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# Abstract

Previous research focused on comparing singles with partnered individuals and geographically close relationships with long-distance relationships (LDRs). Despite sexual satisfaction being acknowledged as a universal indicator of one’s overall well-being via its relation to sexual health, there is a research gap on the relationship between sexual satisfaction and various relationship statuses. Comparing all three relationship statuses (i.e., singlehood, committed relationship, and long-distance relationship) contributes to closing the gap, considering that these groups have distinct characteristics from one another. Other deficient areas include studying military personnel and emerging adults. Therefore, this study aims to compare the levels of sexual satisfaction between individuals in singlehood, committed relationships, and

LDRs with a military student sample. A sample of students (n = 176) with various relationship statuses was recruited from the Royal Military College (RMC). Upon consenting, participants answered a demographics questionnaire, completed the Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale-Revised (Park & MacDonald, 2022) to measure sexual satisfaction level, Sexual Desire Inventory-2 (Spector et al., 1996) for measuring sexual desire, and the Want and Do list (Park & MacDonald, 2022) for measuring desire for and engagement in specific acts, and they were debriefed with a list of available resources. Results indicated that relationship status had a significant main effect on sexual satisfaction, while gender and age did not. There were some differences based on relationship status with partnered individuals reporting the highest sexual satisfaction and singles reporting the lowest. Additionally, solitary sexual desire predicted sexual satisfaction in partnered individuals while age predicted sexual satisfaction in LDR individuals. Emerging adults are learning to balance between career and romantic relationships while navigating LDRs. Military personnel are also subjected to LDRs due to operational requirements, such as deployments and frequent relocations. This study aimed to close the significant gap in our understanding of the sexual satisfaction of these samples. Institutional implications for RMC and the Canadian Armed Forces (CAF) and directions for future research will be discussed.
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# Introduction

 Emerging adulthood is a critical period between 18 and 29 years of age characterized by identity exploration, experimentation, instability, self-focus, and feeling in-between (Arnett, 2015). The focus on finding romantic partners during this period is emblematic of the freedom and reduced responsibility of this developmental period (Hawkins et al., 2023). Other typical experiences include living independently from their parents, attending post-secondary educational institutions, and engaging in a professional career (Hawkins et al., 2023; Lucas et al., 2024).

Sexual exploration is a crucial developmental aspect of emerging adulthood. The importance of sexual exploration—whether it be to find one’s sexual identity or to engage in sexual activities—becomes more obvious when examining emerging adults who have had late sexual transition (LST). One’s sexual transition is considered late after age 18, as proposed by various measures (i.e., the social clock theory and statistical norms; Lucas et al., 2024). According to Lucas et al. (2024), LST was linked to delayed development and negative psychological well-being of emerging adults, despite late transitioners’ likelihood of obtaining higher academic achievements compared to those who transitioned early. Late transitioners were less likely to achieve independence, romantic and intimate relationships, or professional careers (Lucas et al., 2024), which are the developmental tasks associated with emerging adulthood. More importantly, relational and emotional challenges associated with LST, such as feelings of inadequacy, incompetence, negative self-perceptions, and harsh comparisons (Lucas et al., 2024), may further reduce their chances of future sexual opportunities.

Considering that positive sexual experiences in adolescence and emerging adulthood can shape sexual experiences in the later stages of life (Carcedo et al., 2020), research suggests that public school sexual education should expand its topics. Current sexual education focuses on negative health outcomes (e.g., teen pregnancy and sexually transmitted infections) and the physiological aspects of sex (e.g., anatomy; Nurgitz et al., 2021). This type of sexual education creates a gap in not discussing relational intimacy and the emotional aspect of sexual satisfaction (Nurgitz et al., 2021). Sexual satisfaction, thus, is a notable factor in assessing one’s well-being, especially from a developmental perspective.

## Literature review

### Sexual Satisfaction as an Individual-Level Measure

Sexual satisfaction is a reliable predictor of overall well-being (Carcedo et al., 2020; Karakose et al., 2023), sexual health (Flynn et al., 2016; Higgins et al., 2011), and relationship satisfaction (Park et al., 2023; Quinn-Nilas, 2020; Józefacka et al., 2023). The conventional understanding of sexual satisfaction tends to center on committed relationships, as reflected in its most accepted definition of “an affective response arising from one’s subjective evaluation of the positive and negative dimensions associated with one’s sexual relationship” (Lawrance & Byers, 1995, p. 268). Recently, more studies have been challenging this dyadic assumption. For example, Shaw and Rogge (2016) defined sexual satisfaction as “the global positive and negative evaluations of one’s sex life” (p. 250) which includes both solitary and partnered sexual activities while acknowledging individual-level contribution to sexual satisfaction. Supporting the inclusion of singles, Fischer (2023) identified common variables (i.e., satisfaction with singlehood/relationship, sexual activity, body image, genital images, and sexual function) that correlated with sexual satisfaction for both single and partnered individuals. As a result, research including singles captured a deeper understanding of sexual satisfaction as a subjective assessment of sexual well-being and shifted the focus of sexual satisfaction research from couple-level to individual-level.

Previous research supports being in a romantic relationship as a protective factor in mental health among adolescents and emerging adults (Carcedo et al., 2019) and among deployed military members (Smith-Osborne & Jani, 2014). In addition, individuals in relationships have been societally recognized as having more benefits than singles (see Fischer, 2023 and Till et al., 2016 for a full review). However, a study by Till et al. (2016) found that participants with lower relationship satisfaction had more suicide risk factors than singles, while those in happy relationships enjoyed the benefits of a relationship (e.g., higher life satisfaction and less suicidal ideation). The study highlighted the ambivalent effect of a romantic relationship depending on its level of relationship satisfaction, which implied that not all romantic relationships shared the same effects. In fact, a study by Beckmeyer and Jamison (2021) categorized unmarried emerging adult romantic relationships into five groups and found differences in well-being (i.e., depressive symptoms and life satisfaction) between these groups. The study confirmed that romantic relationships could have an adverse effect and challenged the conventional notion that partnered individuals are better off than singles.

With the shift toward an individualistic focus, research in sexual satisfaction expanded by including singles and thus became more inclusive with relationship status, which traditionally only referred to committed relationships (i.e., married, engaged, dating; Beckmeyer & Jamison, 2021). Sexual satisfaction research on singles is valuable as sexual satisfaction is an important indicator of sexual health (Flynn et al., 2016; Higgins et al., 2011), which affects an individual’s overall health and well-being (World Health Organization, 2006). Research on singles is increasingly becoming more applicable to the modern world as singles comprise an increasing portion of the population in the twenty-first century (Kislev, 2021; Park et al., 2021; Træen & Kvalem, 2022). Research on singles’ sexual satisfaction looks at satisfaction with “singlehood” as their relationship status. Studies found that singles with greater satisfaction with singlehood had higher sexual satisfaction as well (Fischer, 2023; Park et al., 2021). Specifically, a study by Træen & Kvalem (2022) found that older individuals, women, and LGBTQ+ participants reported higher levels of singlehood satisfaction than their counterparts.

The acceptance of singlehood as a relationship status led to studying sexual behaviours related to singlehood. Apart from satisfaction with singlehood, sexual behaviours have been explored in the domains of solitary sexual acts (e.g., masturbation, viewing pornography, etc.) and having casual sex. Previous research on solitary sexual acts has been predominantly examined in the context of committed relationships and has produced mixed results on sexual satisfaction (Velten & Margraf, 2017; see Wright et al., 2017 for a full review). However, these sexual acts are important alternatives for singles to achieve sexual pleasure independently of partner availability (see Træen & Kvalem, 2022; Wright et al., 2017 for a full review). Singles can fulfill their sexual desires with non-romantic partners by engaging in casual sex and different forms of casual sexual relationships and experiences (CSREs; e.g., hookups, one-night stands, friends with benefits, booty calls, fuck buddies). CSREs are especially observed among emerging adults, which contribute to their early sexual experiences and shape their expectations of sexual relationships (Claxton & Dulmen, 2013; Furman & Shaffer, 2011; Hawkins et al., 2023). Acknowledging the function of solitary sexual acts and extending types of sexual relationships (i.e., CSREs) broadened the understanding of sexual behaviours among singles and led subsequent researchers to hypothesize about the difference in sexual satisfaction between single and partnered individuals.

### Comparing Sexual Satisfaction across Relationship Statuses

Comprehensively comparing sexual satisfaction between single and partnered individuals requires valid measurement tools. Previous studies used scales, such as the Global Measure of Sexual Satisfaction (GMSEX; Lawrance & Byers, 1995) and the New Sexual Satisfaction Scale-Short form (NSSS-S; Štulhofer et al., 2010), which use a single-item measure of sexual satisfaction to ask individuals about partnered sexual activities (Park et al., 2021). This means that, while a single-item measure of sexual satisfaction in singlehood is generally accepted in the literature (Træen & Kvalem, 2022), there are significant limitations inherent to this mode of data collection. To respond to this limitation, Park and MacDonald (2022) developed a more comprehensive measure designed to compare the sexual satisfaction of single and partnered individuals by assessing levels of sexual desire for dyadic and solitary sexual acts and the frequency of those sexual acts. This allowed both single and partnered individuals to answer on a common scale and, therefore, enabled a more seamless comparison of sexual satisfaction across different relationship statuses.

Further discourse on the sexual satisfaction of different relationship statuses extended its recognition of long-distance relationships (LDRs) as a distinct subgroup of romantic relationships. LDR is “a relationship in which there is a considerable geographical distance between partners, it would be practically impossible for partners to see one another every day, and the majority of communication within the relationship is not face-to-face” (Pistole & Roberts, 2011, as cited in Goldsmith & Byers, 2020, p. 177). Individuals in LDRs are often compared to those in conventional committed relationships, known as geographically close relationships (GCRs; Haskey & Lewis, 2006). For example, a study by Lee and Pistole (2012) found that there were differences in the levels of gossiping and idealization between GCRs and LDRs among those with insecure attachment (i.e., anxious and avoidant). These findings indicate that attachment significantly predicted LDR sustainment (Hammonds et al., 2020). Moreover, Goldsmith and Byers (2020, 2023) explored differences in relationship and sexual maintenance behaviours between GCRs and LDRs. Similar to research comparing single and partnered individuals, Goldsmith and Byers (2020, 2023) found evidence that LDRs are a distinct type of romantic relationship. The researchers found variables that affect sexual satisfaction within LDRs (e.g., sexual maintenance behaviours) and also offered deeper insight into the understanding of sexual satisfaction (e.g., association with relationship satisfaction).

 LDRs may be of particular salience to emerging adults attending universities away from their social support networks. While education is a meaningful pursuit for emerging adults, romantic relationships may be compromised and they may be forced into LDRs during this period (Lucas et al., 2024). Indeed, a study by Waterman et al. (2017) looked at LDR and college adjustment and found that students in LDRs were more likely than those in GCRs to adjust to college with difficulties due to loneliness and distress experienced from being away from their partners. Furthermore, much of the research on LDRs is generally concerned with relationship dissolution (Ayuso, 2019; Baldt, 2020; Cameron & Ross, 2007). This implies that the success of LDRs is relationship survival, which sets the tone that qualitative factors such as sexual satisfaction are assumed to suffer as a result.

### Sexual Satisfaction of Military Personnel

 Military personnel are also subjected to LDRs due to military operational requirements such as training, postings, and deployments. Studies have found that deployment exposes service members (SMs) and their partners to stressors that negatively impact marital satisfaction, such as length of deployment (Smith et al., 2017), partners’ coping strategies (Giff et al., 2020), protective buffering by partners (Carter et al., 2020), and a lack of communication (Bóia et al., 2018). Nonetheless, a qualitative study by Smith-Osborne and Jani (2014) explains that military culture, in which hierarchy and service before self are the basis of the system, mediates communication within the couple and the survival of the LDR. Hence, younger partners and those with limited access to military support services have more threats to relationship resilience (Smith-Osborne & Jani, 2014). Another study by Giff et al. (2020) found that SMs’ and partners’ relationship satisfaction depend on the type of partners’ coping strategies (i.e., problem-focused, emotion-focused, and avoidance coping). This finding highlights the undeniable influence SMs’ partners have on the relationship dynamics and encourages adequate support to be available and accessible for these partners. By extension, military LDR requires its own research to identify relationship needs and to better assist couples whose relationships are at risk as the result of military operations.

