Archives of Sexual Behavior
https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-025-03315-y

BRIEF REPORT

The Psychometric Properties of the Ukrainian Version of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Questionnaire

Tetiana Zavada[1] · Oksana Senyk[2,3] · Tetyana Mandzyk[4] · Mariia Perun[4] · Lars Penke[5]

Received: 6 April 2025 / Revised: 8 September 2025 / Accepted: 9 September 2025

Abstract

This study aimed to evaluate the psychometric properties of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R) in a Ukrainian sample. A sample of 469 adults aged 18–60 years (M = 27.8, SD = 8.9, 20% males) completed Q&A form on sociodemographic data, Ukrainian translation of the SOI-R, measures of personality organization, and meanings of sexual behavior. A three-factor original model with correlated latent variables showed a good fit to the Ukrainian data: $\chi^2 = 60.7$, $p < 0.001$, $\chi^2/df = 2.5$, NFI=0.962, CFI=0.976, TLI=0.964, GFI=0.970, SRMR=0.059, RMSEA=0.06. Cronbach's α for internal consistency was high (0.77–0.86 for total score and subscales). Convergent validity was established by significant positive correlations of SOI-R subscales with personality diffuseness and meanings of sexual behavior related to satisfaction of personal needs. In line with prior research, this study revealed that unrestricted sociosexuality was more characteristic of men, younger individuals, singles, and those with lower levels of formal education. The results suggest that the Ukrainian version of the SOI-R scale is a reliable and valid measure of sociosexual orientation, accurately measuring the diversity of this important aspect of human sexual behavior.

Keywords Sociosexuality · Sexual relationships · Sociosexual Orientation Inventory-Revised

Introduction

Sociosexuality refers to the relationship between social and sexual behavior, highlighting how social factors influence sexual identity and relationships. Introduced by Kinsey et al. (1953), the concept of sociosexual orientation describes individuals' willingness to engage in sexual relationships without commitment. Simpson and Gangestad (1991) developed the Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI) to measure variations in individuals' openness to casual sex. Penke and Asendorpf (2008) expanded this measure, creating the SOI-R, which includes three components: Sociosexual Behavior, Sociosexual Desire, and Sociosexual Attitude. Sociosexual behavior relates to the frequency of past casual sexual encounters, including infidelity, reflecting an individual's capacity to fulfill sociosexual desires. Sociosexual desire pertains to an individual's inclination toward emotionally detached sexual relationships, influenced by personal and social factors such as cultural norms and status. Sociosexual attitude reflects personal views on engaging in such activities, shaped by cultural, moral, and societal factors (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008; Schaller & Murray, 2008; Simpson & Gangestad, 1991).

The concept of sociosexuality has profoundly influenced subsequent research on sexual behavior and interpersonal relationships, leading to its examination across various dimensions. Sociosexuality is a complex, multidimensional phenomenon that necessitates a comprehensive and nuanced approach for its thorough understanding, incorporating not only biological and personal factors but also a broad array of social, cultural, technological, and global influences.

✉ Tetiana Zavada
zavada_t@ucu.edu.ua

1 Department of Psychology and Psychotherapy, Ukrainian Catholic University, 17, Ilariona Svientsytskoho Street, 79011 Lviv, Ukraine

2 Department of Humanities and Social Sciences, WSB Merito University in Gdansk, Gdansk, Poland

3 Department of Psychology and Psychotherapy, Ukrainian Catholic University, Lviv, Ukraine

4 Department of Psychology, Ivan Franko National University of Lviv, Lviv, Ukraine

5 Institute of Psychology, University of Goettingen, Goettingen, Germany

Published online: 11 December 2025

Schmitt's (2005) study on sociosexuality across 48 countries reveals cultural variations, with some societies embracing casual sexual relationships and others maintaining more conservative views. Evolutionary psychology suggests sociosexuality is a reproductive strategy, with men focusing on physical attractiveness and women on resources and status for reproductive success (Buss, 1998; Kenrick et al., 1990). Research also shows sex differences, with men generally exhibiting more unrestricted sociosexuality than women (Buss et al., 1998). Psychological factors, such as extraversion and risk-taking, are linked to sociosexuality, with high sociosexuality also correlated with traits like narcissism and psychopathy (Gosling et al., 2003; Lukaszewski et al., 2014). Biological factors, including testosterone and self-perceived attractiveness, further influence sociosexual behavior (Borráz-León et al., 2023; Roney et al., 2003).

