



Communication forms and experienced well-being in close emotional relationships¹

<https://doi.org/10.34766/1j7jnh25>

Agata M. Marciniuk^a ✉

^a Agata M. Marciniuk, <https://orcid.org/0009-0002-8259-2304>, John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Poland

✉ Corresponding author: agata.m.marciniuk@gmail.com

Abstract: *Introduction:* Communication is an essential element in building interpersonal relationships. Its quality has a significant impact on relationship satisfaction and overall happiness in a romantic partnership. Partners communicate in various ways. Not every form of the communication is beneficial for the relationship. Effective communication, based on mutual understanding and openness, significantly increases the level of intimacy in a relationship, leading to higher psychological well-being. In contrast, ineffective communication can lead to increased conflicts and reduced relationship satisfaction. The article aims to present the relationship between communication styles used by partners and well-being. Particular attention has been given to two forms of communication: empathetic and depreciative, as well as their influence on an individual's psychological well-being. The study presents gender differences in the communication style used. *Method:* The study included 80 people in romantic relationships with an age range of 19-65 years. A survey was conducted using two tools: the Psychological Well-Being Scale (C. Ryff) and the Communication Forms Questionnaire (M. Rys, P. Kwas). Data analysis included the Shapiro-Wilk test, Spearman's rho correlation, and the Mann-Whitney U test. *Results:* statistically significant differences were identified between men and women regarding the communication used. Women scored higher on empathic communication ($M = 39.302, SD = 4.335$), while men were more likely to use depreciative communication ($M = 32.471, SD = 6.501$). A significant but weak negative correlation was also observed between empathic communication and well-being, suggesting that excessive empathy may lead to lower psychological well-being. Furthermore, it was revealed that the higher the empathic communication level, the higher the positive relationship level, confirming the importance of empathic communication in building satisfying interpersonal connections. *Conclusions:* The study provides new evidence on the importance of communication form in romantic relationships and highlights the need for education on regulating empathy and effective communication. Furthermore, the study indicates the need for further research on the negative consequences of excessive empathy and the influence of personality and socio-cultural factors on communication styles in relationships.

Keywords: empathic communication, depreciative communication, well-being, romantic relationships, gender differences

Introduction

The factors influencing satisfaction and enjoyment of a close emotional relationship have been extensively analysed in the scientific literature. Many authors address the role of empathic communication and the ways in which partners express their emotions. According to Gottman (1994), one of the most prominent marital relationship researchers, interpersonal communication and emotional intelligence are crucial factors affecting romantic relationship quality. The researcher believes that from the communication between individuals in a couple, one can infer its future longevity. Therefore, it is a factor

that plays a huge role in building and maintaining a satisfying relationship.

Research conducted by contemporary psychologists also proves that the ability to express one's emotions and actively listen to one's partner is correlated with relationship satisfaction (Szurlej, 2024). Contemporary psychological theories emphasize the importance of emotional intelligence and its positive impact on relationship dynamics (Smoleń and Iskra, 2023). Meanwhile, recent research suggests that the ability to recognize and regulate emotions can predict long-term relationship satisfaction (Smith et al., 2021).

¹ Article in Polish language: https://stowarzyszeniefidesetratio.pl/fer/62P_marc.pdf

1. Close emotional relationship

Researchers define emotional relationships as the outcome of the attachment process (Janicka and Cieślak, 2020). They emphasize that it is formed both between infants and caregivers, friends, or finally between romantic partners. The article will only discuss the relationship between romantic partners. The attachment characterized by close interpersonal relationships is formed in early childhood, in the mother-child relationship, and perpetuates, projecting into all future relationships, including romantic relationships (Bowlby, 2007). According to psychologists, attachment styles in adult life are a reflection of childhood relationships (Hazan and Shaver, 1987).

According to Baumeister and Leary (1995) creating and entering into close relationships is a fundamental and necessary need in everyone's life. Other researchers also reached similar conclusions, indicating that the basic need of every human being is a sense of belonging – a strong desire to be in a relationship, form bonds, and enter into intimacy (Doroszewicz, 2008).

A close interpersonal relationship positively affects the fulfillment of the need for closeness and belonging, but it also determines well-being and the “happiness” of the people in it (Janicka, 2012).

Meanwhile, Doroszewicz (2008) indicates that when a person remains in a satisfying, close interpersonal relationship, his self-esteem increases. Research clearly indicates that having an emotionally close person reduces premature death risk and provides better physical health compared to people without a partner (Janicka, 2012). The experience of remaining in a close, satisfying emotional relationship translates directly into better mental health. Individuals involved in such a relationship are less likely to report depression symptoms and less likely to experience anxiety (Czyżowska, Gurba, Czyżowska, 2019).