A recent study by Quinn-Nilas (2020) found empirical evidence supporting bidirectionality between sexual satisfaction and relationship satisfaction. This finding emphasized the intricate association between these two constructs by observing how changes in one construct affect the other over time. Considering that previous research with military samples have predominantly been concerned with marital satisfaction and deployment (Giff et al., 2020; Smith et al., 2017; Carter et al., 2020), the finding on bidirectionality questions whether deployment, by extension other military operations, could also affect the sexual satisfaction of SMs and their partners. Unfortunately, research on sexual satisfaction and the military is limited to the harmful effects on mental health (Richardson et al., 2020), posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD; Bird et al., 2021), military sexual trauma (Blais et al., 2020; see Rosebrock & Carroll, 2016 for a full review). These topics show the neglected aspect of sexual satisfaction in the research field involving SMs and their partners, despite sexual satisfaction’s widely studied association with well-being.

## Current Study

Previous research has compared sexual satisfaction between single and partnered individuals and further distinguished LDR from conventional committed relationships, particularly among university students. However, despite the distinction, there has been a lack of studies directly comparing sexual satisfaction among these three groups: singlehood, committed relationships, and LDR. There is also a gap in the sexual satisfaction research in military samples and emerging adult samples, as the research mainly focuses on unpropitious associations of sexual satisfaction with negative outcomes (i.e., PTSD for the military and relationship dissolution for the students). Therefore, this study aims to explore the sexual satisfaction levels among Naval/Officer Cadets (N/OCdts) in different relationship statuses to address those research gaps. This study was guided by the broad research questions: “How does sexual satisfaction differ among individuals in singlehood, committed relationships, and LDRs?” and “How are solitary and dyadic sexual desires associated with individuals in LDRs?”

# Methodology

## Procedures

 Upon receiving approval from the RMC Undergraduate Research Ethics Board, participants on the cadet master list were invited via email. The email contained two links to the online surveys on Survey Monkey depending on the participant’s choice of language (English or French). The survey began with an information letter explaining the purpose of the study, confidentiality, and withdrawal options, addressing potential benefits and risks of completing this survey, and asking for consent. The participants were then asked to complete a demographics questionnaire, a battery of scales, and some open-ended questions about their LDR experiences. No question, including demographics, was mandatory to respond. The participants were debriefed at the end of the survey with a reminder of the purpose and confidentiality, contact information of the research team, and a list of available resources was available to participants.

## Participants

 Initially, 346 individuals responded to the surveys (the English and French versions were combined for all analyses). Some participants were excluded due to not providing consent (*n* = 3), failed attention checks (*n* = 153), incomplete or poor-quality responses (*n* = 11), and non-RMC affiliation (i.e., “My [significant other] attends RMC”; *n* = 3). The final sample (*n* = 176) was mainly N/OCdts enrolled in the Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP; *n* = 164, 93.2%), along with other personnel who claimed affiliation with RMC (e.g., civilian students, staff, faculty, etc.) as shown in Table 1. Participants were not forced to answer demographic questions and some individuals elected not to answer some or all questions, so percentages may not add up to 100. The age ranged from 18 to 59 years old (*M* = 21.19, *SD* = 4.36), where 18-22, 23-29, and 30+ years old accounted for 86.9%, 9.7%, and 3.4% of the sample, respectively. There were 112 men (63.3%), 56 women (31.6%), and 3 who chose “prefer not to answer” (1.7%). Due to the small sample, only men and women were included in the advanced analyses (i.e., t-tests, ANOVAs and Regressions) and all other gender responses were excluded. In terms of sexual orientation, respondents were 83.5% heterosexual, 1.7% homosexual, 9.7% bisexual, and 2.3% chose “prefer not to answer.” Participants were 75.3% White, 16.5% Asian, and 2.3% chose “prefer not to answer.” Relationship status included “married or common-law” (2.3%), “engaged” (10.2%), “exclusively dating” (51.7%), “casual” (10.1%), and “single” (25.8%). Similar to gender, relationship status had three groups for the advanced analysis: single (“single” and “casual”), committed (“exclusively dating,” “engaged,” “married/common-law,” but excluding LDR), and LDR (those who indicated that they are currently in relationships *and* are in an LDR).

**Table 1**

*Demographics*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Characteristics |  | n  | % |
| **Age** |  | *N* = 176 |  |
| 18-22 |  | 152 | 86.9 |
| 23-29 |  | 17 | 9.7 |
| 30+ |  | 6 | 3.4 |
| **Affiliation with RMC** |  | *N* = 176 |  |
| Regular Officer Training Plan (ROTP) |  | 164 | 93.2 |
| University Training Plan for Non-Commissioned Members (UTPNCM) |  | 3 | 1.7 |
| Civilian |  | 1 | .6 |
| Indigenous Leadership Opportunity Year (ILOY) |  | 1 | .6 |
| Staff |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Faculty |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Other |  | 3 | 1.7 |
| **Gender** |  | *N* = 175 |  |
| Men |  | 111 | 63.4 |
| Women |  | 56 | 32.0 |
| Transgender |  | 1 | .6 |
| Non-binary |  | 4 | 2.3 |
| Prefer not to answer |  | 3 | 1.7 |
| **Sexual Orientation** |  | *N* = 176 |  |
| Asexual |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Bisexual |  | 17 | 9.7 |
| Heterosexual |  | 147 | 83.5 |
| Homosexual |  | 3 | 1.7 |
| Pansexual |  | 1 | .6 |
| Other |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Prefer not to answer |  | 4 | 2.3 |
| **Ethnicity** |  | *N* = 176 |  |
| White |  | 133 | 75.6 |
| Black (including West Indian) |  | 4 | 2.3 |
| Asian (East and Southeast) |  | 29 | 16.5 |
| Middle Eastern/North African |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Hispanic/Latino |  | 2 | 1.1 |
| Indigenous |  | 3 | 1.7 |
| Prefer not to answer |  | 4 | 2.3 |
| **Relationship Status** |  | *N* = 176 |  |
| Single |  | 45 | 25.6 |
| Casual (hook ups, friends with benefits) |  | 18 | 10.2 |
| Exclusively dating |  | 91 | 51.7 |
| Engaged |  | 18 | 10.2 |
| Married/Common-law**Military Partners**Yes (dual-military couple) |  | 4*N* = 14176 | 2.354 |
| No (military-civilian couple) |  | 65 | 46 |

*Note*. Groups in Gender and Relationship Status are combined for analysis, which is explained in the participant section.

## Measures

### Sexual Satisfaction

The Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale —Revised (Park & MacDonald, 2022) was used to measure the overall satisfaction of sexual life ranging from 1 (not at all) to 7 (extremely). A higher score means a higher level of reported sexual satisfaction. See Supplementary Material for the full descriptives of each item.

### Sexual Desire

Sexual Desire Inventory-2 (Spector et al., 1996) assessed sexual desire. The scale differentiated dyadic desire and solitary desire. Dyadic desire was further differentiated into partner-specific dyadic desire (e.g., “How strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner?”) and attractive-other dyadic desire (e.g., “When you first see an attractive person, how strong is your sexual desire?”). Unlike Park and MacDonald (2022), this study used the same survey for all relationship statuses, but there was a directive before the scale indicating that participants who were singles substitute the word “partner” with “someone.” Items had 8-point or 9-point scales with anchors corresponding to each question. A higher score means a higher level of sexual desire, which refers to an interest in or wish for sexual activity.

### Desire for and Engagement in Specific Sexual Acts

 A total of 12 specific sexual acts were divided into partnered acts (ten of them) and solitary acts (i.e., “Sexually touching myself (e.g., masturbating)” and “Reaching orgasm by myself”; Park & Macdonald, 2022). Each sexual act was measured twice to indicate the desired frequency and actual frequency. Participants rated a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*a lot*) to indicate the potential discrepancies between the desired frequency and actual frequency of sexual acts. A higher score means a higher level of desired frequency and actual frequency of sexual acts as listed.

## Analysis Plan

 This study was a replication and extension of Park and MacDonald (2021). All three scales measure (1) sexual satisfaction, (2) sexual desire, and (3) desire for and engagement in specific sexual acts, and the analysis using correlation, ANOVA, and regression was based on the methodology employed by Park and MacDonald (2021). The adaptations made for this study included having one survey instead of having separate versions for each relationship status, incorporating LDR in the analysis, conducting a paired-sample t-test on desired and actual frequencies across relationship statuses, and conducting an independent t-test to see if having a military partner affects sexual satisfaction. Following Cohen's (1988) benchmarks for effect sizes, correlations were classified as small (r = 0.10-0.29), medium (r = 0.30-0.49), and large (r ≥ 0.50).

# Results

 A Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between sexual satisfaction and seven predictors, as shown in Table 2 below. The results revealed that there were significant but small negative relationships between sexual satisfaction and solitary sexual desire, *r*(167) = -.21, *p* = .008, dyadic desire with other, *r*(167) = -.16, *p* = .043, and actual frequency of solitary sexual acts, *r*(152) = -.18, *p* = .025. A large significant positive relationship was observed between sexual satisfaction and actual frequency of partnered sexual acts, *r*(151) = .62, *p* <.001.

**Table 2**

*Correlations between the Study Variables*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Variables | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 |
| 1. Sexual satisfaction | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. SDI\_solitary | -.21\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. SDI\_dyadic | .10 | .26\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4. SDI\_dyadic\_Other | -.16\* | .36\*\* | .29\*\* | - |  |  |  |  |
| 5. Want\_solitary | -.07 | .75 | .23 | .32 | - |  |  |  |
| 6. Want\_partnered | -.06 | .28\*\* | .79\*\* | .22\*\* | .24\*\* | - |  |  |
| 7. Do\_solitary | -.18\* | .66\*\* | .22\*\* | .26\*\* | .56\*\* | .32\*\* | - |  |
| 8. Do\_partnered | .62\*\* | -.10 | .23\*\* | .14 | .08 | .16\* | .04 | - |

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

\*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).
SDI\_solitary = solitary sexual desire, SDI\_dyadic = dyadic sexual desire (with partner), SDI\_dyadic\_Other = dyadic sexual desire (with other), Want\_solitary = desired frequency of solitary sexual acts, Want\_partnered = desired frequency of partnered sexual acts, Do\_solitary = actual frequency of solitary sexual acts, and Do\_partnered = actual frequency of partnered sexual acts.

The levels of sexual satisfaction by relationship status, gender, and age are presented in Table 3 below. The mean difference revealed that partnered individuals had the highest level of sexual satisfaction compared to other groups with *M* = 5.26, *SD* = 1.32. Single individuals, *M* = 3.27, *SD* = 1.70, were less satisfied than LDR individuals on average, *M* = 4.99, *SD* = 1.63. For gender, women were more satisfied than men on average, *M* = 5.01, *SD* = 1.40 and *M* = 4.23, *SD* = 1.89 respectively. For the age group, 23 to 29 years old were most satisfied on average, *M* = 4.63, *SD* = 1.65, while 18 to 22 years old were very close as well, *M* = 4.47, *SD* = 1.80. The 30+ years old group was the least sexually satisfied on average in comparison, *M* = 3.92, *SD* =2.16.

