UPDATE on Jan. 21, 2022 - Although it's unfortunate Which? published inaccurate and false information in the first place, and despite repetitive refutals from Tinder, we are pleased that Which? has retracted their defamatory allegations, as mentioned in their website.
"(...) Tinder told us it has never factored in sexual orientation into its pricing. Updating our analysis with this new information leaves us with no evidence that sexual orientation impacts pricing for young Tinder users. We have therefore removed reference to it from this piece."

It is categorically untrue that our pricing structure discriminates in any way by sexual orientation. Any reporting or inference is patently false. The mystery shopping activity of less than 200 people by Which? is deeply flawed and the conclusions cannot be relied upon due to several factors.

Tinder members are able to choose up to three different sexual orientations, and they can change those at any time and as many times as they like. We encourage anyone who wants to test this out for themselves to create a Tinder account, add or change their sexual orientation, and then open a Tinder Plus Subscription Screen. They will see the price does not change.

Here are the facts about Tinder's pricing and the problems with Which?'s report:

- This mystery shopper activity included less than 200 people. This is not statistically significant.
- Which? has not shared their methodology, or the breakdown of demographics within the less than 200 people surveyed.
- In their own report, Which? found that mystery shoppers that identify as heterosexual and between the ages of 30-49 are shown to be paying more than their LGBTQAI+ counterparts, which undermines Which?'s whole thesis.

Regarding Tinder's pricing:

- We have never factored in sexual orientation, gender identity, or any other demographic characteristic to our pricing.
- We offer discounts in some regions, including the UK, for members aged 28 and younger.
- The grouping used by Which? was flawed in that it grouped members aged 18-29. 29 year olds do not receive discounted pricing options, therefore every 29 year old would have seen a higher price point. By including 29 year olds in that group, it completely invalidates the credibility of this report.
- If there were proportionally more LGBTQAI+ users than heterosexual users aged 29 in the sample group, the results would be skewed to make it appear that LGBTQAI+ members paid more based upon orientation, when in fact, it was based upon age.
- This grouping has recklessly misrepresented our pricing practices.
- Like other businesses, Tinder also offers promotional rates from time-to-time, which could have impacted the findings.

Tinder is incredibly proud of and humbled by the role we play in the lives of the LGBTQAI+ community. We openly welcome everyone and have a longstanding tradition of supporting the LGBTQAI+ community, partnering extensively with well known and respected global organizations like GLAAD, ILGA World and the Human Rights Campaign to ensure we are continually improving the product and the experience for all our members. With their support, we developed features such as More Genders and Traveler Alert,

Despite Which?'s egregious reporting, we welcome the opportunity to speak with regulators and NGOs to clarify any concerns they may have. Sloppy, flawed or negligent reporting that is defamatory is not acceptable, and we will hold Which? accountable.