The most popular concept of love worth mentioning when examining close emotional relationships is Sternberg's three-factor concept (1986). He distinguishes three love components: intimacy, passion, and commitment. Intimacy was defined as emotional closeness, respect for the partner, or the

ability to depend on the partner. Passion is the desire, the need to connect with a partner, the enjoyment of their presence. Commitment can be defined as partners accepting certain commitments to each other and solving problems together. It is a conscious mechanism, and each partner voluntarily decides whether he or she wants to engage in a relationship. It seems extremely important to test the connection and relationship between experienced well-being (satisfaction, emotional closeness) and the communication type used in the relationship.

2. Well-being in close emotional relationships

According to researchers, well-being is the result of subjective cognitive and affective (emotional) evaluations about an individual's life (Diener, Lucas, Oishi, 2008). Beliefs, judgments, and emotional reactions to events are the components of evaluating one's life. The evaluation is performed only by the individual and not by other, external experts. The individual evaluates their life quality and satisfaction of expectations and needs.

Researcher C. Ryff (1989) defines well-being as an individual's growth and development that depends on the social environment's influence. According to her concept, well-being is understood more broadly than simply “happiness” or “contentment”. For the unit to function well, many more factors are needed. Ryff, based on empirical research, has distinguished six factors. According to her, these factors ensure a good and valuable life. Each represents a challenge that the individual must meet to feel life satisfaction. These are: *self-acceptance*, understood as self-respect; *life purpose* as life's meaning; *environmental mastery* – understood as the ability to cope; *positive relationships with others* – a dimension necessary for a person to function properly; *personal development* – as the ability to realize one's potential; and *autonomy* – independence and the ability to make decisions.

Psychological well-being of individuals in close emotional relationships refers to a subjective feeling of happiness, satisfaction, and fulfillment. It comprises such elements as a feeling of emotional security,

social support, relationship satisfaction, and the ability to deal with conflicts (Reis and Gable, 2018). Individual well-being is not only closely related to the relationship quality and relationship satisfaction level but also to life satisfaction. Research indicates that high-quality communication, empathy, and a feeling of support in a relationship correlate with higher levels of psychological well-being (Holt-Lunstad, 2021), and partners who experience high emotional support levels are more likely to report lower stress levels and better emotional regulation (Pietromonaco and Collins, 2017; Holt-Lunstad, 2021). Moreover, stable and healthy relationships support building a positive self-image and self-esteem (Kuster and Orth, 2018). Partners who support each other and appreciate each other's strengths are more likely to have a higher level of happiness and commitment to the relationship. Relationship satisfaction also depends on the balance between support and autonomy – excessive control or lack of space can lead to a lower sense of well-being. Additionally, research indicates that people in satisfying relationships are less likely to experience depression, anxiety, and somatic problems (Slatcher and Selcuk, 2020), and partner support functions as a “buffer” against harmful stress effects and strengthens mental resilience (Feeney and Collins, 2019).

2.1. Communication in close emotional relationships

Communication is a process aimed at exchanging views, experiences, information, and ideas, causing specific effects (Bijak and Kleka, 2021). However, psychologists understand interpersonal communication as exchanging verbal and nonverbal signals to interact more effectively (Nęcka, Orzechowski, Szymura, 2006). Verbal communication is any information transmitted verbally or in writing between the sender and the recipient. Therefore it has a relational character (Janicka, 2016).

Suwalaska-Barancewicz and Malina (2018) indicate that communication in a romantic relationship can be divided into effective (understood as an empathic communication) and ineffective (which threatens the development of intimacy). Effective

communication in a couple involves partners approaching themselves with openness and respect, resolving conflicts using mutual understanding, and maintaining closeness. Ineffective communication strategies are characterized by criticism, deprecation, hostility, and lack of empathy towards the partner. Neither do they lead to conflict resolution. In conclusion, communication style in a relationship is crucial to a romantic relationship's quality. Openness, active listening, and empathy are predictors of relationship longevity, whereas avoiding conversations and aggressive communication lead to a weakened relationship (Wałęcka-Matyja and Dębska, 2023). Plopa (2007) also reached similar conclusions, distinguishing the following communication types: supportive – is based on showing respect, openness and building community; engaged – is based on creating an atmosphere filled with support and understanding and emphasizes the value of the relationship; depreciative – which is a negative system of communication between partners, full of aggression, arrogance, insults and lack of respect. Increasing this communication type distances partners from each other and causes hostility.