Among the four significant items from Table 3, LDR individuals had the highest levels of solitary sexual desire and actual frequency of solitary sexual acts, whereas singles had the highest level of dyadic sexual desire with other and the lowest level of actual frequency of partnered sexual acts. Interestingly, women scored lower than men across all items on average except for the desired frequency of solitary sexual desire (*M* = 4.16, *SD* =2.04) and the actual frequency of partnered sexual acts (*M* = 4.65, *SD* =1.26), in addition to their higher level of sexual satisfaction. Lastly, the group of 23 to 29 years old scored higher than other groups across all significantly correlated items on average, except for solitary sexual desire.

**Table 3**

*Descriptive Statistics of All Study Variables across Relationship Status, Gender, and Age*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Relationship Status** | **Gender** | **Age** |
|  | Single | Partnered | LDR | Men | Women | 18-22 | 23-29 | 30+ |
|  | *n* = 49 | *n* = 53 | *n* = 51 | *n* = 99 | *n* = 53 | *n* = 132 | *n* = 15 | *n* = 6 |
|  | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* | *M(SD)* |
| Sexual satisfaction | 3.27 (1.70) | 5.26 (1.32) | 4.99 (1.63) | 4.23 (1.89) | 5.01 (1.40) | 4.47 (1.80) | 4.63 (1.65) | 3.92 (2.16) |
| SDI\_solitary | 3.53 (1.95) | 2.86 (1.84) | 3.82 (1.90) | 3.63 (1.88) | 2.95 (1.99) | 3.40 (1.98) | 3.28 (1.71) | 3.46 (1.58) |
| SDI\_dyadic | 4.82 (1.63) | 5.20 (1.26) | 5.82 (1.43) | 5.43 (1.53) | 4.89 (1.39) | 5.22 (1.51) | 5.39 (1.65) | 5.69 (0.52) |
| SDI\_dyadic\_Other | 3.79 (1.83) | 2.90 (1.85) | 2.80 (2.29) | 3.46 (2.07) | 2.63 (1.85) | 3.12 (1.95) | 4.13 (2.60) | 2.33 (1.83) |
| Want\_solitary | 3.77 (1.90) | 3.72 (1.71) | 4.21 (1.83) | 3.79 (1.66) | 4.16 (2.04) | 3.82 (1.82) | 4.34 (1.53) | 4.42 (2.38) |
| Want\_partnered | 5.31 (1.34) | 5.37 (1.05) | 5.81 (1.09) | 5.74 (1.11) | 5.04 (1.19) | 5.48 (1.23) | 5.57 (0.78) | 5.65 (1.04) |
| Do\_solitary | 3.98 (1.92) | 3.45 (1.80) | 4.63 (1.79) | 4.31 (1.85) | 3.45 (1.87) | 3.97 (1.93) | 4.41 (1.55) | 3.92 (1.86) |
| Do\_partnered | 2.84 (1.97) | 4.90 (1.20) | 4.08 (1.42) | 3.63 (1.87) | 4.65 (1.26) | 3.92 (1.77) | 4.34 (1.75) | 4.13 (1.61) |

Results from a two-way ANOVA were used to explore the effect of gender and relationship status on sexual satisfaction. The means and standard deviations for sexual satisfaction are presented in Table 4 below. The result indicated a significant main effect for relationship status, *F*(2, 162) = 12.63, *p* = <.001, partial $η^{2} $= .135, but no significant main effect was observed for gender, *F*(1, 162) = 1.18, *p* = .280, partial $η^{2}$ = .007 and there was no significant interaction, *F*(2, 162) = .97, *p* = .673, partial $η^{2}$ = .005. Post hoc testing using Tukey HSD showed that sexual satisfaction was significantly lower for single individuals than both partnered and LDR individuals (*p* = <.001). However, there was no significant difference between partnered and LDR individuals (*p* = .643).

**Table 4**

*Descriptive Statistics of Two-Way ANOVA for Gender and Relationship Status*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Gender** | **Relationship Status** | ***N*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** |
| Men | Single | 50 | 3.20 | 1.76 |
|  | Partnered | 26 | 5.19 | 1.38 |
|  | LDR | 36 | 4.96 | 1.70 |
|  | Total | 112 | 4.23 | 1.90 |
| Women | Single | 9 | 3.89 | 1.10 |
|  | Partnered | 31 | 5.31 | 1.29 |
|  | LDR | 16 | 5.06 | 1.50 |
|  | Total | 56 | 5.01 | 1.40 |
| Total | Single | 59 | 3.31 | 1.69 |
|  | Partnered | 57 | 5.26 | 1.32 |
|  | LDR | 52 | 4.99 | 1.63 |
|  | Total | 168 | 4.49 | 1.78 |

Multiple linear regression (enter method) was conducted to examine the extent to which solitary and dyadic sexual desires affected sexual satisfaction among single, partnered, and LDR individuals. The results in Table 5 below revealed a significant overall model fit for partnered individuals *F*(5,54) = 2.50, *p* = .043, $R\_{}^{2}$= .19. Further examination showed that only the solitary sexual desire significantly predicted sexual satisfaction, *t* = -2.54, *p* = .014.

On the other hand, age significantly predicted the sexual satisfaction of LDR individuals, *t* = -2.16, *p* = .036. The result showed that increasing age predicts decreasing sexual satisfaction among LDR individuals.

**Table 5**

*Solitary and Dyadic Sexual Desire Associated with Sexual Satisfaction*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Relationship Status** |
|  | **Single** | **Partnered** | **LDR** |
|  | *β* | *t* | *p* | *β* | *t* | *p* | *β* | *t* | *p* |
| Gender | .64 | 1.04 | .30 | -.11 | -.29 | .78 | .25 | .49 | .63 |
| Age | 1.01 | 1.13 | .26 | -.45 | -1.47 | .15 | -1.00 | -2.16 | **.036** |
| SDI\_solitary | -.10 | -.82 | .42 | -.26 | -2.54 | **.014** | -.15 | -1.16 | .25 |
| SDI\_dyadic | -.17 | -.95 | .35 | .14 | .93 | .36 | .16 | .92 | .36 |
| SDI\_dyadic\_Other | .18 | 1.19 | .24 | -.06 | -.61 | .55 | .06 | .56 | .58 |

Table 6 below shows the results from a paired sample t-test comparing the desired and actual frequencies of partnered/solitary sexual acts across relationship statuses. Generally, desired and actual frequencies of many sexual acts were significantly different across all relationship statuses. However, a closer examination revealed that single and LDR individuals exhibited similar patterns. These groups had significant differences between the levels of desired and actual frequencies across identical partnered acts (all *p*s <.005). Another similarity, while not significant, among solitary acts (i.e., “sexually touching oneself,” and “reaching orgasm by myself”) was that they engaged in more solitary sexual acts than their desired frequencies (single: *M* = -.22, *SD* = 1.99, *M* = -.16, *SD* = 2.00; LDR: *M* = -.35, *SD* = 1.92, *M* = -.49, *SD* = 2.06). In contrast, partnered individuals had a few items with no significant differences.

**Table 6**

*Paired Sample T-Test for Specific Sexual Acts*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Single** | **Partnered** | **LDR** |
|  | ***M (SD)*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***t*** | ***p*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***t*** | ***p*** |
| **Factor 1 (partnered acts)** |
| 1. Kissing someone | 2.62 (2.46) | 7.28 | <.001 | .08 (1.38) | .40 | .69 | 1.84 (2.01) | 6.54 | <.001 |
| 2. Sexual touching with someone (e.g., genital stimulation) | 2.46 (2.28) | 7.48 | <.001 | .26 (2.03) | .95 | .35 | 1.78 (2.06) | 6.18 | <.001 |
| 3. Giving oral sex to someone | 1.88 (2.18) | 6.04 | <.001 | .57 (2.00) | 2.07 | .04 | 1.88 (2.28) | 5.82 | <.001 |
| 4. Receiving oral sex from someone | 2.71 (2.06) | 9.22 | <.001 | .85 (2.12) | 2.91 | .005 | 2.25 (2.19) | 7.36 | <.001 |
| 5. Penetrative sex | 2.94 (2.16) | 9.51 | <.001 | 1.15 (1.95) | 4.31 | <.001 | 2.06 (2.32) | 6.34 | <.001 |
| 6. Trying multiple sexual positions with someone | 2.80 (2.17) | 9.02 | <.001 | 1.09 (1.99) | 4.00 | <.001 | 2.30 (2.12) | 7.67 | <.001 |
| 7. Seeing someone naked | 2.37 (2.46) | 6.75 | <.001 | -.40 (1.77) | -1.63 | .11 | .92 (2.23) | 2.96 | .005 |
| 8. Being seen naked by someone | 1.02 (2.52) | 2.83 | .007 | -1.02 (2.06) | -3.60 | <.001 | .39 (2.39) | 1.17 | .25 |
| 9. Receiving an orgasm from someone | 3.16 (2.01) | 11.00 | <.001 | 1.04 (1.72) | 4.39 | <.001 | 1.92 (2.12) | 6.49 | <.001 |
| 10. Giving an orgasm to someone | 2.78 (2.58) | 7.52 | <.001 | 1.04 (1.93) | 3.88 | <.001 | 2.14 (2.05) | 7.45 | <.001 |
| **Factor 2 (solitary acts)** |
| 11. Sexually touching myself (e.g., masturbating) | -.22 (1.99) | -.78 | .44 | .36 (1.23) | 2.13 | .04 | -.35 (1.92) | -1.32 | .19 |
| 12. Reaching orgasm by myself | -.16 (2.00) | -.57 | .57 | .17 (1.24) | 1.00 | .32 | -.49 (2.06) | -1.70 | .10 |

Multiple linear regression (enter method) was conducted to evaluate the extent to which desired and actual frequencies of solitary and/or partnered sexual acts affected sexual satisfaction between relationship statuses, including both unique and interaction effects (Table 7). The results revealed a significant overall model fit for all three relationship statuses: single individuals, *F*(8, 39) = 8.34, p <.001, $R\_{}^{2}$= .56; partnered, *F*(8, 44) = 5.12, p = <.001, $R\_{}^{2}$= .39; LDR, *F*(8, 42) = 2.94, p = .011, $R\_{}^{2}$ = .24. Further examination showed that desiring partnered sexual acts significantly predicted sexual satisfaction of single individuals, *t* = -3.25, *p* = .002, and age significantly predicted sexual satisfaction of LDR individuals, *t* = -2.97, *p* = .005. Despite the significant overall model fit, no other predictors were significant.

**Table 7**

*Solitary and Partnered Sexual Acts Associated with Sexual Satisfaction*

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **Relationship Status** |
|  | **Single** | **Partnered** | **LDR** |
|  | *β* | *t* | *p* | *β* | *t* | *p* | *β* | *t* | *p* |
| Gender | 5.17 | -1.61 | .12 | .05 | .12 | .91 | -.72 | -1.37 | .18 |
| Age | .41 | .57 | .58 | -.14 | -.52 | .60 | -1.33 | -2.97 | **.005** |
| Want\_solitary | .13 | .57 | .58 | -.10 | -.43 | .67 | .37 | 1.19 | .24 |
| Want\_partnered | -.66 | -3.25 | **.002** | -1.29 | -1.87 | .07 | .47 | .54 | .59 |
| Do\_solitary | -.16 | -.69 | .50 | -.11 | -.42 | .68 | -.21 | -.80 | .43 |
| Do\_partnered | .38 | .78 | .44 | -.96 | -1.10 | .28 | 1.58 | 1.14 | .26 |
| Want X Do (solitary) | .01 | .11 | .92 | .00 | .04 | .97 | -.05 | -.76 | .45 |
| Want X Do (partnered) | .07 | .81 | .43 | .28 | 1.90 | .06 | -.22 | -.95 | .35 |

 An independent t-test was conducted to compare sexual satisfaction between participants with military partners (*n* = 76, *M* = 4.90, *SD* = 1.51) and those without (*n* = 65, *M* = 4.79, *SD* = 1.68), as shown in Table 8 below. Levene’s Test indicated no significant difference in variances between the two groups, *F* = 1.03, *p* = .312; thus, equal variance was assumed. The t-test results showed that there was no significant mean difference between those with and without military partners, *t* = .394, *p* = .695.