Sociosexuality's impact on psychological health and well-being is debated, with unrestricted sociosexuality linked to psychological issues, particularly for women (Blasco-Belled et al., 2021). Socioeconomic status also affects sociosexual behavior, with higher status promoting stable relationships and lower status leading to more frequent partner changes (Low, 2000). Unrestricted sociosexuality can reduce long-term relationship satisfaction (Lewis et al., 2012), and the COVID-19 pandemic shifted sociosexual orientations, increasing the desire for stability and using technology to maintain connections (Vaccaro et al., 2023).

As of today, the SOI-R has been translated into more than 25 languages and is widely used in scientific and psychodiagnostic research to measure sociosexuality. Given the cultural sensitivity of the SOI-R, this study aimed to provide a Ukrainian translation and extend the psychometric validation of this instrument. We anticipated an acceptable fit for a three-factor model, consistent with the original version, good homogeneity of the scale, and expected that the Ukrainian version of the scale (SOI-R-UA) would correlate meaningfully with sexual behavior and personality organization.

Cross-cultural adaptations play a crucial role in testing the universality of psychological constructs and ensuring their appropriate application in different social and cultural contexts. It is important to emphasize that cultural differences can significantly affect both the structure and the interpretation of even well-validated measurement instruments. Previous research has shown that models consistently reproduced in Western samples do not always align with results obtained in other sociocultural contexts (Bailey et al., 2013). This highlights the need for systematic examinations of the validity and reliability of instruments across countries and cultures, which in turn allows for a more comprehensive understanding of both universal and culture-specific aspects of psychological phenomena.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The study sample included participants aged 18–60 years (N = 469, M = 27.8, SD = 8.9) (see Table 1). Participants voluntarily consented to complete an online survey via Google Forms. Prior to commencing the survey, individuals were informed about the study's objectives and the confidentiality of their responses. Additionally, 30 participants completed the questionnaire twice over a six-week interval to assess the test–retest reliability of the scale. Data collection occurred between September 2021 and May 2023, with descriptive statistics for the study participants presented in Table 1.

The translation procedure was conducted in March 2021, adhering to international standards for cross-cultural adaptation of psychological measurement instruments (Beaton et al., 2000). The full Ukrainian version of the SOI-R is provided in the SupplementalDocument.

Measures

Sociodemographic information. Participants' sociodemographic characteristics (age and sex) were measured using a self-constructed questionnaire.

Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory (SOI-R). The SOI-R (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008) comprises nine statements that constitute three scales: (1) Sociosexual Behavior (SOI-B), (2) Sociosexual Attitudes (SOI-A), and

Table 1 Characteristics of the study group

	The main research (N = 469)	Retest (N = 30)
Age		
Range	18–60	21–32
Mean	27.8 (8.9)	24.7 (2.2)
Gender		
Men	92 (19.62%)	11 (36.67%)
Women	375 (79.96%)	19 (63.33%)
Marital status		
Married	101 (21.53%)	3 (10%)
Dating	223 (47.55%)	22 (73.3%)
Single	145 (30.92%)	5 (16.67%)
Education		
High school	34 (21.53%)	0
Professional technical college	57 (47.55%)	3 (10%)
Incomplete Bachelor's studies	196 (47.55%)	21 (70%)
Bachelor's or Master's degree	133 (30.92%)	6 (20%)
Ph.D., M.D., JD, or other advanced degree	49 (21.53%)	0

(3) Sociosexual Desire (SOI-D). The values obtained for each subscale—sociosexual behavior, sociosexual desire, and sociosexual attitudes—are summed to yield an overall indicator of sociosexual orientation.

Meanings of Sexual Behavior Inventory (MSBI). The Meanings of Sexual Behavior Inventory (MSBI; Shaw & Rogge, 2017) includes 43 statements reflecting nine distinct sexual motives: sharing pleasure, bonding, de-stressing, energizing the relationship, learning about each other, managing conflict, using sex as an incentive, expressing anger, and controlling a partner. These motives are categorized into positive (Factors 1–5) and negative (Factors 6–9) motives, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients ranging from 0.74 to 0.89. It is hypothesized that sociosexuality, which involves emotionally uninvolved relationships, would have weaker correlations with motives related to interpersonal bonding and stronger correlations with motives focused on fulfilling individual needs, such as expressing anger and controlling a partner.

Ukrainian Adaptation of the Personality Organization Inventory (IPO-R-UKR). The IPO-R-UKR (Semkiv et al., 2022) is a Ukrainian adaptation of the Personality Organization Inventory. It includes 41 items assessed on a five-point Likert scale, measuring two main constructs: reality testing (11 items) and defense mechanisms/identity diffusion (30 items) (Smits et al., 2009). The IPO-R-UKR is based on modifications to Kernberg's (1986) original structured interview, which initially had three scales, but was later refined into a two-factor model due to high correlations between identity diffusion and immature defense mechanisms. The Cronbach's alpha for both scales of the IPO-R-UKR is 0.92. It is hypothesized that sociosexual orientation, characterized by a preference for casual, emotionally uninvolved sexual relationships, may correlate with identity diffusion and reliance on immature defense mechanisms.

