

Selective Sociality Scale

- 1 I avoid social situations that I believe will drain my emotional energy.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 2 I actively avoid situations or people that I know will cause me unnecessary stress.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 3 I avoid social situations that I know will lead to emotional fatigue or stress.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 4 I often disengage from social activities that do not contribute to my well-being.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 5 I choose to spend time with people who offer emotional support rather than with those who cause stress.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 6 I prefer to spend time with a small group of genuine friends rather than engaging in large social gatherings.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 7 I avoid aimless scrolling on the internet, focusing instead on meaningful online activities.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 8 I use the internet primarily for educational or professional purposes rather than for mindless browsing.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 9 I limit my use of social media to prevent feelings of anxiety and dissatisfaction.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 10 I restrict my screen time to focus more on meaningful real-life activities.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 11 I consciously choose to engage in activities that contribute to my inner peace and contentment.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 12 I value quiet time alone to recharge and reflect on my personal growth.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree
- 13 I find time for introspection and self-reflection to maintain my emotional well-being.
 Strongly Disagree Disagree Slightly Disagree Not Sure Slightly Agree Agree Strongly Agree

Psychometric Properties

Scale: Selective Sociality Scale (SSS)

Description: The SSS is a theoretically grounded and psychometrically validated instrument developed to assess the construct of selective sociality—a newly proposed psychosocial skill that entails the intentional, mindful selection of social engagements and digital interactions to promote psychosocial health. As a response to the hyper-connected and often overstimulating nature of the digital age, selective sociality emphasizes the strategic management of interpersonal exposure as a form of psychological self-regulation and wellbeing optimization. This construct introduces a paradigm shift in the understanding of social behavior, positioning intentional social selectivity not as a sign of avoidance or introversion, but rather as an adaptive psychosocial competence rooted in discernment, boundaries, and internal wellbeing. In contrast to traditional measures of sociability or social avoidance, the SSS captures how individuals curate their social ecosystem to protect mental energy, regulate emotional input, and cultivate meaningful connections. The scale comprises three theoretically derived subscales:

Selective Social Engagement – measures the tendency to pursue emotionally nourishing and value-congruent relationships, while avoiding toxic, superficial, or energy-draining interactions.

Mindful Digital Interaction – assesses the intentional regulation of digital and social media use, including the management of online interactions, content consumption, and digital boundaries to prevent cognitive overload and emotional disturbance.

Introspective Wellbeing – evaluates the degree to which individuals draw on solitude, reflection, and inner awareness to maintain psychological equilibrium and autonomy in social contexts.

By integrating dimensions of emotional intelligence, self-awareness, and social discernment, the SSS emerges as a timely and culturally relevant tool that addresses the psychosocial challenges of contemporary life—particularly the overstimulation, comparison anxiety, and attention fragmentation exacerbated by digital hyperconnectivity. The Selective Sociality Scale holds significant utility in clinical, organizational, educational, and developmental contexts, where the quality—not just the quantity—of social engagement is increasingly recognized as vital to mental health. It aligns closely with the principles of Natural Psychology, emphasizing adaptive behavior, psychological boundary-setting, and self-preservative interactional strategies as essential for achieving psychosocial health in both physical and virtual spaces. The SSS contributes to a deeper understanding of social functioning in the Anthropocene, where the cultivation of selective sociality may be seen not as an exception, but as a prerequisite for sustainable psychosocial wellness.

Language: English

Items: 13

Sub-scales: Selective Social Engagement (items 1 to 6), Mindful Digital Interaction (items 7 to 10), Introspective Wellbeing (items 11 to 13)

Response sheet: strongly disagree (scored 1), slightly disagree (scored 2), disagree (scored 3), not sure (scored 4), slightly agree (scored 5), agree (scored 6), strongly agree (scored 7)

Participants: 1737

n=1737; men=812, 46.7%; women=925, 53.3%; unmarried=1405, 80.9%; married=332, 19.1%; age=18-73 years, M=24.42, SD=7.666; education=matriculation to doctorate, average=graduation

Reliability:

Cronbach's alpha: Selective Sociality Scale = 0.838 Selective Social Engagement = 0.815, Mindful Digital Interaction = 0.808, Introspective Wellbeing = 0.805

Item-total correlations range from 0.295 to 0.684 with $p < 0.01$ (mean=0.586)

Item-scale correlations range from 0.576 to 0.854 with $p < 0.01$ (mean=0.763)

