

# Development and Validation of a Polish-Language Version of the Satisfaction with Relationship Status Scale (ReSta)

Katarzyna Adamczyk<sup>1</sup> 

Published online: 23 March 2017

© The Author(s) 2017. This article is published with open access at Springerlink.com

**Abstract** This article presents a study aimed at developing and validating a Polish-language version of the Satisfaction with Relationship Status Scale (ReSta) (Lehmann et al. in *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 169–184 2015). The construct and concurrent validity, and psychometric properties of the Polish ReSta were examined in the sample of 185 Polish respondents aged 20–32 ( $M = 22.59$ ,  $SD = 3.23$ ). Exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the unidimensionality of the Polish ReSta. The analyses demonstrated the existence of differences in the domain of status satisfaction between single and partnered individuals, and between women and men, as well as between single individuals who reported different frequency of preference of the alternate relationship status. The analysis of zero-order correlations revealed strong associations between status satisfaction and relationship satisfaction, and romantic loneliness. Finally, status satisfaction was found to be a better predictor of life satisfaction, emotional and psychological well-being, and depressive symptoms than relationship status per se. The Polish ReSta was assessed to be a valid measure of status satisfaction with high reliability and high test-retest reliability over a lag of one month.

**Keywords** Satisfaction with relationship status · Relationship status · Single · Partnered · Well-being

## Introduction

In a recent study, Lehmann et al. (2015) introduced a new construct termed *satisfaction with relationship status* or *status satisfaction*. This term refers to being satisfied with one's current relationship status (either having a partner or not). With the introduction of this new construct, the authors simultaneously developed a new instrument, that is, the Satisfaction with Relationship Status Scale (ReSta), to measure satisfaction with relationship status. As a generic tool, ReSta was intended to be a first analog scale which could allow to perform comparisons between single and partnered adults in the domain of satisfaction with current relationship status. At the same time, the authors demonstrated that status satisfaction played a more important and exploratory role in predicting well-being measured in terms of life satisfaction and psychological distress than marital status alone.

Regarding the significance of satisfaction with relationship status in the prediction of life satisfaction and psychological distress, and the fact that no scale assessing status satisfaction in Polish culture currently exists, the present author was encouraged to develop and validate the Polish adaptation of the Satisfaction with Relationship Scale (ReSta). Therefore, the primary aim of this study was to determine whether the Polish ReSta would replicate original findings obtained by Lehmann et al. (2015) in terms of construct validity (i.e., factorial structure, mean level differences, zero-order correlations) and concurrent validity (i.e., the predictive role of status satisfaction for life satisfaction and psychological distress beyond marital status), and its psychometric properties. Furthermore, Lehmann et al. (2015) called for further research aimed at identifying factors that influence status satisfaction and at investigating the predictive role of status satisfaction for

---

✉ Katarzyna Adamczyk  
Katarzyna.Adamczyk@amu.edu.pl

<sup>1</sup> Institute of Psychology, Adam Mickiewicz University in Poznań, ul. A. Szamarzewskiego 89/ AB, 60-568 Poznań, Poland