Data Analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using R Studio (psych v.2.1.9, GPArotation v.2014.11–1, lavaan v.0.6–9, semTools v.0.5–5, REdaS v.0.9.3). Descriptive statistics for individual scale items were computed, and the internal reliability of the items was evaluated using Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega coefficients. Test–retest reliability was assessed through Pearson's correlation coefficient. The factor structure of the SOI-R-UA scale was examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Prior to factor analysis, the suitability of the data for this type of analysis was determined using the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin index and Bartlett's test of sphericity.

Results

Descriptive Statistics of the SOI-R-UA

Table 2 presents the mean, standard deviation, skewness, and kurtosis for each item of the SOI-R-UA questionnaire. Most items fall within the normal distribution range, with skewness scores within ± 2 and kurtosis within ± 7, in accordance with Kim (2013). However, items 1 and 2 exhibit right skewness, suggesting a higher frequency of responses in the "0–2" range for the questions: "With how many different partners did you have sex during the last 12 months?" and "With how many different partners have you had sexual contact only once?". These results suggest that most participants had a stable sexual partner, further supported by the elevated kurtosis values for these items.

In the studied group (N = 469), total SOI-R-UA scores covered the full possible range and were distributed from 9 to 81. However, scores in the upper quartile (58, 60–62, 64–65, 67–80) were absent. Based on the lower and upper 25% of the score distribution, cutoff values were set at 18 points for restricted sociosexuality and 39 points for unrestricted sociosexuality.

Factor Structure of SOI-R-UA

The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.8, and Bartlett's test of sphericity $\chi^2(36) = 1709.02$, $p < 0.001$, indicating that the sample was suitable for EFA. The EFA with varimax rotation suggested a 3-factor solution, consistent with the original SOI-R structure proposed by Penke and Asendorpf (2008) (Table 3). This model accounted for 72.35% of the variance, with factor loadings ranging from 0.64 to 0.88, indicating strong correlations between items and the factors of the SOI-R-UA.

Table 2 Descriptive statistics of SOI-R-UA

Items of SOI-R-UA	M	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
1	2.28	1.29	2.37	7.16
2	2.13	1.77	2.05	3.90
3	2.39	1.95	1.50	1.37
4	5.20	2.79	−0.10	−1.28
5	3.65	2.79	0.61	−1.08
6	4.79	2.84	0.06	−1.38
7	3.30	2.09	0.89	−0.38
8	2.66	1.79	1.38	1.09
9	2.39	1.75	1.66	2.35
Subscale 1: Behavior	6.80	4.21	1.82	3.76
Subscale 2: Attitude	13.65	6.99	0.22	−0.95
Subscale 3: Desire	8.35	4.94	1.18	0.86
Total score	28.80	12.62	0.56	−0.14

Table 3 Factor structure and factor loadings of SOI-R-UA

Items of SOI-R-UA	Factor 1—"Desire"	Factor 2—"Behavior"	Factor 3—"Attitude"
1	0.29	**0.64**	0.13
2	0.01	**0.88**	0.15
3	0.07	**0.87**	0.24
4	0.12	0.12	**0.82**
5	0.36	0.20	**0.73**
6	0.11	0.23	**0.80**
7	**0.83**	0.05	0.24
8	**0.87**	0.11	0.20
9	**0.83**	0.17	0.07
% of variance explained	**42.75%**	**17.78%**	**12.11%**

To further validate the three-factor structure of the SOI-R-UA, CFA using Diagonally Weighted Least Squares was performed (Table 4).

The CFA fit indices exceeded the significance threshold, confirming a strong fit between the proposed three-factor model of the SOI-R-UA and the observed data (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

Reliability of SOI-R-UA

To test the reliability of the Ukrainian version of the SOI-R, homogeneity and reproducibility of the scale were assessed. Cronbach's alpha and McDonald's omega coefficients were calculated, yielding values of 0.82 and 0.83, respectively, indicating good internal consistency. The retest reliability, measured after a 6-week interval, resulted in a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.71, proving the stability of the Ukrainian version of the scale. Reliability values for the SOI-R-UA subscales are presented in Table 5.