According to researchers (Janicka, Cieślak, 2020), reciprocity in communication is one of the three fundamental dimensions that build good romantic relationships, right next to intimacy and argumentative behavior. Reciprocity in communication is characterized as the mutual exchange of emotions and experiences, as well as sharing them with one's partner. Important in this is also the communication frequency. This requires partners to be honest and able to communicate their emotional states. The researcher defines intimacy as verbal and non-verbal messages of affection directed to a partner. The dimension of “quarrelsome behavior” is defined as the occurrence of negative verbal messages in a conflict situation, which diminishes relationship satisfaction. Communication that complies with these three conditions (without negative non-verbal messages) provides the most effective way to communicate, leads to closer intimacy between partners, and helps resolve conflicts (Markman et al., 2010). The ability to “express and adequately interpret own and partner's feelings” also has a significant impact (Janicka, Niebrzydowski, 1994).

Communication research in relationships indicates that partners who express emotions openly and constructively are more likely to build lasting and stable relationships. Kelly et al. (2021) revealed that couples who regularly use active listening experience greater closeness and fewer conflicts. It is important to emphasize that the role of communication in a relationship is not limited only to conflict resolution. It is also a crucial element in building intimacy and emotional bonding. According to Sprecher and Hatfield (2022), partners who regularly express appreciation, gratitude, and affirmation have higher relationship satisfaction and lower disagreement levels. This means that depending on the communication style used, it can serve either as a factor that strengthens emotional bonds (e.g., empathic and supportive communication) or as a contributor to the deterioration of the relationship (e.g., communication marked by criticism and devaluation). Therefore, communication style has a direct impact on partners' experienced well-being and sense of emotional connectedness.

2.2. Empathy in interpersonal communication

A crucial element in good communication is empathy. Empathy is an emotional intelligence component and is understood as the ability to identify with the other person's experiences and to understand their perspective (Ryś, 2016). According to Baron-Cohen (2015), empathy is the ability to recognize the thoughts and feelings of another person and respond with appropriate emotions. Many researchers debate whether empathy is a personality characteristic or is shaped by the environment (Ciechomski, 2017). Nevertheless, it remains a fact that empathy is a crucial skill in forming close relationships with others and in building satisfying relationships. Emotional closeness and trust in a partner can only be built by people capable of empathy (Ryś, 2009). It allows the partners to build openness towards each other, which significantly strengthens the bond (Block, 2006). According to psychologists, communication between partners' feelings and experiences is a strong predictor of overall relationship satisfaction

(Walęcka-Matyja and Szkudlarek, 2019). Research also indicates that the higher the partners' level of knowledge in the emotional sphere, the greater their relationship satisfaction (Dakowicz, 2020).

Partners with high empathy levels are more likely to use supportive strategies such as paraphrasing statements, validating the other person's emotions, and avoiding criticism (Perez and Riggio, 2019). Research by Lemay and Clark (2020) indicates that people with a high capacity for empathic response are more likely to compromise and positively reinterpret conflict situations. Partners with high emotional intelligence are more likely to use assertive and open communication, leading to better quality relationships (Mikołajczak et al., 2015). The more empathetic and clear the communication between partners, the greater their sense of satisfaction and closeness (Zarzycka, 2016). Researchers also highlight differences between man and woman in empathy and its impact on communication. Women are more likely to demonstrate a higher ability to respond empathetically and use supportive strategies in communication (Christov-Moore et al., 2019). However, men are more likely to prefer a problem-solving communication style, and are not always effective in situations that require emotional empathy and understanding (Barrett and Bliss-Moreau, 2022). Research conducted over the past five years suggests that these differences may result partially from socio-cultural factors, not just biological ones—men are culturally “deprived” of empathy and raised to be strong and causal individuals (Fischer and Eagly, 2021). Current research indicates that interventions based on empathy training and improving communication strategies can help increase relationship satisfaction (Taylor et al., 2022).

3. Research methods and tools

The article aims to examine and evaluate the connections between communication form and experienced overall well-being of individuals in a romantic relationship. Additionally, it aims to highlight the relationship between the communication form (empathetic/denigrating) and certain subscales of

well-being; self-acceptance and positive relationships with others. For this purpose, the following research hypotheses were formulated:

- H1. There is a correlation between empathic communication and high levels of well-being of individuals in romantic relationship;
- H2. The higher the empathic communication, the higher the level of self-acceptance;
- H3. The higher the empathic communication, the more positive the relationship with others;
- H4. There is a difference between men and women in the communication style used.

