giving monthly allowances in exchange for a girl's company, paying for their college tuition) (Upadhyay, 2021). Unsurprisingly, Sugar Daddies are often older men of high status who have considerable amounts resources to spend on these women (DeSoto, 2018; Motyl, 2012), which is in line with our findings for simps in Factor 4. Moreover, the negative association between Factor 4 and the other three factors could also suggest that

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

this distinct type of “rich man” simps are perceived to be more desirable mates, and not as (uncomfortably) excessive and obsessive as the typical “nice guy” simps.

Overall, the present findings highlight the possibility of various unique subtypes of simps. Future streams of research exploring this topic could investigate the manifestations of these specific facets in simping behavior, and determine how they correlate with one another across different simps. It would also be profitable to examine if a simp from one subtype may switch strategies to another subtype in specific mating contexts, or if there are any cultural differences in the prevalence of each subtype of simps.

Negative Implications of Simping Behaviors

Although not the main aim of the current research, the final 4-factor solution provided preliminary evidence for the negative effects associated with simps and simping behaviors. Specifically, under Factor 1 it was found that simps tend to be individuals who are insecure, having low self-esteem, and lacking self-identity, all of which are generally related to poorer well-being outcomes (Lavy & Littman-Ovadia, 2011; Paradise & Kernis, 2002; Suh, 2002). Additionally, apart from the excessive and obsessive tendencies, when considering that simps are likely to be exploitative and narcissistic individuals (Factor 2), the romantic relationships they enter (if they succeed) would potentially be adversely affected as well. Past research has suggested that individuals high on Dark Triad traits engage in more destructive relationship behaviors (Jones & Weiser, 2014; Rasmussen & Boon, 2014), with partners within these relationships also experiencing poorer satisfaction (Smith et al., 2014). Evidently, the present findings highlight significant actor-partner

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

ramifications of simping behaviors beyond what makes it a playful “pop culture” slang, especially as it becomes more prevalent today. Future research could focus efforts on designing interventions that target the underlying insecurities and self-concept related issues of simps to determine if they alleviate the frequency and adverse effects of these potentially damaging behaviors.

Limitations & Future Directions

Nonetheless, the current work presents a few limitations and unaddressed questions. Firstly, with regards to the romantic context of simping behaviors, the underlying assumption of simps thus far is that they are generally single and in pursuit of a romantic interest. However, from the operationalized definition of a simp to be an individual engaging in obsessive or excessive romantic behavior, it can be postulated that this perception would likely be applicable to both single and coupled individuals, to the extent that one can be regarded to be acting overly excessive or obsessive toward the target individual, or in other words, doing “*too much*” for a romantic interest or for a romantic partner. Therefore, it would be fruitful to examine how these tendencies of excessiveness and obsessiveness may be differentially surface in both single and coupled individuals.

Secondly, the evolutionary premise underlying simping behaviors suggest that it is derived from the adaptiveness of conventional heterosexual behavior of male individuals in the ancestral past, and hence the current work is unable to provide conclusive explanations of simping behaviors in females. Based on sex differences in mating strategies established previously, females appear to engage in more selective (as opposed to overt pursuit) behaviors so as

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

to avoid costly mistakes in choosing a mate (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004; Clark et al., 1999; Trivers, 1972). Interestingly, although the term is almost exclusively used in mainstream media to describe males that engage in these extravagant behaviors, some articles have acknowledged its gradual use on women as well (Hall, 2021; Thompson, 2020; Ward, 2021) to describe their obsessive fixation on specific romantic interests. Future work could examine the prevalence of the term usage within female courtship behaviors, whilst also investigating if there are specific manifestations of simping acts that are unique to these women pursuing men, as compared to male simps.

Given that the construct of a simp still stands as a fairly understudied phenomenon, future researchers could continue working toward further refining and developing its definition to establish how it is associated with other similar constructs. For example, there has been a viral internet trend in recent years of individuals being labelled “simps” for simply displaying normal acts of kindness or courtesy to women (SimpNation; Zane & White, 2022), highlighting that people often conflate the definition of a simp and simply being a nice person. Many articles also suggest that simps tend to be submissive and passive (Chancy, 2023; Thompson, 2020), although this may only be specifically targeted toward a romantic interest (Hall, 2021; Tikvah Lake, 2022; Zane & White, 2022). Future work could examine the unique predictive validity of simping behavior over and above constructs like niceness or agreeableness to see how individuals differentially perceive it, and how the phenomenon may manifest across different individuals and targets of simping behaviors.