**Table 8**

*Descriptive Statistic for Independent T-Test of Having a Military Partner*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Military Partner** | ***n*** | ***M*** | ***SD*** | ***t*** | ***p*** |
| Yes | 76 | 4.90 | 1.51 | .394 | .695 |
| No | 65 | 4.79 | 1.68 |  |  |

# Discussion

This study aimed to explore differences in levels of sexual satisfaction among N/OCdts in various relationship statuses. At the correlation level, sexual satisfaction was negatively related to desiring sexual acts with others and by oneself, engaging in solitary sexual acts, and positively related to engaging in sexual acts with partners. Partnered individuals were the most sexually satisfied group on average whereas singles were least sexually satisfied in comparison. There was no significant difference in sexual satisfaction levels between partnered and LDR individuals. Using the Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale-Revised to evaluate sexual satisfaction levels of individuals, without being restricted to relationship status, is one of the strengths of this paper, especially since the scale has the advantage of using four items compared to one.

This study also examined solitary and dyadic sexual desires associated with each group revealing the distinct behaviours of singlehood, committed relationships, and LDRs. Singles desired dyadic sexual acts with other more than other groups but had the least actual frequency of partnered sexual acts. Considering that desiring more partnered sexual acts predicted lower sexual satisfaction in singles, the fact that singles had the lowest levels of sexual satisfaction makes sense. Partnered individuals had the lowest desire for solitary sexual acts and had the highest levels of actual frequency of partnered sexual acts compared to other groups. Solitary sexual desire was negatively associated with partnered individuals’ sexual satisfaction and sexual satisfaction was positively related to having sexual acts with partner. Considering these results, the highest level of sexual satisfaction observed with partnered individuals can be justified by congruency between the levels of dyadic desire and the actual frequency of partnered sexual acts. Consistent with Dosch et al. (2016), partnered individuals as “dyadic men/women” (p. 2040) had the greatest sexual satisfaction with high dyadic desire and activity and low solitary desire and activity. On the other hand, singles as “solitary men/women” (Dosch et al., 2016, p. 2040) had the lowest sexual satisfaction with high solitary and low dyadic desire and activity but, contrary to previous findings, the results from the current study reflected rather high dyadic desires among singles. While both Dosch et al. (2016) and the current study agreed on singles being the least sexually satisfied, Dosch et al. (2016) described singles as individuals with low dyadic desire and activity whereas the current study associated having high dyadic desire and activity to less sexual satisfaction. Thus, this discordance depicts the influential role of dyadic desire and activity in sexual satisfaction among singles.

Consistent with Dosch et al. (2016), the sexual satisfaction of LDR individuals as “dyadic and solitary men/women” (p. 2040) falls between that of single and partnered individuals with high dyadic and high solitary sexual desire and activity. While LDR individuals had similar levels of sexual satisfaction as partnered individuals, the discrepancies between their mean desired and actual frequencies were nearly identical to that of singles. This finding highlights that the LDR is a committed relationship with sexual behaviours like singles, suggesting that, perhaps, individuals in LDRs have a similarly lower sexual frequency to singles but have satisfying sex like partnered individuals. However, Goldsmith and Byers (2020) found a contrasting result about the relationship between sexual maintenance behaviours and sexual satisfaction among LDRs and GCRs. Goldsmith and Byers (2020) found better supporting evidence of a model which asserts romantic and sexual maintenance behaviours affect sexual satisfaction via relationship satisfaction than vice versa. The researchers concluded that the sexual satisfaction maintenance behaviours of individuals in LDRs and GCRs will be similar since behaviours which correlate with higher satisfaction (i.e., idealization) may be independent of physical proximity (Goldsmith & Byers, 2020). While LDRs and GCRs may indeed share many similarities, the current results provide additional clarity on the uniqueness of LDRs and their apparent similarities to singles. Nonetheless, a study on well-being of N/OCdts in LDRs by Thibault (2024) found that these N/OCdts had lower levels of emotional and psychological well-beings than N/OCdts in committed relationships. This finding hints at the nuanced difference between LDRs and GCRs while reasoning their minute difference in sexual satisfaction levels observed in the current study. Therefore, LDRs and GCRs may share more similarities than they warrant, yet this study still offers valuable insight into the uniqueness of LDR by highlighting its similarities with singles.

### Gender

The current results suggest that women in the sample were more sexually satisfied than men. Previous studies demonstrated mixed results in terms of gender differences in levels of sexual satisfaction between men and women. Men’s lower sexual satisfaction could be partially explained by sexual desire discrepancy where the difference between actual and desired frequencies of sex negatively affects their sexual satisfaction (Velten & Margraf, 2017). This desire discrepancy implies that men experience more refusal of their sexual initiatives. For women, sexual frequency does not seem to affect sexual satisfaction as much as men, considering that single women with no sexual activity in the past 12 months scored higher in sexual satisfaction than sexually active women (Træen & Kvalem, 2022). This finding could explain why women were more sexually satisfied than men despite having lower sexual desire levels than men. Women, indeed, showed a complementary pattern for the use of pornography whereas men showed a compensatory pattern (Fischer & Træen, 2022), which supports the higher desired frequency of solitary sexual acts favouring greater sexual satisfaction in women. Alternatively, other studies found no gender differences among individuals in committed relationships (Schmiedeberg & Schröder, 2016; Roels & Janssen, 2020). Another way to explain gender differences is by examining how rewards and costs were measured might determine the sexual satisfaction level (Lawrence and Byers, 1995). Since more women considered relational qualities (e.g., degree of emotional disclosure) to be rewarding and more men with physical aspects (e.g., orgasmic consistency), the researchers asserted that the measurement of sexual satisfaction may have an inherent methodological limitation. Despite this explanation, the items used to measure sexual satisfaction and the list of dyadic and solitary sexual acts in this study were rather physical-focused, which meant men should have scored higher than women. This discrepancy suggests that the previous research does not reflect the current study’s primarily young, heterosexual, male samples and/or the sexual behaviours of women in the military.

### Age

 Age consistently predicted sexual satisfaction negatively for individuals in LDRs in this study. Miguel et al., (2024) whose study looked at whether sexual satisfaction changed with age and found that sexual satisfaction decreased with increasing age. The study explained that younger participants (ages 18 to 44) scored the highest sexual satisfaction compared to 45 to 64 years old and 65+ years old because of a higher sense of purpose and ambitions and more social support (Miguel et al., 2024). This study then suggests that LDR individuals have a lower sense of purpose and ambitions and less social support than the other groups as they age. This claim, however, warrants further research. Another way to explain this is if age refers to the duration of a relationship. However, Velten and Margraf (2017) found that age and relationship duration were not significant predictors of sexual satisfaction in committed relationships. According to Schmiedeberg & Schröder (2016), sexual satisfaction peaked in the second half of the first year of the relationship and then declined after the second year. This finding seems to indicate that, perhaps, age predicted sexual satisfaction via relationship duration, instead of directly affecting sexual satisfaction. Additionally, Schmiedeberg & Schröder (2016) found that having young children affected sexual satisfaction negatively with three to six years old yielding the lowest level. This finding could explain the negative effect of age referring to life circumstances, such as having kids and owning a house together, that pose challenges to maintaining or ameliorating the sexual satisfaction of individuals in LDRs in particular.

### Dual-Military Couple

The mean-level difference shows that an SM with a military partner had higher sexual satisfaction but there was no significant difference. The participants were mainly military personnel, and their results were self-reported, which questions whether self-reported sexual satisfaction will differ from SMs to their partners. This finding also supports Campbell et al. (2017) and suggests that it is not a matter of having a military partner, thus making them a military couple, rather it is having a supportive partner that matters for sexual satisfaction.

Despite the romantic notion espoused by Campbell et al. (2017), the current study delved into the sexual satisfaction of dual-military couples in which both individuals are SMs. Research on dual-military couples in general is limited, and sexual satisfaction research for this group is non-existent, but few studies provide insights into relationship (e.g., marital) satisfaction. Woodall et al. (2020) found that dual-military couples had fewer military stress experiences (e.g., deployment, intense training schedule, and frequent relocations) than military couples with civilian spouses (hereafter “military-civilian couple”). These military stress experiences were associated with lower marital satisfaction as a result of increased work-family conflict (Woodall et al., 2020). The researchers speculated that dual-military couples may have an advantage over military-civilian couples of having a partner who is understanding and supportive of the military. Putting these results together, dual-military couples may have higher marital satisfaction than military-civilian couples, which suggests its status as a protective factor from the military work-life balance stressors and differentiates dual-military couples from military-civilian couples. These are important considerations for individuals and the CAF because women were five times more likely to be dual-military couples than men according to Woodall et al. (2020) and the CAF’s goal is to reach 25% representation of women by 2026 (Department of National Defence, 2024).

## Implications

 The results of this paper have implications for various areas including sexual education for N/OCdts at RMC and retention in the CAF. Research on the sexuality of emerging adults consistently stresses including positive outcomes of sexual behaviours, such as intimacy (Walters & Lefkowitz, 2022) and sexual self-awareness (Higgins et al., 2011), in sexual education that traditionally focused on the physical aspects of sexual satisfaction (see Nurgitz et al., 2021 for a full review). A comprehensive school-based sexual education provided in an accepting environment contributed to increased sexual self-efficacy, which then contributed to increased sexual satisfaction (Nurgitz et al., 2021). While the need for education and training related to sexual misconduct in Canadian Military Colleges was highlighted in a recent report (Arbour, 2022), the narrow focus on misconduct seems to ignore the importance of comprehensive sexual education. Comprehensive sexual education is an effective and proactive prevention strategy for gender-based violence while centering the overall well-being and knowledge of learners (Rollston et al., 2020; Schneider & Hirsch, 2018). Unfortunately, sexual education at RMC is limited to having condoms and brochures in the Medical Inspection Room (military clinic) and at the dormitories. Considering comprehensive sexual education’s mediating role in increasing sexual satisfaction, RMC could employ and support a sexual education delivered by health promoters, who are comfortable with the topic and accepting of various sexual desires and experiences. Therefore, rather than focusing solely on misconduct, RMC and other military educational institutes with young candidates may be better served by offering comprehensive sexual education that emphasizes healthy sexuality and sexual expression.

Examining the relationship between spousal support and retention re-emphasized the protective factor of one’s significant other and family on SM’s well-being. A SM’s retention intention increased with increased spousal support in the US military (Campbell et al., 2017). This finding optimistically relates having supportive partners to the retention of SMs. Thus, it may be in the CAF’s best interest to motivate and facilitate spousal support despite what it asks of them (e.g., LDR as a result of the deployments and a lack of established support networks due to frequent relocations). This assertion then raises the question of how the partners of SMs would like to be involved in the business of war and whether current efforts, such as initiatives undertaken by the Military Family Resource Centres and Canadian Forces Morale and Welfare Services, are effectively supporting the partners in order for them to support SMs. It will also be critical to evaluate whether deployment training (e.g., pre-deployment phase) adequately involves family members and whether they are realistically previewed and briefed on maintaining LDRs. For dual-military couples, Huffman et al., (2017) suggested various strategies from couple-level to military-level. Employing different types of resources such as service and money could positively affect the couples’ perception of organizational support. Furthermore, “soft” organizational support from supervisors, coworkers, organizational climate, and family-friendly culture could also contribute to dual-military couples’ perception of organizational support.