Convergent Validity of SOI-R-UA

Convergent validity was assessed through correlations with IPO-R-UKR and MSBI scores. As hypothesized, sociosexual orientation correlated with personality organization, as well as with various meanings that sexual behavior can acquire within relationships (Table 6). The SOI-R-UA total score showed positive correlations with immature defense mechanisms and personality diffuseness ($r = 0.22$), as well as with the following aspects of sexual activity in relationships: to share pleasure ($r = 0.16$), to de-stress ($r = 0.20$), as an incentive ($r = 0.15$), to express anger ($r = 0.14$), and to control a partner ($r = 0.16$).

Table 5 Internal consistency and test–retest reliability coefficients of the SOI-R-UA subscales and total score

	Cronbach's alpha	McDonald's omega	Test–retest (Pearson's correlation)
Sociosexual Behavior	0.77	0.78	0.68***
Sociosexual Attitude	0.77	0.78	0.70***
Sociosexual Desire	0.85	0.86	0.69***
Total score	0.82	0.83	0.71***

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

To examine potential sex differences in the relationship between sociosexuality (SOI-R) and motives for sexual behavior (MSBI), separate correlation analyses were conducted for men (N = 66) and women (N = 171). The results revealed several noteworthy patterns. Among women, unrestricted sociosexuality, particularly on the Behavior and Desire subscales, was significantly positively associated with motives such as expressing anger ($r = 0.30$), controlling a partner ($r = 0.27$), and using sex as stimulation. In contrast, among men, sociosexuality as measured by the Attitude subscale demonstrated negative correlations with the same motives: expressing anger ($r = -0.28$), controlling a partner ($r = -0.38$), and stimulation ($r = -0.24$).

Effects of Age, Sex, Education, Relationship Status, and War-Related Stress on Sociosexuality

The study revealed a medium-sized effect of sex on sociosexuality, with men exhibiting higher levels compared to women ($F(1, 319) = 40.69$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.12$). When controlling for sex, the effect of age was small, indicating restricted sociosexuality in older participants ($F(1, 319) = 5.43$, $p = 0.02$, $\eta p^2 = 0.02$). With respect to the three facets of the SOI-R, the most substantial effect of sex was observed in the behavioral facet ($F(1, 319) = 34.08$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.10$), followed by the desire facet ($F(1, 319) = 21.04$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.06$), with the smallest effect found in the attitude facet (F (1,

Table 4 Results of confirmatory factor analysis for three-factor model of SOI-R-UA

p level	χ^2	χ^2/df (≤3)	NFI (≥0.90)	RMR	SRM R (≤0.08)	RMSEA robust (≤0.06)	GFI (≥0.95)	TFI robust (≥0.90)	CFI robust (≥0.90)
0.00	60.7	2.5	0.962	0.209	0.059	0.06	0.970	0.964	0.976

χ^2—Chi-square; df—degrees of freedom; NFI—normed fit index, RMR—root mean square residual; SRMR—standardized root mean square residual; RMSEA—root mean square error of approximation; GFI—a measure of goodness of fit; TFI—Tilburg frailty indicator, CFI—comparative fit index

Table 6 Correlation coefficients between SOI-R-UA, IPO-R-UKR, and MSBI scores

		SOI-R-UA			
		Sociosexual Behavior	Sociosexual Desire	Sociosexual Attitude	Total Score
Inventory of Personality Organization-Revised (N = 120)	The defense mechanisms/identity diffusion	**0.20***	**0.25****	0.08	**0.22***
	Reality testing	0.12	0.03	-0.09	0.01
Meanings of Sexual Behavior Inventory (N = 237)	To share pleasure	**0.17****	**0.14***	0.08	**0.16***
	To bond	0.05	0.03	0.04	0.05
	To de-stress	**0.15***	**0.17***	**0.15****	**0.20****
	To energize the relationship	0.05	0.01	0.01	0.02
	To learn more about each other	0.05	0.09	0.05	0.08
	To manage conflict	**0.17****	0.06	0.02	0.10
	As an incentive	**0.19****	0.10	0.07	**0.15***
	To express anger	**0.19****	0.05	0.10	**0.14***
	To control a partner	**0.18****	0.11	0.09	**0.16***

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

319) = 18.41, $p < 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.05$). These results indicate that men are more likely to report a higher number of sexual partners, express significantly greater desire for potential future sexual encounters, and hold a more favorable attitude toward sociosexuality compared to women. After controlling for sex, the effect of age was small on the desire and attitude facets ($p = 0.02$, $\eta p^2 = 0.02$, and $p = 0.04$, $\eta p^2 = 0.01$, respectively) and remained insignificant for the behavioral facet ($p = 0.62$, $\eta p^2 < 0.001$).