Finally, an important question to be asked in light of the evolutionary mystery of simping behaviors is, are these behaviors actually effective? In other

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

words, does engaging in more simping behaviors lead to greater success in acquiring mates? On the surface, although simping behaviors appear relatively costly, they may still prove to be adaptive if they are able to secure a certain degree of reproductive fitness in the long run. For example, simping for a potential partner that is markedly higher in mate value (e.g., exceptional genes, abundance of financial resources) may prove worthwhile in the long run if one is able to eventually form a relationship with this target individual, and hence reap these considerable benefits. Future research could examine the different contexts that simping behaviors may be more viable, if any.

References

- Ackerman, J. M., Griskevicius, V., & Li, N. P. (2011). Let's get serious: Communicating commitment in romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(6), 1079–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022412>
- Baumeister, R. F., & Vohs, K. D. (2004). Sexual Economics: Sex as Female Resource for Social Exchange in Heterosexual Interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 8*(4), 339–363. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0804_2
- Beavers, A. S., Lounsbury, J. W., Richards, J. K., Huck, S. W., Skolits, G. J., & Esquivel, S. L. (2013). Practical considerations for using exploratory factor analysis in educational research. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation, 18*(1), 6.
- Bhatnagar, R. (2020). *Men answer to why they 'simp' over streamers online, and it's heartbreaking*. Sportskeeda. Retrieved from <https://www.sportskeeda.com/esports/men-answer-simp-streamers-online-heartbreaking-ft-pokimane-amouranth>
- Boateng, G. O., Neilands, T. B., Frongillo, E. A., Melgar-Quiñonez, H. R., & Young, S. L. (2018). Best Practices for Developing and Validating Scales for Health, Social, and Behavioral Research: A Primer. *Frontiers in public health, 6*, 149. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpubh.2018.00149>
- Bleske, A. L., & Buss, D. M. (2000). Can men and women be just friends? *Personal Relationships, 7*(2), 131–151. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1475-6811.2000.tb00008.x>

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- Buss, D. M. (2021). Act Nomination Method. In: Shackelford, T.K., Weekes-Shackelford, V.A. (eds) *Encyclopedia of Evolutionary Psychological Science*. Springer, Cham. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-19650-3_1862
- 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>
- Buss, D. M., & Schmitt, D. P. (1993). Sexual strategies theory: An evolutionary perspective on human mating. *Psychological Review*, 100, 204–232.
- Buss, D. (1989). Sex differences in human mate preferences: Evolutionary hypotheses tested in 37 cultures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 12(1), 1-14. doi:10.1017/S0140525X00023992
- Buss, D. M., & Craik, K. H. (1983). The act frequency approach to personality. *Psychological Review*, 90(2), 105–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.90.2.105>
- Cameron, C., Oskamp, S., & Sparks, W. (1977). Courtship American style: Newspaper ads. *The Family Coordinator*, 26(1), 27–30. <https://doi.org/10.2307/581857>
- Chancy, G. (2023). *Simping Demystified: What it is and why it matters*. ALANA Recovery Centers. <https://www.alanarecovery.com/simping-demystified-what-it-is-and-why-it-matters>
- Clark, C. L., Shaver, P. R., & Abrahams, M. F. (1999). Strategic behaviors in romantic relationship initiation. *Personality and Social Psychology*

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Bulletin, 25(6), 707–

720. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167299025006006>

Comrey, A. L., & Lee, H. B. (1992). Interpretation and application of factor analytic results. *Comrey AL, Lee HB. A first course in factor analysis*, 2, 1992.

Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2000). Obsessive relational intrusion: Incidence, perceived severity and coping. *Violence and Victims*, 15(4), 357–372.

Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2002). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and break-up context. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 237–264). Springer Publishing Company.