## Limitations and Future Directions

 While this study has a number of strengths such as the specialized sample recruited, there are limitations as well. The most significant limitation of this study is the small sample size. While the sample was specialized and from a difficult-to-reach population, the sample was relatively small and not necessarily representative of military culture as a whole. The sample mainly consisted of N/OCdts at RMC and the affiliation to RMC applies to a small group of the population. As mentioned, this sample was mainly young, heterosexual, and men which underrepresented 2SLGBTQI+ individuals and those in non-dyadic relationships. Future research should strive to collect larger and more diverse samples from comparable military universities, such as the United States Military Academy and the Australian Defence Force Academy. The small sample size also meant that the results from this study were underpowered. The effect size from having a small sample was also evident from having significant overall model fits but observing no significant variables. Having more participants could alleviate the small effect size for future research. Another limitation regarding the sample is volunteer bias for sexuality research of university students (Wiederman, 1999). There have been differences between sexuality research volunteers versus non-volunteers, which skew the results. This bias possibly overestimated results, which is prevalent in research assessing the frequency of particular sexual acts, or it has ambiguous results as it normally does in survey research involving university students (Wiederman, 1999).

The Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale-Revised measured the level of sexual satisfaction with the phrase “sexual life.” As previously mentioned by Park and MacDonald (2022), participants may have different meanings of the phrase, similar to differentiating “partner” from “someone” depending on one’s relationship status for better interpretation. Additionally, the measures were translated into French by bilingual members of the team and back translated. This means that the measures were not validated in French and that there may be questions of reliability or validity for the French responses. Future research should strive to validate the measures used in French.

 This study offers future directions in the areas of relationship status satisfaction. A concept of measuring relationship status satisfaction arises from looking at previous research on satisfaction with singlehood. Research has shown that voluntary singles had “almost comparable rates of sexual satisfaction” (Kislev, 2020, p. 734) compared to partnered individuals. This finding highlighted the voluntariness of singlehood’s influence on sexual satisfaction. Then, the insight of the voluntariness may transfer to other relationship statuses where voluntary single, partnered, and LDR individuals may also be a factor of analysis/comparison in future studies.

# Conclusion

Sexual satisfaction as a measure of one’s well-being is widely accepted. However, measuring sexual satisfaction at an individual level to compare different relationship statuses was still limited to singlehood versus committed relationships and LDRs versus GCRs. This study compared levels of sexual satisfaction across all three groups and the results showed that these groups have distinct sexual behaviours, which indicates that each relationship status requires unique considerations. Partnered individuals had the highest level of sexual satisfaction whereas singles had the lowest. The discrepancies between the levels of solitary and dyadic sexual desires and frequencies of solitary and partnered sexual acts explained the different levels of sexual satisfaction across the groups. The results also showed that individuals in LDRs equivocally behaved like singles and partnered individuals. The finding of this study confirmed that these three groups can be differentiated by their sexual satisfaction levels and associated sexual behaviours.

This study is specifically relevant to N/OCdts at RMC who are undergoing a developmental stage of emerging adulthood in which commitments to a romantic relationship and a career have a crucial influence on one’s identity and freedom. The current results indicated the need for comprehensive sexual education to increase sexual satisfaction considering one’s relationship status, which can assist in making an informed decision and practicing safe sex. In addition, N/OCdts are highly likely to be in LDRs at some point in their careers because of the military requirements. Being aware of the potential effect of the distance on their sexual satisfaction via relationship satisfaction can better prepare SMs and their support networks (i.e., partners) to learn adequate coping mechanisms to maintain their well-being, which contributes to mission success.
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# Appendix

## Appendix A. Email Invitation

You have been invited to participate in the Spicy Sexy Survey. This is entirely voluntary and should take about 10-15 minutes to complete.

Purpose: This research aims to explore differences in sexual satisfaction among different relationship statuses. If you are interested in participating in this study, click the link below. Please note that data collection will be closed on 1 February 2025.

For English: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DMJBC6L

For French: https://fr.surveymonkey.com/r/886ZMKL

Anonymity and Confidentiality: The survey is available in either English or French and the data collected is completely anonymous and confidential. The researcher team will not know who participated.

Withdrawal: Your participation in this study is voluntary and you are not required to answer any questions you are uncomfortable with. You may also withdraw at any time without penalty by exiting the survey. Due to the anonymous nature of the study, it will be impossible to remove specific responses from the dataset once it has been started.

Ethics: The research is being conducted by myself, OCdt. Park, for my undergraduate thesis project under the supervision of Dr. Zidenberg, adjunct professor, Royal Military College of Canada. Should you have any questions or concerns about the ethics of this study, please contact our Research Ethics Board – Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca), Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), and Dr. Nicole Berubé (reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca).

Please do not hesitate to email OCdt. Park (s30220@rmc.ca) with any questions or concerns you may have. Thank you in advance for your participation.

## Appendix A. Invitation à la recherche

Vous avez été invité à participer au Sondage Spicy Sexy. Il s'agit d'une démarche entièrement volontaire qui devrait prendre environ 10 à 15 minutes.

Objectif: Cette étude a pour but d'explorer les différences de satisfaction sexuelle entre les différents statuts relationnels. Si vous souhaitez participer à cette étude, cliquez sur le lien ci-dessous. Veuillez noter que la collecte de données sera clôturée le 1er février 2025.

Pour Anglais: https://www.surveymonkey.com/r/DMJBC6L

Pour Français: https://fr.surveymonkey.com/r/886ZMKL

Anonymat et confidentialité: L'enquête est disponible en anglais ou en français et les données recueillies sont totalement anonymes et confidentielles. L'équipe de chercheurs ne saura pas qui a participé à l'enquête. Retrait: Votre participation à cette étude est volontaire et vous n'êtes pas obligé de répondre à des questions qui vous mettent mal à l'aise. Vous pouvez également vous retirer à tout moment sans pénalité en quittant le sondage.

Éthique: La recherche est menée par moi-même, OCdt. Park, dans le cadre de mon projet de thèse de premier cycle, sous la supervision de Dr. Zidenberg, professeur associé au Collège militaire royal du Canada. Si vous avez des questions ou des inquiétudes concernant l'éthique de cette étude, veuillez contacter le Comité d'éthique de la recherche – Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca), Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), et Dr. Nicole Berubé (reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca).

N'hésitez pas à envoyer un courriel à l'OCdt. Park (s30220@rmc.ca) si vous avez des questions ou des préoccupations. Nous vous remercions d'avance pour votre participation.

## Appendix B. Informed Consent Form

Researchers:

Jiyoon Park

Honours Thesis Student

Department of Military Psychology and Leadership, Royal Military College of Canada

Email: s30220@rmc.ca

Alexandra Zidenberg, PhD

Adjunct Professor, Department of Military Psychology and Leadership, Royal Military College of Canada

Assistant Professor, School of Criminology, University of Montreal

Email: alexandra.zidenberg@rmc-cmr.ca; alexandra.zidenberg@umontreal.ca

Purpose and procedure: The purpose of this study is to explore differences in sexual satisfaction among different relationship statuses. To participate, you must be a minimum of 18 years of age and have had sexual intercourse at least once. If you decide to take part in this study, you will be asked to fill out a series of online questionnaires related to demographics, your sexual and romantic life, and your attitudes. These questionnaires should take no longer than 10-15 minutes to complete in total.

Anonymity and Confidentiality: Strict guidelines will be followed to protect your privacy. The study is completely anonymous and confidential, and the researcher team will not be able to identify who has completed the study. Only group data will be reported and a summary of results will be distributed to those who request. Your anonymous data may be reanalysed in future research projects. If that is the case, all the current privacy protections will apply to that reuse, and you will not be identifiable. Data will be deleted from Survey Monkey, made only accessible by the research team, and anonymous data will be stored indefinitely with them. The information will reside on a password-protected computer in a secure setting for the duration of the storage term described above. Data will be removed from Survey Monkey once the data collection period is completed.

Please note that Survey Monkey does not guarantee the security of information on their site. However, they state that they use the highest level of security possible on the internet. It is strongly suggested that you review Survey Monkey’s statements about the security of information, prior to completing this survey. Furthermore, Survey Monkey stores personal information in the United States where privacy cannot be guaranteed. Please refer to <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/data-privacy/> for more information

Potential Benefits: Participating in this research will contribute to the limited knowledge base on sexual and romantic relationships among members of the Canadian Armed Forces. This research may also help inform therapeutic and support programs for military members and cadets. While there will be no direct benefit to you as a participant, you will have the opportunity to evaluate your sexual and romantic relationships and participate in novel research.

Potential Risks: During participation in this study, there is the potential to experience some discomfort due to the sensitive nature of the questions. Some items may be shocking, difficult to answer, and uncomfortable to rate; however, they are unlikely to cause significant psychological or emotional discomfort. In the debriefing form, you will be given the contact information of the research team and mental health services. Please remember that you have the right to skip any questions you wish or to discontinue your participation at any time without penalty. Should you have any questions or concerns related to the study, please contact Jiyoon Park or Dr. Zidenberg, whose contact information is provided at the top of this page. If you experienced distress while completing the survey or are concerned about your well-being and in need of support, please consider contacting your local crisis intervention service (find yours at <https://findahelpline.com/>).

Talk Suicide Canada: 1-833-456-4566

Wellness Together Canada: 1-866-585-0445

Withdrawal: Your participation in this study is voluntary and you are not required to answer any questions that you are uncomfortable with. You may also withdraw at any time without penalty by exiting the survey. Due to the anonymous nature of the study, it will be impossible to remove specific responses from the dataset once it has been started.

Ethics: This research project has received ethical approval by the Royal Military College Research Ethics Board (REB 25102024). We hope this research will benefit the field of psychology, the Royal Military College and the Canadian Armed Forces. If you have concerns about the ethical nature of this study or your rights as a participant, please contact the president of the undergraduate studies research ethics board, Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca), Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), and Dr. Nicole Berubé (reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca).

Consent: Pressing the “Yes” button (below) will be interpreted as providing consent for participation in this research. It will also be interpreted as indicating that you understand the procedures, realize that you are not required to participate if you so choose, are free to withdraw from the study at any point in time, and freely consent to participate in this research.

If you would like a copy of the consent form, please print a copy for your records. You may also contact the researchers for a copy of the consent form.

Thank you in advance for your participation.

Do you consent to participate in this study?

<Yes> or <No>

#

## Appendix B. Formulaire de consentement éclairé

Chercheurs:

Jiyoon Park

Thèse de doctorat

Département de psychologie militaire et de leadership, Collège militaire royal du Canada

Courriel : s30220@rmc.ca

Alexandra Zidenberg, PhD

Professeur associé, Département de psychologie militaire et de leadership, Collège militaire royal du Canada

Professeur adjoint, École de criminologie, Université de Montréal

Courriel : alexandra.zidenberg@rmc-cmr.ca; alexandra.zidenberg@umontreal.ca

Objectif et procédure: L'objectif de cette étude est d'explorer les différences de satisfaction sexuelle entre les différents statuts relationnels. Pour participer, vous devez être âgé(e) d'au moins 18 ans et avoir eu des rapports sexuels au moins une fois. Si vous décidez de participer à cette étude, il vous sera demandé de remplir une série de questionnaires en ligne portant sur des données démographiques, votre vie sexuelle et sentimentale et vos attitudes. Ces questionnaires ne devraient pas prendre plus de 10 à 15 minutes à remplir au total.

Anonymat et confidentialité: Des directives strictes seront suivies pour protéger votre vie privée. L'étude est totalement anonyme et confidentielle, et l'équipe de chercheurs ne sera pas en mesure d'identifier les personnes ayant participé à l'étude. Seules les données de groupe seront rapportées et un résumé des résultats sera distribué à ceux qui en feront la demande. Vos données anonymes peuvent être réanalysées dans le cadre de futurs projets de recherche. Dans ce cas, toutes les protections actuelles de la vie privée s'appliqueront à cette réutilisation et vous ne serez pas identifiable. Les données seront supprimées de Survey Monkey et ne seront accessibles qu'à l'équipe de recherche, qui conservera indéfiniment les données anonymes. Les données seront conservées sur un ordinateur protégé par un mot de passe dans un environnement sécurisé pendant la durée de stockage décrite ci-dessus. Les données seront supprimées de Survey Monkey une fois la période de collecte des données terminée.