Participants with lower educational attainment exhibited unrestricted sociosexuality compared to those with advanced degrees (F (3, 458) = 3.15, $p = 0.025$, $\eta p^2 = 0.02$). Additionally, war-related stress was associated with increased sociosexuality: Participants surveyed during the full-scale war period reported unrestricted sociosexuality compared to those surveyed during peacetime (F (1, 462) = 3.98, $p = 0.047$, $\eta p^2 = 0.009$). Furthermore, individuals not in a relationship showed unrestricted sociosexuality compared to those who were either romantically involved or married (F (2, 449) = 6.99, $p = 0.001$, $\eta p^2 = 0.03$). These effects—related to education, war-related stress, and relationship status—remained significant even when controlling for sex.

Discussion

This study aimed to translate and evaluate the psychometric properties of the SOI-R-UA. Descriptive analysis indicated that all SOI-R-UA items were normally distributed, except for Item 1 ("With how many different partners have you had sex in the last 12 months?"), which exhibited pronounced right skewness, suggesting that the majority of respondents had a stable sexual partner (reporting between 0 and 2 partners). Cutoff scores were established for the extreme 25% of the score distribution, resulting in threshold values of 18 and 39 for the total SOI-R-UA score.

Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses validated the original three-factor structure of the SOI-R within the Ukrainian sample (Penke & Asendorpf, 2008). The three-factor model demonstrated good fit indices and accounted for 72.35% of the total variance, with all item factor loadings exceeding 0.6. The three-factor structure of the SOI-R has been consistently confirmed across various cultural adaptations, including Hungarian (Meskó et al., 2014), Portuguese (Neto, 2016), Polish (Jankowski, 2016), Spanish (Barrada et al., 2018), Brazilian (Nascimento et al., 2018), Colombian (Romero et al., 2023), and Chinese versions (Chen et al., 2024).

The retest conducted after a 6-week interval yielded a Pearson's correlation coefficient of 0.71, demonstrating the stability of the SOI-R-UA. The analysis of internal consistency also produced satisfactory Cronbach's alpha coefficients for both the SOI-R-UA total score and its subscales. Similar results have been reported in other studies. Penke and Asendorpf (2008) found that sociosexual orientation remained stable over a one-year period (r = 0.83). Additionally, a shorter-term retest reliability was confirmed within a 14-day period in the Italian adaptation of the questionnaire (r = 0.72) (Ciocca et al., 2024).

Positive correlations between the total SOI-R-UA score and its subscales with immature defense mechanisms, identity diffusion, and certain types of sexual activities in relationships (e.g., sharing pleasure, de-stressing, sex as an incentive, expressing anger, controlling a partner) confirm the convergent validity of the Ukrainian version of the SOI-R. At the same time, although identity diffusion demonstrated significant associations with sociosexuality, it should not be considered a primary criterion of convergent validity for the SOI-R. In the present study, this construct served as a supplementary, theoretically informed indicator, broadening

the interpretation of sociosexuality by linking it to personality organization and identity-related processes. According to Blasco-Belled et al. (2021), this relationship may be more pronounced in women. Furthermore, the association of sociosexuality with a focus on self-satisfaction in sexual relations is consistent with research by Vaccaro et al. (2023). The results also indicate that the relationship between sociosexuality and sexual motives varies by sex. Women with high levels of sociosexuality are more likely to use sexual activity as a means of emotional regulation or interpersonal influence. In contrast, men with high sociosexuality are less likely to use sex as a tool for aggression or manipulation. Overall, the results indicate that sociosexuality is more strongly related to motives for sexual behavior that prioritize the satisfaction of individual psychological needs rather than interpersonal relationships.

Casual sexual encounters, lacking emotional involvement, can serve as a mechanism for avoiding deep emotional experiences and managing internal conflicts, often associated with immature defense mechanisms that hinder resolution of relationship issues and self-perception. This may lead to alienation and identity instability. In contrast, mature defense mechanisms, such as sublimation, humor, and altruism, help manage emotions and foster effective communication, promoting empathy and emotional stability, which are essential for healthy relationships (Bowlby, 1988; Gottman & Silver, 1999; Vaillant, 1992).

It is also important to consider the positive aspects of sociosexuality, particularly its connection to shared experiences of pleasure. When partners encourage experimentation and prioritize each other's satisfaction, the pressures surrounding intimacy are alleviated, fostering a more open exploration of sexual expression (Mitchell et al., 2020). Such openness can enhance trust, reducing the likelihood of jealousy and dissatisfaction, thereby positively influencing relationship stability. Additionally, sociosexuality, linked to sexual activity aimed at fulfilling personal needs, can be a valuable resource for psychological well-being, especially in relationships that allow greater autonomy in partner selection, such as open or non-monogamous arrangements (Rubel & Bogaert, 2015).