Davis, K. E., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Research on stalking: What do we know and where do we go? *Violence and Victims*, 15(4), 473–487. <https://doi.org/10.1891/0886-6708.15.4.473>

DeSoto, M. (2018). A content analysis of sugar dating websites. *Unpublished Master's thesis, California State University, Sacramento.*

Duntley, J. D., & Buss, D. M. (2012). The evolution of stalking. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 66(5-6), 311–327. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-010-9832-0>

Dutton, L. B., Winstead, B. A., & Mongeau, P. (Ed.). (2006). Predicting unwanted pursuit: Attachment, relationship satisfaction, relationship alternatives, and break-up distress. *Journal of Social and Personal*

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Relationships, 23(4), 565–

586. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407506065984>

Dziuban, C. D., & Shirkey, E. C. (1974). When is a correlation matrix appropriate for factor analysis? Some decision rules. *Psychological Bulletin*, 81(6), 358–361. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0036316>

Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). Exploratory factor analysis. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Fletcher, G. J. O., Simpson, J. A., Thomas, G., & Giles, L. (1999). Ideals in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(1), 72–89. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.1.72>

Hall, N. (2021). What is a Simp? The True Simp Meaning Explained. Man of Many. <https://manofmany.com/lifestyle/what-is-a-simp>

Hayward, J. (2022). Let's Talk About Being Called a "Simp" as an Insult to Men. Medium. <https://medium.com/modernidentities/lets-talk-about-being-called-a-simp-as-an-insult-to-men-b5dc80b2e02c>

Howard, M. C. (2016). A review of exploratory factor analysis decisions and overview of current practices: What we are doing and how can we improve? *International Journal of Human-Computer Interaction*, 32(1), 51–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10447318.2015.1087664>

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., & Teicher, E. A. (2010). Who is James Bond?: The Dark Triad as an agentic social style. *Individual Differences Research*, 8(2), 111–120.

Jonason, P. K., Li, N. P., Webster, G. D., & Schmitt, D. P. (2009). The dark triad: Facilitating a short-term mating strategy in men. *European Journal of Personality*, 23(1), 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.698>

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- Jones, D. N., & Weiser, D. A. (2014). Differential infidelity patterns among the Dark Triad. *Personality and Individual Differences, 57*, 20–24. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.09.007>
- Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*(1), 31–36. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02291575>
- Kenrick, D. T., & Keefe, R. C. (1992). Age preferences in mates reflect sex differences in human reproductive strategies. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 15*(1), 75–133. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X00067595>
- Laner, M. R., & Ventrone, N. A. (1998). Egalitarian daters/traditionalist dates. *Journal of Family Issues, 19*(4), 468–477. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251398019004005>
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohlin, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 212–236). Springer Publishing Company.
- Larson, R., & Buss, D. M. (2006). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Lavy, S., & Littman-Ovadia, H. (2011). All you need is love? Strengths mediate the negative associations between attachment orientations and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences, 50*(7), 1050–1055. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.01.023>
- Li, N. P., van Vugt, M., & Colarelli, S. M. (2018). The evolutionary mismatch hypothesis: Implications for psychological science. *Current Directions*

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

in Psychological Science, 27(1), 38–

44. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721417731378>

Li, N. P., Yong, J. C., Tov, W., Sng, O., Fletcher, G. J. O., Valentine, K. A., Jiang, Y. F., & Balliet, D. (2013). Mate preferences do predict attraction and choices in the early stages of mate selection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(5), 757–

776. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0033777>

Li, N. P., Valentine, K. A., & Patel, L. (2011). Mate preferences in the US and Singapore: A cross-cultural test of the mate preference priority

model. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 50(2), 291–

294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.10.005>

Li, N. P., Bailey, J. M., Kenrick, D. T., & Linsenmeier, J. A. W. (2002). The necessities and luxuries of mate preferences: Testing the tradeoffs. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 947–

955. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.947>

Linde, A. (2023). What is a Simp? the Simp Meaning and Definition Explained. The Trend Spotter. <https://www.thetrendspotter.net/what-is-a-simp/>

Marcus, E., & Bromwich, J. E. (2020). *A short history of 'simp'*. The New York Times. Retrieved from