Veuillez noter que Survey Monkey ne garantit pas la sécurité des informations sur son site. Toutefois, il affirme utiliser le niveau de sécurité le plus élevé possible sur l'internet. Nous vous conseillons vivement de prendre connaissance des déclarations de Survey Monkey concernant la sécurité des informations avant de répondre à cette enquête. En outre, Survey Monkey stocke les informations personnelles aux États-Unis, où la confidentialité ne peut être garantie. Pour plus d'informations, veuillez consulter le site <https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/data-privacy/>

Avantages potentiels: La participation à cette recherche contribuera à la base de connaissances limitée sur les relations sexuelles et romantiques parmi les membres des Forces armées canadiennes. Cette recherche peut également contribuer à l'élaboration de programmes thérapeutiques et de soutien pour les militaires et les cadets. Bien qu'il n'y ait aucun avantage direct pour vous en tant que participant, vous aurez l'occasion d'évaluer vos relations sexuelles et amoureuses et de participer à une nouvelle recherche.

Risques potentiels: Lors de la participation à cette étude, il est possible de ressentir un certain malaise en raison de la nature sensible des questions. Certaines questions peuvent être choquantes, il peut être difficile d'y répondre et il peut être inconfortable de les évaluer ; cependant, il est peu probable qu'elles causent un inconfort psychologique ou émotionnel important. Dans le formulaire de débriefing, vous recevrez les coordonnées de l'équipe de recherche et des services de santé mentale. N'oubliez pas que vous avez le droit de sauter toutes les questions que vous souhaitez ou d'interrompre votre participation à tout moment sans pénalité. Si vous avez des questions ou des inquiétudes concernant l'étude, veuillez contacter Jiyoon Park ou Dr. Zidenberg, dont les coordonnées figurent en haut de cette page. Si vous avez ressenti de la détresse en répondant à l'enquête ou si vous êtes inquiet pour votre bien-être et avez besoin de soutien, veuillez envisager de contacter votre service local d'intervention en cas de crise (trouvez le vôtre sur <https://findahelpline.com/>).

Talk Suicide Canada: 1-833-456-4566

Wellness Together Canada: 1-866-585-0445

Retrait: Votre participation à cette étude est volontaire et vous n'êtes pas obligé de répondre à des questions qui vous mettent mal à l'aise. Vous pouvez également vous retirer à tout moment sans pénalité en quittant l'enquête. En raison de la nature anonyme de l'étude, il sera impossible de retirer des réponses spécifiques de l'ensemble de données une fois qu'il aura commencé.

Éthique: Ce projet de recherche a reçu l'approbation éthique du Comité d'éthique de la recherche du Collège militaire royal (CER 25102024). Nous espérons que cette recherche profitera au domaine de la psychologie, au Collège militaire royal et aux Forces armées canadiennes. Si vous avez des préoccupations concernant la nature éthique de cette étude ou vos droits en tant que participant, veuillez contacter le président du comité d'éthique de la recherche des études de premier cycle – Dr. Jordan Sutcliffe (jordan.sutcliffe@rmc.ca), Dr. Meaghan Wilkin (meaghan.wilkin@rmc.ca), and Dr. Nicole Berubé (reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca).

Consentement: Le fait d'appuyer sur le bouton "Oui" (ci-dessous) sera interprété comme un consentement à la participation à cette recherche. Il sera également interprété comme indiquant que vous comprenez les procédures, que vous êtes conscient que vous n'êtes pas obligé de participer si vous le souhaitez, que vous êtes libre de vous retirer de l'étude à tout moment et que vous consentez librement à participer à cette recherche.

Si vous souhaitez obtenir une copie du formulaire de consentement, veuillez en imprimer une pour vos dossiers. Vous pouvez également contacter les chercheurs pour obtenir une copie du formulaire de consentement.

Nous vous remercions d'avance pour votre participation.

Consentez-vous à participer à cette étude ?

<Oui> ou <Non>

## Appendix C. Demographics

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| How old are you? * Type #
* Prefer not to answer
 | What is your affiliation with RMC?* Student (ROTP)
* Student (UTPNCM)
* Student (Reserves)
* Student (civilian)
* Student (ILOY)
* Staff
* Faculty
 | What is your gender?* Man
* Woman
* Transman
* Transwoman
* Non-binary
* Other (specify)
* Prefer not to answer
 | What is your sexual orientation?* Asexual
* Bisexual
* Heterosexual
* Homosexual
* Pansexual
* Other (specify)
* Prefer not to answer
 |
| What is your race/ethnicity? * White
* Black
* East Asian
* Southeast Asian
* Middle Eastern/North African
* West Indian
* Hispanic/Latino
* Indigenous
* Other (specify)
* Prefer not to answer
 | Have you ever been sexually active? Note: By sexually active, we mean vaginal, oral, or anal intercourse, or has anyone inserted an object or their fingers in your anus or vagina.* Yes
* No
* Prefer not to answer

If yes, how many sexual partners have you had?* Type #
 | What is your current relationship status?* Single
* Casual (hook up, friends with benefits)
* Exclusively dating
* Engaged
* Married or common-law
* Other (specify)
 | How long have you been in your current relationship status *in total*?* Type #
* Month
* Year
 |
| Are you currently in a long-distance relationship? \*provide the definition of LDR* Yes
* No
 | *Why* are you in a long-distance relationship? Please select all that apply. * University attendance (for students)
* Employment
* Residence in a different city
* Other (specify)
 | Have you and your current partner been in a long-distance relationship in the past?* Yes
* No
 | How *long* did the long-distance phase last?* Type #
* Month
* Year
 |
| Question about your sexual partner(s). What is their gender?* Man
* Woman
* Transman
* Transwoman
* Other (specify)
* Prefer not to answer
 | How old are they? \*separate by comma(s) if multiple* Type #
* Prefer not to answer
 | What is the distance between you and your sexual partner? \*separate by comma(s) if multiple* Type # (km)
* At RMC
* Other (specify)
 | Are they in the military?* Yes
* No
 |
| In a typical week, how *often* do you talk (e.g., in-person, tele-/electronic communication) to your sexual partner(s)?* 0 hours/week
* 1-3 hours/week
* 4-6 hours/week
* 7+ hours/week
* Other (specify)
 | In a typical week, how *often* do you see your sexual partner(s) in person? * 0 times/week
* 1-3 times/week
* 4-6 times/week
* 7+ times/week
* Other (specify)
 | In a typical week, how *often* do you engage in sexual activities with other(s)?* 0 times/week
* 1-3 times/week
* 4-6 times/week
* 7+ times/week
* Other (specify)
 | In a typical week, how *often* do you engage in sexual activities by yourself?* 0 times/week
* 1-3 times/week
* 4-6 times/week
* 7+ times/week
* Other (specify)
 |

The definition of a long-distance relationship (RDL) by Pistole and Roberts (2011): “a relationship in which there is a considerable geographical distance between partners, it would be practically impossible for partners to see one another every day, and the majority of communication within the relationship is not face-to-face.”

## Appendix C. Données démographiques

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Quel âge avez-vous?* Type #
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 | Quelle est votre affiliation au CMR?* Étudiant (PFOR)
* Étudiant (PFUMR)
* Étudiant (réserves)
* Étudiant (civil)
* Étudiant (PILA)
* Personnel
* Faculté
 | Quel est votre genre?* Homme
* Femme
* Homme transgenre
* Femme transgenre
* Non-binaire
* Autre (préciser)
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 | Quelle est votre orientation sexuelle?* Asexué
* Bisexuel
* Hétérosexuel
* Homosexuel
* Pansexuel
* Autre (préciser)
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 |
| Quelle est votre race/ethnicité? * Blanc
* Noir
* Asie de l'Est
* Asie du Sud-Est
* Moyen-Orient/

Afrique du Nord* Antillais
* Hispanique/Latino
* Autochtone
* Autre (préciser)
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 | Avez-vous déjà été sexuellement actif? \*Note: Par "sexuellement actif", nous entendons des rapports sexuels vaginaux, oraux ou anaux, ou l'introduction d'un objet ou de doigts dans l'anus ou le vagin.* Oui
* Non
* Préfère ne pas répondre

Si oui, combien de partenaires sexuels avez-vous eu?* Type #
 | Quel est le statut de votre relation actuelle?* Célibataire
* Occasionnel (coup d'un soir, amicales avec avantages)
* Rencontres exclusives
* Engagé
* Marié(e) ou concubin(e)
* Autre (préciser)
 | Depuis combien de temps au *total êtes-vous* dans votre relation actuelle?* Type #
* Mois
* Année
 |
| Êtes-vous actuellement dans une relation à distance? \*Donnez la définition d'une relation à distance* Oui
* Non
 | *Pourquoi* vivez-vous une relation à distance? Veuillez sélectionner toutes les réponses qui s'appliquent. * Fréquentation de l'université (pour les étudiants)
* Emploi
* Résidence dans une autre ville
* Autre (préciser)
 | Avez-vous déjà vécu une relation à distance avec votre partenaire actuel?* Oui
* Non
 | Combien *de temps* a duré la phase de longue distance?* Type #
* Mois
* Année
 |
| Question sur votre/vos partenaire(s) sexuel(s). Quel est leur sexe?* Homme
* Femme
* Homme transgenre
* Femme transgenre
* Autre (préciser)
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 | Quel âge ont-ils? \*séparer par une virgule si multiple* Type #
* Préfère ne pas répondre
 | Quelle est la distance entre vous et votre partenaire sexuel? \*Séparer par une virgule si multiple* Type # (km)
* Au CMR
* Autre (préciser)
 | Sont-ils militaires?* Oui
* Non
 |
| Au cours d'une semaine normale, combien *de fois* parlez-vous (par exemple, en personne, par communication télé- ou électronique) à votre/vos partenaire(s) sexuel(s)?* 0 heure/semaine
* 1-3 heures/semaine
* 4-6 heures/semaine
* 7+ heures/semaine
* Autre (préciser)
 | Au cours d'une semaine normale, combien *de fois* voyez-vous votre/vos partenaire(s) sexuel(s) en personne? * 0 fois/semaine
* 1 à 3 fois/semaine
* 4 à 6 fois/semaine
* 7+ fois/semaine
* Autre (préciser)
 | Au cours d'une semaine normale, à quelle *fréquence* avez-vous des activités sexuelles avec d'autres personnes?* 0 fois/semaine
* 1 à 3 fois/semaine
* 4 à 6 fois/semaine
* 7+ fois/semaine
* Autre (préciser)
 | Au cours d'une semaine normale, combien *de fois* vous arrive-t-il de vous livrer à des activités sexuelles seul(e)?* 0 fois/semaine
* 1 à 3 fois/semaine
* 4 à 6 fois/semaine
* 7+ fois/semaine
* Autre (préciser)
 |

La définition d'une relation à distance (RDL) par Pistole et Roberts (2011) : "une relation dans laquelle il existe une distance géographique considérable entre les partenaires, où il serait pratiquement impossible pour les partenaires de se voir tous les jours et où la majorité de la communication au sein de la relation ne se fait pas en face-à-face".

## Appendix D. The Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale-Revised

Please indicate how well each statement reflects your thoughts and feelings about your sexual life (including all the sexual activities you may or may not be engaging in). 1 = Not at all, 2 = Very little, 3 = A little, 4 = Somewhat, 5 = A fair bit, 6= Very much, 7= Extremely.

1. In most ways, my sexual life is close to my ideal.
2. The conditions of my sexual life are excellent.
3. I am satisfied with my sexual life.
4. My sexual life meets my expectations.

## Appendix D. Échelle de satisfaction de la vie sexuelle-révisée

Veuillez indiquer comment chaque item reflète vos pensées et vos sentiments par rapport à votre vie sexuelle (incluant toutes les activités sexuelles auxquelles vous participez ou non). 1 = Pas du tout, 2 = Très peu, 3 = Un peu, 4 = Quelque peu, 5 = Un peu juste, 6 = Très beaucoup, 7 = Extrêmement.