The research was conducted by a diagnostic survey method using an online questionnaire. It was conducted from January to March 2025. To construct the questionnaire, two tools were used: the Shortened Mental Well-Being Scale (C. Ryff) and the Communication Forms Questionnaire (M. Ryś, P. Kwas). The first tool measures overall well-being and its six dimensions: self-acceptance, environmental mastery, personal development, positive relationships with others, life purpose, and autonomy. The method consists of 42 statements, to which the participant responds on a 7-point scale. The overall scale score is calculated by adding up each statement's score. The higher the score obtained, the higher the well-being level. The second tool, the Communication Forms Questionnaire, measures two communication styles: empathic and deprecating. The method consists of 22 statements to which the respondent responds on a 5-point scale. The higher the score obtained in each of the subscales, the higher the overall score for a given communication style.

4. Study group characteristics

The study included 80 people involved in romantic relationships with varying seniority. Respondents are between the ages of 19 and 65 years old. 79% of them were women and 21% men. Respondents are both married (44%) and in informal relationships (56%). Approximately 35% of the respondents defined the duration of their current relationship as

being between 2 and 5 years, while the second highest result (21%) was the relationship duration defined as between 6 and 10 years. Among respondents, 51% described their relationship as satisfactory and 32% as ideal. Up to 60% rated their communication style as good while indicating that their partner's communication style is at an average level

5. Results

The results were obtained using the SPSS IBM statistical program. The Shapiro-Wilk test was used for descriptive statistics. Spearman's rho test was used to calculate the correlation. The nonparametric Mann-Whitney U test was used to calculate differences between the male and female groups. The significance level was set at $\alpha = 0.05$. The result was considered statistically significant if it was in the range $0.05 < p < 0.1$.

The data presented in the table indicate that the overall level of well-being in the respondents is average ($M = 166.913$, $SD = 9.4483$). The highest possible score in each subscale is 49, so the highest possible overall score is 343. Based on the values presented in Table 1, it can be concluded that the variables had a right-skewed distribution (positive skewness), meaning that most of the results were below average. Respondents scored highest in the subscale concerning relationships ($M = 29.93$, $SD = 3.4101$). Therefore, it can be concluded that among those surveyed, many have relationships with loved ones that are satisfactory to them and have positive relationships with other people. High scores on this scale also indicate that the examined individuals exhibit empathy and understanding toward others.

In the research sample, the average value for empathic communication was $M = 38.463$, indicating the average results obtained. The average empathic communication score among women was $M = 39.302$, while among men, $M = 35.353$. Additionally, the standard deviation values ($SD = 4.335$ for women and $SD = 5.689$ for men) indicate that women were more consistent in their responses. These results suggest that the empathic communication level differs by gender. Among women, it is at a high level, while among men, it is at a medium level.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of the PWB questionnaire obtained from own research (N=80)

	M	Me	SD	Lower quartile	Upper quartile	Min	Max
WELL-BEING							
Autonomy	27.288	27	4.007	25	30	15	35
Environmental mastery	26.7	27	3.8987	25	29	15	40
Personal development	28.125	28	4.2824	25	30	18	40
Positive relationships	29.938	30	3.4101	28	31.25	22	38
Life Purpose	26.975	26	4.2693	24	30	16	36
Self-acceptance	27.888	28	3.7518	25	31	19	35
Overall	166.913	18	9.4483	158.75	173.25	147	184

M- mean, Me- median, SD- Standard deviation, Min- minimum, Max- maximum

Table 2. Descriptive statistics of the communication forms questionnaire from own research (N=80) by gender of respondents

	M	Me	SD	Lower quartile	Upper quartile	Min	Max
Total	66.586	66	8.028	62	71	47	88
Empathic communication	38.463	38.5	4.894	35.75	42	28	49
Deprecating communication	28.125	27	7.956	23.75	32.25	11	50
Among women							
Total	66.254	66	7.960	62	70	47	88
Empathic communication	39.302	40	4.335	36	42	28	49
Deprecating communication	26.952	26	7.948	22	30	11	50
Among men							
Total	67.824	68	8.406	59	75	57	84
Empathic communication	35.353	33	5.689	32	37	29	47
Deprecating communication	32.471	30	6.501	27	35	25	50

M- mean, Me- median, SD- Standard deviation, Min- minimum, Max- maximum

For depreciative communication, the average is $M = 28.125$, which is significantly lower than for empathic communication. The average result among women was $M = 26.952$, while among men, it was $M = 32.471$. Furthermore, the standard deviation values ($SD = 7.948$ for women and $SD = 6.501$ for men) indicate that men were more consistent in their responses. These results suggest that the depreciative communication level among men is at a medium level, while among women, it is at a low level.