<https://www.nytimes.com/2020/07/07/style/simp-history-slang.html>

McAndrew, F. T. (2019). Costly signaling theory. In Encyclopedia of evolutionary psychological science, eds. Shackelford, T. and Weekes-Shackelford, V. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.

https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-16999-6_3483-1

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- McDaniel, A. K. (2005). Young women's dating behavior: Why/why not date a nice guy? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 53(5-6), 347–359. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-005-6758-z>
- Motyl, J. (2012). Trading sex for college tuition: How sugar daddy dating sites may be sugar coating prostitution. *Penn St. L. Rev.*, 117, 927.
- Paradise, A. W., & Kernis, M. H. (2002). Self-esteem and psychological well-being: Implications of fragile self-esteem. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 21(4), 345–361. <https://doi.org/10.1521/jscp.21.4.345.22598>
- Paulhus, D. L., & Williams, K. M. (2002). The Dark Triad of personality: Narcissism, Machiavellianism and psychopathy. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 36(6), 556–563. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566\(02\)00505-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(02)00505-6)
- Peterson, R. A. (2000). A Meta-Analysis of Variance Accounted for and Factor Loadings in Exploratory Factor Analysis. *Marketing Letters*, 11(3), 261–275. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40239882>
- Rasmussen, K. R., & Boon, S. D. (2014). Romantic revenge and the dark triad: A model of impellance and inhibition. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 56, 51–56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2013.08.018>
- Saad, G., & Gill, T. (2003). An Evolutionary Psychology Perspective on Gift Giving among Young Adults. *Psychology & Marketing*, 20(9), 765–784. <https://doi.org/10.1002/mar.10096>
- Smith, C. V., Hadden, B. W., Webster, G. D., Jonason, P. K., Gesselman, A. N., & Crysel, L. C. (2014). Mutually attracted or repulsed? Actor–partner interdependence models of Dark Triad traits and relationship

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- outcomes. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 67, 35–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2014.01.044>
- Strutzenberg, C. C., Wiersma-Mosley, J. D., Jozkowski, K. N., & Becnel, J. N. (2017). Love-bombing: a narcissistic approach to relationship formation. *Discovery: The Student Journal of Dale Bumpers College of Agricultural, Food and Life Sciences*-Volume 18 2017, 81.
- Suh, E. M. (2002). Culture, identity consistency, and subjective well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), 1378–1391. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1378>
- Symons, D. (1979). The evolution of human sexuality.
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using Multivariate Statistics* (6th ed.). Boston, MA: Pearson.
- Thomas, A. G., Jonason, P. K., Blackburn, J. D., Kennair, L. E. O., Lowe, R., Malouff, J., Stewart-Williams, S., Sulikowski, D., & Li, N. P. (2020). Mate preference priorities in the East and West: A cross-cultural test of the mate preference priority model. *Journal of Personality*, 88(3), 606–620. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jopy.12514>
- Thompson, D. (2020). What is a simp? Everything you need to know about 2020's strangest slang term. Yahoo! News. <https://sg.news.yahoo.com/simp-everything-know-2020-strangest-133335730.html>
- Tikvah Lake. (2022, February 23). What is meant by the term “simp” or “simpling”? Tikvah Lake Florida. <https://www.tikvahlake.com/blog/simp-or-simpling/>

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- Tooby, J. and Cosmides, L. (2015). Conceptual Foundations of Evolutionary Psychology. In *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, D.M. Buss (Ed.). <https://doi.org/10.1002/9780470939376.ch1>
- Trivers, R. L. (1972). Parental investment and sexual selection. In: Campbell B (ed) *Sexual selection and the descent of man 1871-1971*. Aldine, Chicago, pp 136.179
- 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>
- Urbaniak, G. C., & Kilmann, P. R. (2006). Niceness and dating success: A further test of the nice guy stereotype. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 55(3-4), 209–224. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-006-9075-2>
- Urbaniak, G. C., & Kilmann, P. R. (2003). Physical Attractiveness and the "Nice Guy Paradox": Do Nice Guys Really Finish Last? *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 49(9-10), 413–426. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1025894203368>
- Valentine, K. A., Li, N. P., Meltzer, A. L., & Tsai, M.-H. (2020). Mate preferences for warmth-trustworthiness predict romantic attraction in the early stages of mate selection and satisfaction in ongoing relationships. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 46(2), 298–311. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167219855048>
- Ward, T. (2021). The new slang teens use to insult boys who are “too nice” to girls. CNN. <https://edition.cnn.com/2021/02/19/health/what-is-simp-teen-slang-wellness/index.html>