1. À bien des égards, ma vie sexuelle est proche de mon idéal.
2. Les conditions de ma vie sexuelle sont excellentes.
3. Je suis satisfait(e) de ma vie sexuelle.
4. Ma vie sexuelle répond à mes attentes.

## Appendix E. Sexual Desire Inventory-2

This questionnaire asks about your level of sexual desire. By desire, we mean interest in or wish for sexual activity. Please check the number that best shows your thoughts and feelings for each item. For individuals who are single, “a partner” means “someone”. Your answers will be private and anonymous.

1. During the last month, how often would you have liked to engage in sexual activity with a partner (for example, touching each others’ genitals, giving or receiving oral stimulation, intercourse, etc.)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all1 | Once a month2 | Once every two weeks3 | Once aweek4 | Twice a week5 | 3 to 4times a week6 | Once aday7 | More than once a day8 |

2. During the last month, how often have you had sexual thoughts involving a partner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all 1 | Once or twice amonth2 | Once a week3 | Twice a week4 | 3 to 4 times a week5 | Once a day6 | A couple of times a day7 | Many times a day8 |

3. When you have sexual thoughts, how strong is your desire to engage in sexual behaviour with a partner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

4. When you first see an attractive person, how strong is your sexual desire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

5. When you spend time with an attractive person (for example, at work or school), how strong is your sexual desire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

6. When you are in romantic situations (such as a candle-lit dinner, a walk on the beach, etc.), how strong is your sexual desire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

7. How strong is your desire to engage in sexual activity with a partner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

8. How important is it for you to fulfill your sexual desire through activity with a partner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at allimportant0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Extremely important8 |

9. Compared to other people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually with a partner?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Much less desire0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Much more desire8 |

10. During the last month, how often would you have liked to behave sexually by yourself (for example, masturbating, touching your genitals, etc.)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at all1 | Once amonth2 | Once every two weeks3 | Once aweek4 | Twice aweek5 | 3 to 4 times aweek6 | Once a day7 | More thanonce a day8 |

11. How strong is your desire to engage in sexual behaviour by yourself?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| No desire 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Strongdesire8 |

12. How important is it for you to fulfill your desire to behave sexually by yourself?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Not at allimportant0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Extremely important8 |

13. Compared to other people of your age and sex, how would you rate your desire to behave sexually by yourself?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Much less desire0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Much more desire8 |

14. How long could you go comfortably without having sexual activity of some kind?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Forever1 | A year or two2 | Several months3 | A month4 | A few weeks5 | A week6 | A few days7 | One day8 | Less than one day9 |

## Appendix E. Inventaire du désir sexuel-2

Ce questionnaire porte sur votre niveau de désir sexuel. Par désir, nous entendons l'intérêt ou le souhait d'une activité sexuelle. Veuillez cocher le chiffre qui correspond le mieux à vos pensées et à vos sentiments pour chaque question. Pour les personnes célibataires, « un partenaire » signifie « quelqu'un ». Vos réponses seront privées et anonymes.

1. Au cours du dernier mois, à quelle fréquence auriez-vous aimé avoir une activité sexuelle avec un ou une partenaire (e.g., se toucher les organes génitaux, donner ou recevoir une stimulation orale, avoir un rapport pénétratif sexuel, etc.)?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas duTout1 | Une fois par mois2 | Une fois toutes les deux semaines3 | Une fois par semaine4 | Deux fois par semaine5 | 3 à 4 fois par semaine6 | Une fois par jour7 | Plus d'une fois par jour8 |

2. Au cours du dernier mois, à quelle fréquence avez-vous eu des pensées sexuelles impliquant un ou une partenaire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas du tout1 | Une ou deux fois par mois2 | Une fois par semaine3 | Deux fois par semaine4 | 3 à 4 fois par semaine5 | Une fois par jour6 | Quelques fois par jour7 | Nombreux fois par jour8 |

3. Lorsque vous avez des pensées sexuelles, quelle est l'intensité de votre désir d'avoir un comportement sexuel avec un partenaire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

4. Lorsque vous voyez une personne attirante pour la première fois, quelle est l'intensité de votre désir sexuel?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

5. Lorsque vous passez du temps avec une personne attirante (par exemple, au travail ou à l'école), quelle est l'intensité de votre désir sexuel?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

6. Lorsque vous vivez des situations romantiques (comme un dîner aux chandelles, une promenade sur la plage, etc.), quelle est l'intensité de votre désir sexuel?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

7. Quelle est l'intensité de votre désir de vous livrer à une activité sexuelle avec un partenaire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

8. Dans quelle mesure est-il important pour vous de satisfaire votre désir sexuel en pratiquant une activité avec un partenaire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas du tout important0 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | Extrêmement important 8 |

9. Par rapport à d'autres personnes de votre âge et de votre sexe, comment évaluez-vous votre désir d'avoir un comportement sexuel avec un partenaire?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Beaucoup moins désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Beaucoup plus désir8 |

10. Au cours du dernier mois, à quelle fréquence auriez-vous aimé vous comporter sexuellement seul(e) (par exemple, vous masturber, toucher vos parties génitales, etc.).

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas du tout1 | Une fois par mois2 | Une fois toutes les deux semaines3 | Une fois par semaine4 | Deux fois par semaine5 | 3 à 4 fois par semaine6 | Une fois par jour7 | Plus d'une fois par jour8 |

11. Quelle est l'intensité de votre désir d'avoir des comportements sexuels par vous-même?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas de désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Fort désir8 |

12. Dans quelle mesure est-il important pour vous de satisfaire vos désirs d’avoir des comportements sexuels par vous-même?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pas du tout important0 | 1  | 2  | 3  | 4  | 5  | 6  | 7  | Extrêmement important 8 |

13. Par rapport à d'autres personnes de votre âge et de votre sexe, comment évaluez-vous votre désir d’avoir des comportements sexuels par vous-même?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Beaucoup moins désir0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | Beaucoup plus désir8 |

14. Combien de temps seriez-vous à l'aise sans avoir aucune activité sexuelle?

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Pour toujours1 | Un an ou deux2 | Plusieurs mois3 | Un mois4 | Quelques semaines5 | Une semaine6 | Quelques jours7 | Un jour8 | Moins d’un jour9 |

## Appendix F. Want and Do Activity Scale

The following is a list of sexual activities that some people like to do. Please rate how often you WANT to do each of the listed sexual activities. 1 = Not at all, 4 = Neutral, 7 = A lot.

1. Kissing someone
2. Sexual touching with someone (e.g., genital stimulation)
3. Giving oral sex to someone
4. Receiving oral sex from someone
5. Penetrative sex
6. Trying multiple sexual positions with someone
7. Seeing someone naked
8. Being seen naked by someone
9. Receiving an orgasm from someone
10. Giving an orgasm to someone
11. Sexually touching myself (e.g., masturbating)
12. Reaching orgasm by myself

The following is the same list of sexual activities that you just saw. Please rate how often you DO or GET each of the listed sexual activities. 1 = Not at all, 4 = Neutral, 7 = A lot.

1. Kissing someone
2. Sexual touching with someone (e.g., genital stimulation)
3. Giving oral sex to someone
4. Receiving oral sex from someone
5. Penetrative sex
6. Trying multiple sexual positions with someone
7. Seeing someone naked
8. Being seen naked by someone
9. Receiving an orgasm from someone
10. Giving an orgasm to someone
11. Sexually touching myself (e.g., masturbating)
12. Reaching orgasm by myself

## Appendix F. Échelle d'activité de la volonté et de l'action

Voici une liste d'activités sexuelles que certaines personnes aiment pratiquer. Veuillez évaluer la fréquence à laquelle vous VOULEZ pratiquer chacune des activités sexuelles énumérées. 1 = Pas du tout, 4 = Neutre, 7 = Beaucoup.

1. Embrasser quelqu'un
2. Attouchements sexuels avec quelqu'un (par exemple, stimulation génitale)
3. Donner du sexe oral à quelqu'un
4. Recevoir du sexe oral de quelqu'un
5. Sexe avec pénétration
6. Essayer plusieurs positions sexuelles avec quelqu'un
7. Voir quelqu'un nu
8. Être vu nu par quelqu'un
9. Recevoir un orgasme de quelqu'un
10. Donner un orgasme à quelqu'un
11. Me toucher sexuellement (e.g., masturber)
12. Atteindre l’orgasme par moi-même

Voici la même liste d'activités sexuelles que celle que vous venez de voir. Veuillez évaluer la fréquence à laquelle vous FAITES ou OBTENEZ chacune des activités sexuelles énumérées.

1. Embrasser quelqu'un
2. Attouchements sexuels avec quelqu'un (par exemple, stimulation génitale)
3. Donner du sexe oral à quelqu'un
4. Recevoir du sexe oral de quelqu'un
5. Sexe avec pénétration
6. Essayer plusieurs positions sexuelles avec quelqu'un
7. Voir quelqu'un nu
8. Être vu nu par quelqu'un
9. Recevoir un orgasme de quelqu'un
10. Donner un orgasme à quelqu'un
11. Me toucher sexuellement (e.g., masturber)
12. Atteindre l’orgasme par moi-même

## Appendix G. Additional Questions

These questions are for those who are currently in long-distance relationships. If this is not your case, please skip these questions and click “next.”

1. Please tell me about your experience in a long-distance relationship. Perhaps there are some advantages and/or disadvantages that you want to share.

2. How do people around you react to your long-distance relationship? Are they supportive or worried? Are there any specific aspects of the long-distance relationship that they comment about?

3. What are the circumstances that led you to be in a long-distance relationship?

4. How do you anticipate the long-distance part of your relationship to end?

5. Tell me about the moments when you experienced sexual frustration during your long-distance relationship and what triggered it.

6. How are you managing your sexual desire(s)?

## Appendix G. Questions supplémentaires

Ces questions s'adressent aux personnes qui vivent actuellement une relation à distance. Si ce n'est pas votre cas, veuillez ignorer ces questions et cliquer sur "suivant".

1. Parlez-moi de votre expérience dans une relation à distance. Peut-être y a-t-il des avantages et/ou des inconvénients que vous souhaitez partager.

2. Comment votre entourage réagit-il à votre relation à distance? Les soutiennent-ils ou s'inquiètent-ils? Comment les gens autour de vous réagissent-ils à votre relation longue distance?

3. Quelles sont les circonstances qui vous ont mené à être dans une relation longue distance?

4. Comment prévoyez-vous que la partie à distance de votre relation se termine?

5. Parlez-moi des moments qui vous ont frustré(e) sexuellement pendant votre relation longue distance et ce qui les a déclenchés.

6. Comment gérez-vous vos désirs sexuels?

## Appendix H. Debriefing Form

Thank you for your participation in the study. As you were told at the beginning of the study, the purpose of this study is to explore differences in sexual satisfaction among different relationship statuses.

Aim: Sexual satisfaction is a topic that many people, whether single or partnered individuals, are uncomfortable discussing; although it is undoubtedly an important aspect of one’s sexual health. Moreover, there is a lack of information about sexual satisfaction of LDR individuals and, therefore, ways to best address and support their needs are under-researched. The study is especially relevant to the military as deployment and relocation are unique challenges that military families face.

Anonymity and Confidentiality: Please be assured that the responses you provide will remain anonymous and no identifiable information will be released when the results are published. A summary of the results will be provided to those who request it. If you wish to receive a copy of the summary of results, please email the researcher at the information listed below. If you have any further questions, comments, or concerns about the study, please feel free to contact the research team. You are also welcome to contact the Royal Military College Research Ethics Board at reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca if you require further clarification of your rights as a research participant.

Again, we thank you for your help with our research. Your participation in this scientific endeavour was greatly appreciated!