This study identified the effects of sex, age, and education on sociosexuality. The findings suggest that as individuals age, their interest in and approval of casual, emotionally detached sexual relationships decline, leading to an overall decrease in sociosexuality. Additionally, unrestricted sociosexuality was found to be more prevalent among men, single individuals, and those with lower levels of formal education. Regarding sex differences, the most pronounced disparity between men and women emerged in the behavioral dimension, with men reporting a significantly higher number of sexual partners compared to women. These results are in line with other language adaptations (Chen et al., 2024; Ciocca et al., 2024; Jankowski, 2016; Meskó et al., 2014; Nascimento et al., 2018; Romero, 2023), where men report higher levels of sexual activity compared to women.

An intriguing result emerged in the context of continuous war-related stress, where an unrestricted sociosexuality orientation was observed. This finding contrasts with the data of Vaccaro et al. (2023), which indicated that during the COVID-19 pandemic, the need for stability and security in partnerships increased, while the inclination toward casual sexual relationships decreased. Thus, war-induced stress may exert a different influence on sociosexuality compared to pandemic-related stress.

Ongoing war represents a state of continuous traumatic stress, with heightened neuroendocrine, neuronal, and immune responses occurring without adequate recovery periods, leading to dysregulation of the body's adaptive systems and increased allostatic load (Goral, 2017; Guidi et al., 2020; Itzhaky et al., 2017). This environment may intensify the desire to relieve stress through sexual contact, which may not be possible in stable partnerships due to disruptions caused by wartime. Many relationships are strained, with men conscripted into the military and women relocating to safer areas, resulting in physical separation. These findings are consistent with previous research linking sociosexual orientation to sexual behavior motives focused on satisfying individual needs in sexual relationships.

A major strength of this study is its adherence to established procedures for assessing psychometric properties, resulting in a clear factor structure for the Ukrainian version of the SOI-R. Additionally, the study extends the convergent validity of the construct, demonstrating that unrestricted sociosexuality is associated with sexual behaviors aimed at satisfying personal needs rather than focusing on interpersonal relationships.

However, several limitations of the present study should be considered. First, the results were derived from a large sample of individuals from the general population (N = 469), the majority of whom were in stable, long-term relationships. Future research could strengthen these findings by incorporating data from more diverse groups, such as individuals with multiple sexual partners. Second, the predominance of young women in our study sample may have influenced the results, particularly given that age and sex have been shown to significantly affect sociosexuality in our study and in previous research (Buss et al., 1998). Although the timing of data collection (pre-war vs. wartime) provides an ecologically valid comparison, we acknowledge that this operationalization does not capture individual differences in subjective stress levels or trauma exposure. This limitation should be addressed in future research through the inclusion of standardized psychometric measures of war-related stress or trauma. Finally, future studies on sociosexuality in the context of war should account for participants' exposure to various war-related and non-war-related traumatic events. This approach would significantly enhance our understanding of the factors underlying sociosexuality.

Nonetheless, the obtained indicators of reliability, validity, and factor structure confirm that the SOI-R-UA is a

psychometrically sound psychodiagnostic tool. It is a valuable instrument for studying sociosexual orientation, enabling the assessment of both behavioral and psychological aspects of sociosexuality, and thus contributing to a more comprehensive understanding of this critical area of human behavior.

Conclusions

This study validated the Ukrainian version of the SOI-R, following established translation guidelines. The results confirmed its three-factor structure—behavior, attitude, and desire—and demonstrated strong reliability and validity. The scale showed internal consistency and temporal stability over six weeks, supporting its use as a reliable tool for assessing sociosexuality in the Ukrainian cultural context.

Supplementary Information The online version contains supplementary material available at https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-025-03315-y.

Acknowledgements The authors express their gratitude to people who provided translations and back-translations of the questionnaires: Oksana Senyk, Tetiana Mandzyk, Vira Hrabchuk, and Anne MacFarlane.

Author Contributions Tetiana Zavada, Oksana Senyk, Tetyana Mandzyk, and Mariia Perun contributed to the conception, design, analysis, and interpretation of the data. Tetiana Zavada, Oksana Senyk, and Tetyana Mandzyk also participated in drafting the paper. Lars Penke was involved in critically revising it for intellectual content and in the final approval of the version to be published. All authors agree to be accountable for all aspects of the work.