Spearman's correlation analysis was conducted to examine whether and what communication forms affect selected dimensions of well-being, allowing for assessment of the strength and direction of the relationship. The results obtained indicate a statistically significant but weak negative correlation between empathic communication and well-being level. The correlation coefficient is $r = -0.2769$, $p = 0.0129$. This means that people who score higher in empathic communication

experience lower well-being levels. Therefore, hypothesis 1., proposed by the study's author, was not confirmed.

To verify hypothesis 2, the relationship between empathic communication level and a dimension of well-being – self-acceptance – was examined. The correlation coefficient is $r = -0.2465$, $p = 0.0275$. Therefore, there is a significant negative relationship between the variables examined. Accordingly, the higher the empathic communication score, the lower the level of self-acceptance. This result is interesting, and although it does not confirm the hypothesis formed before the study, it finds justification in the literature.

The results obtained in the study indicate a weak but significant correlation ($r = 0.249$, $p = 0.0259$) between empathic communication and the positive relationship subscale of the well-being scale. This means that people with higher empathic communication are more likely to report better quality interpersonal relationships. The obtained result confirms hypothesis 3 proposed by the author. Although this relationship is relatively weak, its statistical significance suggests that empathetic communication plays a role in building positive connections.

Hypothesis 4 presented in the study was also confirmed. The results indicate that women have higher levels of empathic communication, while men score higher on deprecating communication. The statistical significance of these differences was confirmed using the Mann-Whitney U test. The obtained results indicate that women achieved a higher average score in empathic communication ($M = 39.302$, $SD = 4.445$) compared to men ($M = 35.353$, $SD = 5.689$). This difference is statistically significant ($Z = 304$, $p = 0.006$), suggesting that women are more likely to use communication strategies based on understanding, compassion, and willingness to help. Men had a higher average score for deprecatory communication ($M = 32.471$, $SD = 6.501$) compared to women ($M = 26.952$, $SD = 7.948$). This difference was also statistically significant ($Z = 0.003$, $p = 0.003$). This result means that men are more likely to use communication strategies based on rivalry, irony, sarcasm, or verbal aggression.

6. Results discussion

Although some of the hypotheses (H1 and H2) proposed by the author were not confirmed, there is an interesting interpretation of the obtained results. Researchers describe a certain paradox of empathy – one that has both positive and negative consequences. According to Batson (2011), empathy is associated with greater involvement in others' problems, which can lead to "emotional overload" and burnout. Empathic people often absorb others' emotions, which can negatively affect their well-being. According to research by Eisenberg et al. (2020), excessive engagement with others' emotions can lead to mental exhaustion. In the context of empathic communication, this means that people who are heavily involved in others' emotions may feel more stress and fatigue. They may also excessively analyze and worry about the situation, affecting their well-being. According to the pro-social cost theory (Perez and Riggio, 2019), engaging in helping and emotional support can lead to sacrificing one's own needs, which can result in reduced well-being. People who display high empathic communication may neglect their own emotions, needs, and rest, leading to mental exhaustion. An interesting explanation for the obtained research results may also be the specificity of the research group. If the study had been conducted on people working in helping professions (e.g., psychologists, doctors, and teachers), they might have experienced the negative effects of empathy more often. However, the study's author has no insight into the occupations performed by the respondents. Although the results obtained do not support the accepted hypothesis, they are consistent with the empathy, emotion regulation, and pro-social cost theories in the literature. According to these theories, empathy can be both a resource and a burden, depending on how it is experienced and how emotions are regulated. According to research by Eisenberg and Strayer (2001) and Deci and Ryan (2000), highly empathetic individuals often prioritize the needs of others over their own. This may lead to self-neglect and prioritizing the emotions of others over their own. People with high empathic communication levels are more likely to compare themselves to others, making them more likely to

view themselves critically, be concerned about others' opinions, and perceive their imperfections (Neff, 2011; Lopez-Correa et al., 2020). Highly empathic people also tend to focus on others' emotions and problems, causing them to downplay their own needs and achievements. Simultaneously, people with high empathy may take too much responsibility for others' emotions, and when their efforts do not have a positive result, they experience failure. Such action can lead to decreased self-esteem and self-acceptance and burnout (Figley, 2002). Empathy is essential for interpersonal relationships but can be associated with lower self-acceptance if it is not accompanied by the ability to self-care.