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

- Weir, L. K., Grant, J. W., & Hutchings, J. A. (2011). The influence of operational sex ratio on the intensity of competition for mates. *The American naturalist*, 177(2), 167–176. <https://doi.org/10.1086/657918>
- Williams, G.C. (1975). *Sex and Evolution*. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press.
- Wu, K., Chen, C., & Greenberger, E. (2019). Nice guys and gals can finish first: Personality and speed-dating success among Asian Americans. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(8), 2507–2527. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0265407518790103>
- Yong, J. C., Li, N. P., Valentine, K. A., & Smith, A. R. (2017). Female virtual intrasexual competition and its consequences: An evolutionary mismatch perspective. In M. L. Fisher (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of women and competition* (pp. 657–680). Oxford University Press.
- Zane, Z., & White, R. (2022). Here's What It Means When Someone Calls You a 'Simp'. *Men's Health*. Retrieved from <https://www.menshealth.com/sex-women/a31994140/what-is-simping/>

Appendix

Appendix A - Study 1

In this study, we are interested in finding out what defines a “simp” and what constitutes “simping” behavior within the context of courtship and romantic relationships. A “simp” is loosely defined as someone, typically male, who pursues a romantic interest in an excessive or obsessive manner, often not receiving any immediate reciprocation for their efforts. You may have even experienced or witnessed people you know exhibiting these types of behaviors or traits.

Specifically, we are interested how **you** would define what a simp looks like to you, and what are some behaviors or traits that typically characterise such an individual.

Below is a list of guiding questions:

What comes to mind when you think of the word “simp”?

What kind of traits do simps have?

What are some behaviors a simp exhibits?

What kind of person would be most likely to engage in simping behavior?

Please take a few minutes to provide as many meaningful answers as you can; the survey will only be able to proceed after at least 5 minutes spent on this page. When filling out your answers in the box below, each answer should be kept concise (preferably limited to a short phrase per answer). Please also separate each answer with a semi-colon.

[Next page]

Below are list of traits that typically characterise a simp or simping behavior. Please rate the extent to which you agree with each statement.

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Disagree strongly 1

Disagree moderately 2

Disagree a little 3

Neither agree nor disagree 4

Agree a little 5

Agree moderately 6

Agree strongly 7

A simp is someone who:

1. Is exploitative of others
2. Is narcissistic
3. Is submissive
4. Values sex or sexual activity
5. Is caring/compassionate
6. Values emotional connection
7. Is kind/considerate
8. Is romantic
9. Is physically attractive
10. Is popular and well-liked by individuals of the same sex
11. Is popular and well-liked by individuals of the opposite sex

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Appendix B – List of Nominated Traits

Aggressive	Desperate for attention	Spends excessive amounts of money on a romantic interest	Often unreciprocated for their romantic efforts	Low social skills	Physically attractive	Unaware that the person they are pursuing is not interested in them	Lazy	Single
Agreeable	Disrespected by others	Feminine	Lacks self-identity	Manipulative	Physically unattractive	Has low mate value (i.e., undesirable as a mate/partner)	Lonely	Stubborn
Avoidant	Emotional and sensitive	Highly intelligent	Low in commitment	Pursues partner of higher mate value (i.e., more desirable) than themselves	Prentious	Carefree	Nerdy	Thriftly
Holds benevolent/patronising attitudes toward women (e.g., perceiving women as requiring the protection of men)	Emotionally weak and fragile	humble	Insecure and low in confidence	Naïve	Risk-seeking/risk-taking	Creepy	Warm/sensitive	Dresses poorly
High in confidence	Entitled	Idolises their partner or romantic interest	Submissive to their partner or romantic interest	Narcissistic	Selfless and altruistic	Male	Old	Wealthy