Researcher:

OCdt. Jiyoon Park

S30220@rmc.ca

Department of Military Psychology and Leadership

Royal Military College of Canada

Advisor:

Dr. Alexandra Zidenberg

alexandra.zidenberg@rmc.ca

Adjunt Professor, Department of Military Psychology and Leadership

Royal Military College of Canada

alexandra.zidenberg@umontreal.ca

Assitant Professor, School of Criminology

University of Montreal

If you experienced distress while completing the survey or are concerned about your well-being and in need of support, please consider contacting your local crisis intervention service (find yours at <https://findahelpline.com/>) or consult the services below:

## Appendix H. Formulaire de débriefing

Nous vous remercions de votre participation à l'étude. Comme on vous l'a dit au début de l'étude, le but de celle-ci est d'explorer les différences de satisfaction sexuelle entre les différents statuts relationnels.

Objectif : la satisfaction sexuelle est un sujet que de nombreuses personnes, qu'elles soient célibataires ou en couple, n'aiment pas aborder, bien qu'il s'agisse sans aucun doute d'un aspect important de la santé sexuelle d'une personne. En outre, on manque d'informations sur la satisfaction sexuelle des personnes vivant en couple et, par conséquent, les moyens de répondre au mieux à leurs besoins et de les soutenir font l'objet de recherches insuffisantes. L'étude est particulièrement pertinente pour les militaires, car les déploiements et les déménagements sont des défis uniques auxquels les familles de militaires sont confrontées.

Anonymat et confidentialité : Soyez assurés que les réponses que vous fournirez resteront anonymes et qu'aucune information permettant de vous identifier ne sera divulguée lors de la publication des résultats. Un résumé des résultats sera fourni à ceux qui en feront la demande. Si vous souhaitez recevoir une copie du résumé des résultats, veuillez envoyer un courriel au chercheur aux coordonnées indiquées ci-dessous. Si vous avez d'autres questions, commentaires ou préoccupations concernant l'étude, n'hésitez pas à contacter l'équipe de recherche. Vous pouvez également contacter le Comité d'éthique de la recherche du Collège militaire royal à l'adresse reb-cer@rmc-cmr.ca si vous souhaitez obtenir des précisions sur vos droits en tant que participant à la recherche.

Une fois encore, nous vous remercions pour votre aide dans nos recherches. Votre participation à cette entreprise scientifique a été très appréciée!

Chercheur:

OCdt. Jiyoon Park

S30220@rmc.ca

Département de psychologie militaire et de leadership

Collège militaire royal du Canada

Conseiller:

Dr. Alexandra Zidenberg

alexandra.zidenberg@rmc.ca

Professeur associé, Département de psychologie militaire et de leadership

Collège militaire royal du Canada

alexandra.zidenberg@umontreal.ca

Professeur adjoint, École de criminologie

Université de Montréal.

Si vous avez ressenti de la détresse en répondant à l'enquête ou si vous êtes préoccupé par votre bien-être et avez besoin de soutien, veuillez envisager de contacter votre service local d'intervention d'urgence (trouvez le vôtre sur https://findahelpline.com/) ou de consulter les services ci-dessous:

## Appendix I. RMC Resources / Ressources du CMR

RMC Duty Staff:

- RMC Duty Officer: 613-483-3024, 613-453-5007 or 613-541-6000 x 6547

- Padre on duty: 613-541-6000 x 6284 or 6204 or 613-541-5330 (specify if at RMC)

Padres at RMC:

Senior Chaplain - Padre (LCdr) Mike Rundle

Cell: 613-539-1463 or (613) 541-6000 ext. 6204, Room: 304, Yeo Hall

Email: michael.rundle@forces.gc.ca

Campus Security Control Centre (CCS) (24/7)

Tel: 613-541-6000 x 666

On Call Station: 613-541-6000 x 6209

33 Health Services Centre – detachment RMC (Monday to Friday, 7:30 am to 4:00 pm)

Tel: 613-541-5010

Ambulance (24/7): 613-544-5555

Emergency (24/7): 911

Police

Kingston Police non-emergency line (24/7): 613-549-4660

Military Police (24/7): 613-541-5648

Canadian Forces Sexual Misconduct Response Centre (24/7):

Tel: 1-844-750-1648

Email: DND.SMRC-CIIS.MDN@forces.gc.ca

CFB Kingston Mental Health Services

Tel: 613-541-5010 x 5776

Respect in the CAF Mobile Application (for IOS and Android Users)

DND/CF Ombudsman (Direct source of information; referral and outreach)

Tel: 1-888-828-3626

Email: ombudsman-communications@forces.gc.ca

Member Assistance Program (MAP) - (24/7) (Confidential short-term professional counselling service)

Tel: 1-800-268-7708

Conflict and Complaint Management Services

Kingston Office

Tel: 613-541-6000 x 5641

++CCMS Kingston@CFB Kingston@Kingston

**COMMUNITY RESOURCES**

KFL& A Sexual Health Clinic<https://www.kflaph.ca/en/health-topics/sexual-health.aspx>

Tel: 613-549-1232; Toll Free: 1-800-267-7875

Talk Suicide Canada <https://www.crisisservicescanada.ca/en/>

Tel: 1-888-456-4566 (24/7/365); SMS: 45645, type "Start" (between 4 pm and midnight)

Ontario Suicide Hotlines <http://www.suicide.org/hotlines/international/canada-suicide-hotlines.html>

Phone: 1-800-Suicide

Tel: 1-800-273-TALK\_dial 1 for military veterans

Phone or text: 1-800-799-4TTY

LifeLine Canada <https://thelifelinecanada.ca/lifeline-canada-foundation/lifeline-app/>

Pan-Canadian Mental Health Resources

<https://www.ccmhs-ccsms.ca/mental-health-resources-1>

Mouvement santé mentale Québec Clavardage: [https://suicide.ca](https://suicide.ca/)

Tel: 1-866-APPELLE (277-3553) (24/7)

SMS: 1-855-957-5353

Kids Help Phone<https://kidshelpphone.ca/>

Interligne (LBGTQ+)

Tel & SMS: 1-888-505-1010

Chat: [https://interligne.co](https://interligne.co/)

Good2Talk [https://good2talk.ca](https://good2talk.ca/)

24/7 Support Services for Post Secondary Students in Ontario

Tel: 1-866-925-5454

SMS: "Type" GOOD2TALKON at 686868

Mental Health (Indigenous) - Bilingual

Tel: 1-855-242-3310

Chat: [https://www.hopeforwellness.ca](https://www.hopeforwellness.ca/)

TALK4HEALING: Indigenous Women's Support 24/7

Tel: 1-855-554-4325

Chat:<http://www.talk4healing.com/live-chat/>

For more information about Sexual Assault Centres, Crisis Lines, and Support Services:

<https://endingviolencecanada.org/sexual-assault-centres-crisis-lines-and-support-services/>

## Appendix J. Certification of Institutional Ethics Clearance



# Supplemental Materials

Table S1 presents the means for all groups of the Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale—Revised, including the subgroups of relationship status and gender. The general pattern of mean-level differences revealed that singles scored lower than the average in all four items whereas partnered and LDR individuals scored above the average. Regarding gender, women scored above the average in all four items whereas men scored below the average.

**Table S1**

*The Satisfaction with Sex Life Scale-Revised and Descriptive Statistics*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Items** | **All** | **Single** | **Partnered** | **LDR** | **Men** | **Women** |
|  | n = 169 | n = 60 | n = 57 | n = 52 | n = 112 | n = 56 |
|  | *M (SD)* | *M (SD)* | *M (SD)* | *M (SD)* | *M (SD)* | *M (SD)* |
| 1. In most ways, my sexual life is close to my ideal | 4.22 (1.88) | 3.10 (1.82) | 5.07 (1.35) | 4.58 (1.86) | 3.96 (1.94) | 4.79 (1.61) |
| 2. The conditions of my sexual life are excellent | 4.41 (1.93) | 3.17 (1.84) | 5.32 (1.33) | 4.87 (1.87) | 4.23 (2.04) | 4.84 (1.58) |
| 3. I am satisfied with my sexual life | 4.60 (1.94) | 3.23 (1.90) | 5.39 (1.45) | 5.31 (1.60) | 4.28 (2.05) | 5.30 (1.45) |
| 4. My sexual life meets my expectations | 4.65 (1.86) | 3.57 (1.88) | 5.25 (1.46) | 5.21 (1.67) | 4.44 (1.96) | 5.13 (1.48) |

Further mean comparisons were made between the desired and actual frequencies of each sexual act among relationship status. Visual inspection of Table S2 below revealed differences among single, partnered, and LDR individuals concerning frequencies of sexual acts. Among singles, the desired frequency was higher than the actual frequency for all partnered acts, but the actual frequency was higher for solitary acts. Among partnered individuals, both desired frequencies of partnered and solitary acts were relatively similar to the actual frequencies, except four items with near or more than 1-point difference (“penetrative sex,” “trying multiple sexual positions with someone,” “being seen naked by someone,” and “receiving an orgasm from someone”). LDR individuals had a similar pattern to single individuals; they had a higher desired frequency of partnered acts but also had a higher actual frequency of solitary acts. Further paired sample t-test was conducted to observe significant changes between desired and actual frequencies across relationship statuses, as shown in Table 6.

**Table S2**

*Descriptive Statistics for Specific Sexual Acts*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Single** | **Partnered** | **LDR** |
|  | **Want** | **Do** | **Want** | **Do** | **Want** | **Do** |
|  | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** | ***M (SD)*** |
| **Factor 1 (partnered acts)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1. Kissing someone | 5.85 (1.53) | 3.31 (2.44) | 6.23 (.89) | 6.15 (1.19) | 6.27 (1.00) | 4.43 (1.73) |
| 2. Sexual touching with someone (e.g., genital stimulation) | 5.49 (1.58) | 3.02 (2.21) | 5.51 (1.30) | 5.25 (1.40) | 6.02 (1.22) | 4.24 (1.56) |
| 3. Giving oral sex to someone | 4.41 (1.78) | 2.53 (2.03) | 4.57 (1.75) | 4.00 (1.89) | 5.27 (1.70) | 3.46 (1.83) |
| 4. Receiving oral sex from someone | 5.29 (1.73) | 2.57 (1.89) | 4.98 (1.89) | 4.13 (1.84) | 5.71 (1.66) | 3.45 (1.62) |
| 5. Penetrative sex | 5.69 (1.56) | 2.76 (2.10) | 6.00 (.94) | 4.85 (1.78) | 6.10 (1.43) | 4.04 (1.84) |
| 6. Trying multiple sexual positions with someone | 5.47 (1.66) | 2.67 (2.03) | 5.38 (1.71) | 4.28 (1.93) | 5.98 (1.55) | 3.71 (1.75) |
| 7. Seeing someone naked | 5.51 (1.61) | 3.14 (2.25) | 5.06 (1.69) | 5.45 (1.54) | 5.61 (1.69) | 4.69 (1.54) |
| 8. Being seen naked by someone | 3.96 (2.04) | 2.94 (2.17) | 4.30 (1.68) | 5.32 (1.54) | 4.86 (1.64) | 4.47 (1.71) |
| 9. Receiving an orgasm from someone | 5.57 (1.61) | 2.41 (1.61) | 5.75 (1.07) | 4.72 (1.85) | 6.00 (1.17) | 4.08 (1.72) |
| 10. Giving an orgasm to someone | 5.86 (1.63) | 3.10 (1.61) | 5.92 (1.12) | 4.87 (1.75) | 6.35 (1.00) | 4.22 (1.80) |
| **Factor 2 (solitary acts)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11. Sexually touching myself (e.g., masturbating) | 3.74 (1.91) | 3.96 (1.91) | 3.92 (1.73) | 3.36 (1.84) | 4.25 (1.82) | 4.59 (1.78) |
| 12. Reaching orgasm by myself | 3.86 (1.94) | 4.02 (1.99) | 3.72 (1.78) | 3.55 (1.89) | 4.18 (1.90) | 4.67 (1.84) |