The hypotheses confirmed in the presented research (H3, H4) are also confirmed in other papers. Batson (2011) indicates that the ability to understand and empathize with others' emotions enhances interpersonal relationship quality. Empathic communication increases trust and closeness. People who can actively listen and understand the perspectives of others build deeper and more satisfying relationships (Davis, 1983). Higher empathy levels reduce conflicts – empathic communication allows for effective dispute resolution, as it allows you to notice the other person's emotions and needs (Rogers, 1951). It also promotes mutual support – people with higher empathy are more likely to engage in pro-social behavior, which has a positive impact on relationships (Eisenberg et al., 2020). Goleman's (1995) research indicates that people with high emotional intelligence – and therefore also able to empathize – perform better in social interactions. Their relationships are more harmonious because they can adapt their communication style to the speaker's emotions and needs. The author's research included people in partner relationships – therefore, the expected relationship between empathic communication and relationships. This interpretation is consistent with empathy, attachment, and emotional intelligence theories. This means that developing empathetic skills can positively affect the relationship quality, but the ability to regulate one's own emotions should also be nurtured. According to Batson's (2011) empathy theory, women are more likely to react in empathetic way, which may result

from biological and social factors. Eisenberg and Fabes' (1998) research indicates that women are more likely to engage in pro-social behavior and recognize and regulate emotions better in interpersonal interactions. Moreover, according to gender role theory (Eagly, 1987), women are often socialized in ways that promote empathy and caregiving, which may be reflected in their communication style. Research by Olweus (1993) indicates that men are more likely to engage in verbal aggression as a form of expressing frustration or achieving dominance. Gender role theory (Bem, 1981) suggests that men are socially conditioned to engage in more assertive and sometimes aggressive communication forms. Research by Cross and Madson (1997) indicates that men are more likely to focus on individualistic behavior, which may lead to less empathy and greater use of deprecating communication.

7. Theoretical and practical implications

Based on the conducted research and the analyzed literature, several important conclusions can be drawn, not only for researchers studying communication in interpersonal relationships but also for practitioners working with patients. Firstly, there is a clear need for further research into the potential negative impact of empathy on the human psyche to describe its effects and potential consequences for the individual. Another conclusion drawn is the need for education children and their parents about emotions and interpersonal relationships. Special emphasis should be placed on learning to protect one's well-being and to skillfully set boundaries in relationships, as being an empathetic person can be aggravating. It is also crucial to foster self-compassion and empathy toward oneself, so that partners can become more emotionally self-aware and better equipped to build fulfilling relationships. The final conclusion is the need to focus on boys and men to cultivate empathetic communication from an early age. To this end, it is essential to educate parents and caregivers about emotional development and relationship skills.

8. Future research directions

The conducted research inspires further exploration. It should be expanded to verify other internal and external factors that can influence communication and well-being in close emotional relationships. Understanding these factors is crucial, as it can contribute to better comprehension of relationship dynamics and at least the appropriate therapeutic interventions used in therapy. Future studies should consider individuals' empathy levels, personality traits and temperamen-

tal characteristics. From a research perspective, it would also be valuable to examine attachment styles within romantic partnerships. Further exploration into the distinct types of empathy and the role of self-compassion is recommended. Qualitative studies could provide a more nuanced understanding of the personal determinants of empathic communication. Additionally, it would be worthwhile to investigate the long-term effects of different communication styles on relationship stability and to explore the origins of gender differences in communication patterns.