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Defensive of someone they are romantically interested in	Expressive and engage in flattery frequently	Immature	Incompetent/unintelligent	Needy	Sexist	Female	Optimistic	Young
Delusional	Displays excessive affection and care	Inexperienced with women	Low self-esteem	Warm/sensitive toward their romantic interest	Spineless	Gentle	Patient	Authentic
Has a strong desire for love or a romantic partner	Has an excessive sexual desire	Inexperienced with sex/sexual activity	Low in social dominance	Masochistic	Obsessive and fixated	Idealistic	Romantic	

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Appendix C: Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for Items Measuring Characteristics and Behaviors of

Simps

Item	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>
A simp is someone who is aggressive	3.56	1.687	299
A simp is someone who is agreeable	4.64	1.619	299
A simp is someone who is avoidant	3.85	1.594	299
A simp is someone who holds benevolent/patronising attitudes toward women (e.g., perceiving women as requiring the protection of men)	4.81	1.639	299
A simp is someone who is high in confidence	2.63	1.375	299
A simp is someone who is defensive of someone they are romantically interested in	5.45	1.452	299
A simp is someone who is delusional	5.18	1.520	299
A simp is someone who has a strong desire for love or a romantic partner	5.78	1.263	299
A simp is someone who is desperate for attention	5.64	1.304	299
A simp is someone who is disrespected by others	4.98	1.414	299
A simp is someone who is emotional and sensitive	5.23	1.360	299
A simp is someone who is emotionally weak and fragile	5.26	1.366	299
A simp is someone who is entitled	3.94	1.749	299
A simp is someone who is expressive and engages in flattery frequently	5.36	1.458	299
A simp is someone who displays excessive affection and care	5.60	1.370	299
A simp is someone who has an excessive sexual desire	4.69	1.550	299

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

A simp is someone who spends excessive amounts of money on a romantic interest	5.55	1.381	299
A simp is someone who is feminine	3.51	1.549	299
A simp is someone who is highly intelligent	3.33	1.242	299
A simp is someone who is humble	3.76	1.505	299
A simp is someone who idolises their partner or romantic interest	5.99	1.264	299
A simp is someone who is immature	5.07	1.489	299
A simp is someone who is inexperienced with women	5.26	1.443	299
A simp is someone who is inexperienced with sex/sexual activity	4.94	1.511	299
A simp is someone who is often unreciprocated for their romantic efforts	5.91	1.318	299
A simp is someone who lacks self-identity	5.02	1.399	299
A simp is someone who is low in commitment	3.20	1.594	299
A simp is someone who is insecure and low in confidence	5.52	1.317	299
A simp is someone who is submissive to their partner or romantic interest	5.71	1.363	299
A simp is someone who is incompetent/unintelligent	3.97	1.548	299
A simp is someone who has low self-esteem	5.38	1.401	299
A simp is someone who is low in social dominance	5.41	1.374	299
A simp is someone who has low social skills	5.18	1.441	299
A simp is someone who is manipulative	4.27	1.680	299
A simp is someone who pursues partners of higher mate value (i.e., more desirable) than themselves	5.34	1.355	299
A simp is someone who is naive	5.39	1.350	299

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

A simp is someone who is narcissistic	4.09	1.675	299
A simp is someone who is needy	5.77	1.253	299
A simp is someone who is warm/sensitive toward their romantic interest	4.86	1.561	299
A simp is someone who is masochistic	4.00	1.541	299
A simp is someone who is physically attractive	3.40	1.215	299
A simp is someone who is physically unattractive	4.24	1.197	299
A simp is someone who is pretentious	3.97	1.501	299
A simp is someone who is risk-seeking/risk-taking	3.79	1.593	299
A simp is someone who is selfless and altruistic	3.65	1.590	299
A simp is someone who is sexist	4.03	1.665	299
A simp is someone who is spineless	4.83	1.484	299
A simp is someone who is obsessive and fixated	5.91	1.284	299
A simp is someone who is unaware that the person they are pursuing is not interested in them	5.31	1.456	299
A simp is someone who has low mate value (i.e., undesirable as a mate/partner)	5.00	1.457	299
A simp is someone who is carefree	3.30	1.524	299
A simp is someone who is creepy	5.28	1.418	299
A simp is someone who is male	5.60	1.305	299
A simp is someone who is female	2.71	1.395	299
A simp is someone who is gentle	4.13	1.429	299
A simp is someone who is idealistic	4.58	1.510	299
A simp is someone who is lazy	3.59	1.426	299