Construct Validity: Chi-square test: Baseline model: $\chi^2 = 2291.412$, $df = 78$, Factor model: $\chi^2 = 146.734$, $df = 62$, $p < 0.001$; Additional Fit Measures: Comparative Fit Index (CFI): 0.962; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI): 0.952; Bentler-Bonett Non-normed Fit Index (NNFI): 0.952; Bentler-Bonett Normed Fit Index (NFI): 0.936; Parsimony Normed Fit Index (PNFI): 0.744; Bollen's Relative Fit Index (RFI): 0.919; Bollen's Incremental Fit Index (IFI): 0.962; Relative Noncentrality Index (RNI): 0.962; Information Criteria: Log-likelihood: -6663.212, Number of free parameters: 42, Akaike (AIC): 13410.425, Bayesian (BIC): 13576.678, Sample-size adjusted Bayesian (SSABIC): 13443.417; Root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA): 0.059; RMSEA 90% CI lower bound: 0.047; RMSEA 90% CI upper bound: 0.072; RMSEA p-value: 0.102; Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR): 0.043; Hoelter's critical N ($\alpha = .05$): 215.637; Hoelter's critical N ($\alpha = .01$): 240.483; Goodness of fit index (GFI): 0.997; McDonald fit index (MFI): 0.896; Expected cross-validation index (ECVI): 0.896; Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Test: Overall KMO: 0.834; KMO for individual indicators ranged from 0.760 to 0.899; Bartlett's Test of Sphericity: $\chi^2 = 2254.899$, $df = 78$, $p < 0.001$; Heterotrait-monotrait ratio=1; Reliability: Coefficient $\omega=0.886$, Coefficient $\alpha=0.817$

Convergent Validity: Strong convergent validity was demonstrated by the scale's strong correlation with the Efficient Social Intelligence Scale ($r = 0.558$, $p < 0.001$).

Discriminant Validity: Significant inverse correlation with the External Locus of Control ($r = -0.709$, $p < 0.01$)

Predictive Validity: The predictive validity of the SSS was established through its strong predictive values for emotionality ($\beta = 0.319$; $p < 0.001$), creativity ($\beta = 0.391$; $p < 0.001$), sensitivity ($\beta = 0.231$; $p < 0.001$), responsibility ($\beta = 0.466$; $p < 0.001$), outlook ($\beta = 0.409$; $p < 0.001$), leadership ($\beta = 0.244$; $p < 0.001$), sympathy ($\beta = 0.191$; $p < 0.01$), justice ($\beta = 0.165$; $p < 0.01$), religiosity ($\beta = 0.353$; $p < 0.001$), spirituality ($\beta = 0.329$; $p < 0.001$), psychosocial health ($\beta = 0.995$; $p < 0.001$), socioenvironmental wellness ($\beta = 0.589$; $p < 0.001$), religious wellness ($\beta = 0.413$; $p < 0.001$), emotional wellness ($\beta = 0.614$; $p < 0.001$), cognitive wellness ($\beta = 0.399$; $p < 0.001$), moral wellness ($\beta = 0.378$; $p < 0.001$), spiritual wellness ($\beta = 0.559$; $p < 0.001$), sexual wellness ($\beta = 0.663$; $p < 0.001$), psychological wellbeing ($\beta = 0.246$; $p < 0.001$), mental wellbeing ($\beta = 0.419$; $p < 0.001$), psychosocial illness ($\beta = -0.485$; $p < 0.001$), emotional problems ($\beta = -0.278$; $p < 0.001$), sexual problems ($\beta = -0.305$; $p < 0.001$), religious & moral problems ($\beta = -0.365$; $p < 0.001$), social problems ($\beta = -0.277$; $p < 0.001$), spiritual problems ($\beta = -0.125$; $p < 0.05$), professional problems ($\beta = -0.344$; $p < 0.001$), depression ($\beta = -0.467$; $p < 0.001$), anxiety ($\beta = -0.21$; $p < 0.001$), stress ($\beta = -0.223$; $p < 0.001$), and psychosocial life satisfaction ($\beta = 0.373$; $p < 0.001$).

Interpretation of Results:

- 13 to 26 = Extreme Social Engagement (Unhealthy)
- 27 to 52 = Moderate Social Engagement (Unhealthy)
- 53 to 78 = Moderate Selective Sociality (Healthy)
- 79 to 91 = Extreme Selective Sociality (Healthy)