Bibliography

- Baron-Cohen, S. (2015). *Teoria zła. O empatii i genezie okrucieństwa*. Warszawa: Smak Słowa.
- Barrett, L. F., Bliss-Moreau, E. (2009). She's emotional. He's having a bad day: Attributional explanations for emotion stereotypes. *Emotion*, 9(5), 649-658. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0016821>
- Batson, C. (2011). *Altruism in humans*. Oxford University Press.
- Baumeister, R., Leary, M. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117(3), 497-525.
- Bem, S.L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review*, 88(4), 354-364.
- Bijak, K., Kleka, P. (2021). Relacje online. Ekstrawersja i inteligencja emocjonalna w kontekście wybranych aspektów komunikacji internetowej. *Człowiek i Społeczeństwo*, 51, 189-203. <https://doi.org/10.14746/cis.2021.51.10>
- Block, J. (2006). *Intymność w związku: Bliskość, czułość, akceptacja*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Bowlby, J. (2007). *Przywiązanie*. Warszawa: PWN
- Christov-Moore, L., et al. (2019). Empathy: Gender differences in neural mechanisms of emotional recognition. *Neuroscience & Biobehavioral Reviews*, 103, 137-145.
- Ciechomski, M. (2017). Wychowanie do empatii jako sposób na redukcję stresu i jego szkodliwych skutków u dzieci i młodzieży. *Forum Pedagogiczne*, 7(2), 49-62.
- Cross, S.E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin*, 122(1), 5-37.
- Czyżowska, D., Gurba, E., Czyżowska, N. (2019). Intimate relationship and a chance for a good life in young people. (2019). *Quarterly Journal Fides et Ratio*, 37(1), 183-200. <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v1i37.44>
- Dakowicz, A. (2020). Psychotransgresyjna analiza sfery emocjonalnej małżonków o wyższym i niższym poziomie zadowolenia ze swojego związku. (In:) M. Sroczyńska, A. Linek (eds.), *Społeczne konteksty współżycia i intymności. Szkice z socjologii emocji*, Vol. 1, 145-163, Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Davoodvandi, M., Navabi Nejad, S., Farzad, V. (2018). Examining the effectiveness of Gottman couple therapy on improving marital adjustment and couples' intimacy. *Iranian Journal of Psychiatry*, 13(2), 135-141.
- Davis, M. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.
- Deci, E., Ryan, R. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Diener, E., Lucas, R., Oishi, S. (2018). Advances and open questions in the science of subjective well-being. *Collabra: Psychology*, 4(1), 15. <https://doi.org/10.1525/collabra.115>
- Doroszewicz, K. (2008). Bliskie związki a jakość życia. *Psychologia Jakości Życia*, 7(1/2), 5-18.
- Eagly, A.H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Psychology Press
- Eisenberg, N., Fabes, R.A. (1998). Prosocial development. *Handbook of Child Psychology*, 3(5), 701-778.
- Eisenberg, N. (2000). Emotion, regulation, and moral development. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 51(1), 665-697.
- Eisenberg, N., Strayer, J. (2001). *Empathy and its development*. Cambridge University Press.
- Eisenberg, N., Eggum, N., Di Giunta, L. (2020). Empathy-related responding: Associations with prosocial behavior, aggression, and intergroup relations. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 14(1), 143-174. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sipr.12058>
- Eisenberg, N., Spinrad, T., Knafo-Noam, A. (2020). Prosocial development from a multi-system perspective. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71, 91-125. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010419-050937>
- Feeney, B.C., Collins, N.L. (2019). Thriving through relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 31, 22-28.
- Figley, C. (2002). Compassion fatigue: Psychotherapists' chronic lack of self-care. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 58(11), 1433-1441.
- Fischer, A.H., Eagly, A.H. (2021). The socialization of gender differences in emotional expression. *Emotion Review*, 13(2), 91-109.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. Bantam Books.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994). *Why marriages succeed or fail and How You Can Make Yours Last*. London: Bloomsbury
- Holt-Lunstad, J. (2021). The Major Health Implications of Social Connection. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 30(3), 251-259 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721421999630>
- Hazan, C., Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52(3), 511-524.
- Janicka, I., Niebrzydowski, L. (1994). *Psychologia małżeństwa*. Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