Funding No funding was received for conducting this study.

Data Availability Yes.

Code Availability https://osf.io/arvg8/?view_only=ad1d81b67cf5420896f63635f2124f48.

Declarations

Conflict of interest The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Ethical Approval The study was approved by the Scientific Committee of the Faculty of Health Sciences of the Ukrainian Catholic University (Protocol № 11, 07.05.2021) and conducted according to the Declaration of Helsinki and ethical principles of the Ukrainian Catholic University and Ivan Franko National University of Lviv.

Informed Consent Informed consent was obtained from all individual participants included in the study.

References

Bailey, D. H., Walker, R. S., Blomquist, G. E., Hill, K. R., Hurtado, A. M., & Geary, D. C. (2013). Heritability and fitness correlates of personality in the Ache, a natural-fertility population in Paraguay. *PLoS ONE, 8*(3), Article e59325. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0059325

Barrada, J. R., Castro, Á., Correa, A. B., & Ruiz-Gómez, P. (2018). The tridimensional structure of sociosexuality: Spanish validation of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. *Journal of Sex & Marital Therapy, 44*(2), 149–158. https://doi.org/10.1080/0092623X.2017.1335665

Beaton, D. E., Bombardier, C., Guillemin, F., & Ferraz, M. B. (2000). Guidelines for the process of cross-cultural adaptation of self-report measures. *Spine, 25*(24), 3186–3191. https://doi.org/10.1097/00007632-200012150-00014

Blasco-Belled, A., Zyskowska, E., Terebu, M., Włodarska, K. A., & Rogoza, R. (2021). Sociosexual orientations and well-being: Differences across gender. *International Journal of Sexual Health, 34*(2), 254–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/19317611.2021.1998284

Borráz-León, J. I., Krams, I. A., Cerda-Molina, A. L., & Rantala, M. J. (2023). Psychological flexibility and sociosexual orientation mediate the association between self-perceived attractiveness and mating effort. *Current Psychology, 42*, 31998–32007. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-022-04155-y

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A secure base: Parent-child attachment and healthy human development*. Basic Books.

Buss, D. M. (1998). Sexual strategies theory: Historical origins and current status. *Journal of Sex Research, 35*(1), 19–31.

Chen, L. X., Zhan, Y. Y., Li, Y., Chen, Y., & Zou, L. Q. (2024). Reliability and validity of the Chinese version of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 53*(6), 2111–2122. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-024-02883-9

Ciocca, G., Giorgini, R., Petrocchi, L., Origlia, G., Occhiuto, G., Aversa, A.,& Liuzza, M. T. (2024). Psychometric characteristics of the Italian version of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, *53*, 3267–3283. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10508-024-02882-w

Goral, A., Lahad, M., & Aharonson-Daniel, L. (2017). Differences in posttraumatic stress characteristics by duration of exposure to trauma. *Psychiatry Research, 258*, 101–107. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2017.09.079

Gosling, S. D., Rentfrow, P. J., & Swann, W. B., Jr. (2003). A very brief measure of the big-Five personality domains. *Journal of Research in Personality, 37*, 504–528. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-6566(03)00046-1

Gottman, J. M., & Silver, N. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work*. Harmony Books.

Guidi, J., Lucente, M., Sonino, N., & Fava, G. A. (2020). Allostatic load and its impact on health: A systematic review. *Psychotherapy and Psychosomatics, 90*(1), 11–27. https://doi.org/10.1159/000510696

Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal, 6*(1), 1–55. https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118

Itzhaky, L., Gelkopf, M., Levin, Y., Stein, J. Y., & Solomon, Z. (2017). Psychiatric reactions to continuous traumatic stress: A latent profile analysis of two Israeli samples. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders, 51*, 94–100. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.janxdis.2017.06.006

Jankowski, K. S. (2016). Charakterystyka psychometryczna polskiej wersji zrewidowanego Inwentarza Orientacji Socjoseksualnej (SOI-R). In A. Rynkiewicz, K. S. Jankowski, & W. Oniszczenko (Eds.), *Wybrane metody i paradygmaty badawcze w psychologii* (pp. 77–92). Scholar.

Kenrick, D. T., Sadalla, E. K., Groth, G., & Trost, M. R. (1990). Evolution, traits, and the stages of human courtship: Qualifying the parental investment model. *Journal of Personality, 58*(1), 97–116.

Kernberg, O. F. (1986). *Severe personality disorders: Psychotherapeutic strategies*. Yale University Press.