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

A simp is someone who is lonely	5.56	1.341	299
A simp is someone who is nerdy	4.57	1.409	299
A simp is someone who is warm/sensitive	4.24	1.451	299
A simp is someone who is old	3.14	1.266	299
A simp is someone who is optimistic	4.55	1.466	299
A simp is someone who is patient	4.05	1.564	299
A simp is someone who is romantic	4.34	1.594	299
A simp is someone who is single	5.31	1.390	299
A simp is someone who is stubborn	4.77	1.542	299
A simp is someone who is thrifty	3.48	1.235	299
A simp is someone who dresses poorly	3.95	1.333	299
A simp is someone who is wealthy	3.49	1.121	299
A simp is someone who is young	4.43	1.271	299
A simp is someone who is authentic	3.58	1.418	299

Note. Total sample size = 299. All items were rated on a 7-point scale (1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*).

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

Appendix D: Table 2

Factor Loadings of Items Using Promax Rotation (4-Factor Solution)

Item	Factor 1 Undesirability/Low Mate Value	Factor 2 Exploitative/Supremacy/Complex	Factor 3 Obsessive/Excessiveness/Behaviors	Factor 4 Competence/Selection/Efficacy
A simp is someone who is emotionally weak and fragile	.746			
A simp is someone who is spineless	.733			
A simp is someone who is low in social dominance	.720			
A simp is someone who has low social skills	.711			
A simp is someone who dresses poorly	.698			
A simp is someone who has low self-esteem	.696			
A simp is someone who is insecure and low in confidence	.688			
A simp is someone who inexperienced with women	.678			
A simp is someone who is physically unattractive	.638			
A simp is someone who has low mate value (i.e., undesirable as a mate/partner)	.628			
A simp is someone who lacks self-identity	.586			
A simp is someone who is inexperienced with sex/sexual activity	.585			
A simp is someone who is naive	.564			
A simp is someone who is nerdy	.550			
A simp is someone who is needy	.508			
A simp is someone who is disrespected by others	.494			

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

A simp is someone who is manipulative	.805	
A simp is someone who is narcissistic	.774	
A simp is someone who is sexist	.742	
A simp is someone who is aggressive	.731	
A simp is someone who is entitled	.688	
A simp is someone who is masochistic	.539	
A simp is someone who holds benevolent/patronising attitudes toward women (e.g., perceiving women as requiring the protection of men)	.496	
A simp is someone who is humble	-.455	
A simp is someone who is creepy	.432	
A simp is someone who has a strong desire for love or a romantic partner	.751	
A simp is someone who idolises their partner or romantic interest	.724	
A simp is someone who is defensive of someone they are romantically interested in	.608	
A simp is someone who displays excessive affection and care	.600	
A simp is someone who is expressive and engages in flattery frequently	.548	
A simp is someone who is obsessive and fixated	.506	
A simp is someone who spends excessive amounts of money on a romantic interest	.442	
A simp is someone who is optimistic	.428	
A simp is someone who is often unreciprocated for their romantic efforts	.413	
A simp is someone who is wealthy		.647
A simp is someone who is authentic		.602

SIMPING BEHAVIOR

A simp is someone who is carefree	.506
A simp is someone who is highly intelligent	.457
A simp is someone who is old	.424

Note. $N = 299$. Loadings below $|.40|$ and cross loadings above $|.30|$ are omitted.

Appendix E: Table 3.

Factor Correlation Matrix for 4-Factor Solution

	1	2	3	4
1. Undesirability/Low Mate Value	-			
2. Exploitative/Superiority Complex	.33	-		
3. Obsessive/Excessiveness Behaviors	.48	.06	-	
4. Competent/Efficacious	-.33	-.30	-.09	-