- Janicka, I. (2012). Poczucie dobrostanu u osób poślubionych, kohabitujących i u singli. (In:) T. Rostowska, M. Lewandowska-Walter (eds.), *Małżeństwo i rodzicielstwo a zdrowie*, 26-53. Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Janicka, I. (2016). Style komunikacji w związkach kohabitacyjnych. *Psychologiczne Zeszyty Naukowe*, 2, 37-49.
- Janicka, I., Cieślak, M. (2020). Satysfakcja seksualna i jej znaczenie w bliskich związkach emocjonalnych. *Polskie Forum Psychologiczne*, Vol. XXV(4), 389-405.
- Kelly, A., Fincham, F., Beach, S. (2003). Communication skills in couples: A review and discussion of emerging perspectives. (In:) J.O. Greene, B.R. Burleson (eds.), *Handbook of communication and social interaction skills*, 723-751. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Kuster, F., Orth, U. (2018). The long-term stability of self-esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 114(3), 317-334.
- Lemay, E., Clark, M. (2021). Emotions and relationships. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 44, 1-6.
- Markman, H.J., Stanley, S.M., Blumberg, S.L. (2010). *Fighting for your marriage*. Jossey-Bass.
- Mikolajczak, M., Roy, E., Luminet, O., Fillée, C., de Timary, P. (2015). The mediating role of emotional intelligence in the impact of stress on alcohol consumption. *European Review of Applied Psychology*, 65(2), 71-77.
- Mikolajczak, M., Gross, J., Roskam, I. (2015). The emotion-regulation ability of empathic people. *Emotion*, 15(5), 695-703.
- Min, L., Jianchao, N., Mengyuan, L. (2022). The influence of self-compassion on mental health of postgraduates: Mediating role of help-seeking behavior. *Frontiers of Psychology*, 13. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.915190>
- Neff, K. (2003). The development and validation of a scale to measure self-compassion. *Self and Identity*, 2(3), 223-250.
- Neff, K. (2011). Self-compassion, self-esteem, and well-being. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 1-12.
- Nęcka, E., Orzechowski, J., Szymura, B. (2006). *Psychologia poznawcza*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Perez, J.C., Riggio, R.E. (2019). The role of empathy in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 36(7), 1910-1925.
- Pietromonaco, P.R., Collins, N.L. (2017). Interpersonal mechanisms linking close relationships to health. *American Psychologist*, 72(6), 531-542.
- Płopa, M. (2007). *Węzi w małżeństwie i rodzinie. Metody badań*. Kraków: Oficyna Wydawnicza „Impuls”.
- Reis, H.T., Gable, S.L. (2018). Relationships, well-being, and health. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 69, 207-236.
- Rogers, C. (1951). *Client-centered therapy: Its current practice, implications and theory*. Houghton Mifflin.
- Ryff, C. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 1069-1081.
- Ryś, M. (2009). *Relacje w małżeństwie*. (In:) F. Adamski (ed.) *Miłość, małżeństwo, rodzina*, 177-188. Kraków: Petrus.
- Ryś, M. (2016). Miłość jako podstawa wspólnoty małżeńskiej. Ujęcie psychologiczne. *Kwartalnik Naukowy Fides et Ratio*, 27(3), 57-74.
- Slatcher, R.B., Selcuk, E. (2020). A social psychological perspective on close relationships and health. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 71, 335-359.
- Smoleń, J., Iskra, J. (2023). Inteligencja emocjonalna droga do pokojowego budowania relacji przyjacielskich. *Społeczeństwo. Edukacja. Język*, 18. [https://doi.org/10.19251/sej/2023.18\(6\)](https://doi.org/10.19251/sej/2023.18(6))
- Smith, A.L., Brown, J.D., Lee, C.T. (2021). Emotional regulation and long-term relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Couple and Relationship Therapy*, 20(3), 224-240.
- Sprecher, S., Hatfield, E. (2022). Ratings of the physical attractiveness of an interaction partner after a getting-acquainted interaction. *Personal Relationships*, 29(2), 366-385. <https://doi.org/10.1111/per.12422>
- Sternberg, R. (1986). A triangular theory of love. *Psychological Review*, 93(2), 119-135.
- Suwalska-Barancewicz, D., Malina, A. (2018). Samoocena i styl przywiązania jako predyktory oceny zachowań komunikacyjnych własnych oraz partnera. *Psychologia Rozwojowa*, 23(3), 65-82. <https://doi.org/10.4467/20843879PR.18.017.9358>
- Szurlej, A. (2024). *Inteligencja emocjonalna jako mediator związku między potrzebą przynależności, poczuciem szczęścia i rozwojem osobistym* (Master thesis, Jagiellonian University in Kraków, Poland).
- Taylor, R.D., Morris, J.P., Cameron, C.A. (2022). Enhancing empathy in romantic relationships: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 48(5), 667-684.
- Walecka-Matyja, K., Dębska, J. (2023). Interpersonal relationships and communication in romantic relationships vs digitization of life. (2023). *Quarterly Journal Fides et Ratio*, 54(2), 9-23. <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v54i2.1183>
- Walecka-Matyja, K., Szkudlarek, A. (2019). Psychological predictors of satisfaction with a close interpersonal relationship. The role of emotional communication. *Quarterly Journal Fides et Ratio*, 38(2), 50-73. <https://doi.org/10.34766/fetr.v2i38.66>
- Zarzycka, B. (2016). Psychologiczne koncepcje przebaczenia w relacjach międzyludzkich. *Pedagogia Christiana*, 37(1), 163-181.