Kim, H.-Y. (2013). Statistical notes for clinical researchers: Assessing normal distribution (2) using skewness and kurtosis. *Restorative*

Dentistry & Endodontics, 38(1), 52–54. https://doi.org/10.5395/rde.2013.38.1.52

Kinsey, A. C., Pomeroy, W. B., Martin, C. E., & Gebhard, P. H. (1953). *Sexual behavior in the human female*. Saunders.

Lewis, D. M. G., Al-Shawaf, L., Conroy-Beam, D., Asao, K., & Buss, D. M. (2012). Friends with benefits II: Mating activation in opposite-sex friendships as a function of sociosexual orientation and relationship status. *Personality and Individual Differences, 53*(5), 622–628. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2012.04.040

Low, B. S. (2000). *Why sex matters: A Darwinian look at human behavior*. Princeton University Press.

Lukaszewski, A. W., Roney, J. R., & Simmons, Z. L. (2014). The role of physical formidability in human social status allocation. *Journal of Evolutionary Psychology, 12*(2), 100–119.

Meskó, N., Láng, A., & Kocsor, F. (2014). The Hungarian version of Sociosexual Orientation Inventory Revised (SOI-R): Sex and age differences. *Interpersona: An International Journal on Personal Relationships, 8*(1), 85–99. https://doi.org/10.5964/ijpr.v8i1.130

Mitchell, V. E., Mogilski, J. K., Donaldson, S. H., Nicolas, S. C. A., & Welling, L. L. M. (2020). Sexual motivation and satisfaction among consensuallynon-monogamous and monogamous individuals. *Journal of Sexual Medicine, 17*, 1072–1085. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsxm.2020.02.018

Nascimento, B. S., Hanel, P. P. H., Monteiro, R. P., Gouveia, V. V., & Little, A. C. (2018). Sociosexuality in Brazil: Validation of the SOI-R and its correlates with personality, self-perceived mate value, and ideal partner preferences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 124*, 98–104. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2017.12.007

Neto, F. (2016). Psychometric properties of a Portuguese version of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. *Journal of Relationships Research, 7*, Article e5. https://doi.org/10.1017/jrr.2016.3

Penke, L., & Asendorpf, J. B. (2008). Beyond global sociosexual orientations: A more differentiated look at sociosexuality and its effects on courtship and romantic relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(5), 1113–1135.

Romero, D., Mebarak, M., Millán, A., Tovar-Castro, J. C., Martinez, M., & Rodrigues, D. L. (2023). Reliability and validity of the Colombian version of the Revised Sociosexual Orientation Inventory. *Archives of Sexual Behavior, 52*(1), 325–331.

Roney, J. R., Mahler, S. V., & Maestripieri, D. (2003). Behavioral and hormonal responses of men to brief interactions with women. *Evolution and Human Behavior, 24*(6), 365–375. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1090-5138(03)00053-9

Rubel, A. N., & Bogaert, A. F. (2015). Consensual nonmonogamy: Psychological well-being and relationship quality correlates. *Journal of Sex Research, 52*(9), 961–982. https://doi.org/10.1080/00224499.2014.942722

Schaller, M., & Murray, D. R. (2008). Pathogens, personality, and culture: Disease prevalence predicts worldwide variability in sociosexuality, extraversion, and openness to experience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(1), 212–221. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.95.1.212

Schmitt, D. P. (2005). Sociosexuality from Argentina to Zimbabwe: A 48-nation study of sex, culture, and strategies of human mating. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 28*(2), 247–311. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0140525X05000051

Semkiv, I., Turetska, K., Kryvenko, I., & Kechur, R. (2022). Linguistic and psychometric validation of the Ukrainian translation of the Inventory of Personality Organization-Revised (IPO-R-UKR). *East European Journal of Psycholinguistics, 9*(1), 176–192. https://doi.org/10.29038/eejpl.2022.9.1.sem

Shaw, A. M., & Rogge, R. D. (2017). Symbolic meanings of sex in relationships: Developing the meanings of Sexual Behavior Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, *29*, 1221–1234. https://doi.org/10.1037/pas0000400

Simpson, J. A., & Gangestad, S. W. (1991). Individual differences in sociosexuality: Evidence for convergent and discriminant validity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 60*(6), 870–883.

Vaccaro, M. G., Izzo, G., Sarica, A., La Vignera, S., & Aversa, A. (2023). Cluster analysis method reveals gender attitudes in sociosexual orientation of a Southern Italy population during the COVID-19 lockdown. *Sexuality Research and Social Policy*, *20*, 950–963. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13178-022-00771-2

Vaillant, G. E. (1992). *Ego mechanisms of defense: A guide for clinicians and researchers*. American Psychiatric Publishing.