other aspects relevant to intimate and sexual relationships. Therefore, the current study was also intended to provide insight into the validity of ReSta by examining the associations between status satisfaction and other variables that had not been examined in the original study aimed at developing ReSta. These additional variables included: emotional and psychological well-being, depressive symptoms, gender, relationship satisfaction, romantic loneliness, duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood, fear of being single. First, the current study extended the study by Lehmann et al. (2015) by focusing on emotional and psychological well-being, and depressive symptoms. The inclusion of these indicators of well-being was dictated by the recognition that positive aspects of health together with the lack of problems are crucial in obtaining a comprehensive picture of the human being (e.g. Cierpiałkowska and Sęk 2015; Kaczmarek 2016; Trzebińska 2008). Second, some prior studies suggested that marriage and romantic relationships may operate differently for women and for men (e.g. Wadsworth 2016), which may be a result of differences in the socialization of women and men who are expected to undertake the role of wife and husband, but it is women who are expected to be especially concentrated on the family and their marital role (Mandal 2008). Furthermore, as suggested by Bernard (1972), marriage may be related to more social, psychological and economic benefits for men than for women. In addition, the differences in the meaning of being in a relationship, including a marital relationship, for women and men may translate into different consequences for women and men in the case of being single (e.g. Keith 2003). These various consequences may on the one hand be related to the stronger focus on relationships among women compared to men as well as to different social perceptions of single women and single men, with singlehood being more acceptable in among women (Wadsworth 2016). To be precise, for example for centuries it has been assumed that every woman wants to get married, and if she does not succeed, she is treated as if she had some deficits (Duch-Krzystoszek 1995). As opposed to unmarried women, unmarried men are treated more leniently as it is presumed that their being single is a choice they themselves have made for such important reasons as lack of time to start a family or personal sacrifice for the sake of science or one's country" (Duch-Krzystoszek 1995). Therefore, based on these notions, gender was included in the performed analyses. Third, relationship satisfaction is an important aspect of romantic relationships related to such outcomes as depressive symptoms and marital distress (e.g. Kiecolt-Glaser and Newton 2001), and personal well-being (e.g. Proulx et al. 2007). Therefore, it would be useful to determine how and to what extent relationship satisfaction among partnered individuals and status satisfaction – as two distinctive constructs – are related to each other. Fourth, romantic loneliness as related to “the absence of a partner, that is, to the absence of an exclusive, close, and intimate tie” (Dykstra and Fokkema

2007, p. 9) is directly related to the domain of romantic relationships as status satisfaction. Based on these past findings, although not directly pertaining to status satisfaction and loneliness, it is reasonable to assume that these constructs are related to each other in a negative way since satisfaction may be understood as a positive outcome and loneliness is understood as a subjectively unpleasant and distressing feeling with potentially serious consequences (e.g. Peplau and Perlman 1982). For example, Mellor et al. (2008) found that satisfaction with personal relationships was moderately and negatively correlated with loneliness. In turn, Whitton and Kuryluk (2012) found a negative correlation between satisfaction in dating relationships and depressive symptoms, and Levis et al. (2015) found in their study that women in poor-quality marriages reported worse mental health compared to unmarried women. As a result, increased status satisfaction would be expected to be associated with decreased romantic loneliness. Fifth, in prior studies, duration of a relationship has been found to be related to such outcomes as relationship/marital satisfaction (e.g. Mirecki et al. 2013) and mental health (e.g. Gibb et al. 2011). Also, duration of singlehood has been found to be positively related to romantic loneliness (author citation). Therefore, it would be worthwhile to determine whether duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood are related to status satisfaction. Sixth, fear of being single is a new construct recently introduced by Spielmann et al. (2013). The authors described it as “entailing concern, anxiety, or distress regarding the current or prospective experience of being without a romantic partner” (Spielmann et al. 2013, p. 1049). Considering that fear of being single is a relatively new construct which was found to be a predictor of various romantic outcomes (Spielmann et al. 2013), it would be worthwhile to examine its links with status satisfaction. Finally, the current study also aimed at determining the test-retest reliability of ReSta during a one month interval, since in the original study this reliability was not investigated.

## Method

The procedure of developing and validating the Polish-language version of ReSta included the following steps: (1) elaboration of the Polish-language version of ReSta on; (2) investigation of the construct validity of the Polish ReSta by performance of (a) exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses, (b) determination of the mean level differences between groups differing in regard to relationship status, gender, frequency of the preference of the alternate relationship status, and perception of marriage as a goal in life, (c) determination of zero-order correlations between status satisfaction and other variables (i.e., life satisfaction, emotional and psychological well-being, depressive symptoms, relationship satisfaction, romantic loneliness, duration of a relationship, duration of

being single, and fear of being single; (3) investigation of the concurrent validity by performance hierarchical regression analyses testing the predictive role of status satisfaction for life satisfaction, emotional and psychological well-being, and depressive symptoms; (4) investigation of the reliability and test-retest reliability of the Polish ReSta over a lag of one month.

### Step 1. Elaboration of the Polish-Language Version of ReSta

In the first step, three independent translators translated the original ReSta into the Polish language. The five translated items were also reviewed by the present author and a native English speaker in regard to their content and clarity. As a result of this work, the initial version of the Polish ReSta was administered among a sample of 21 university students who were asked to indicate any confusing words or sentences. The improvement of the troublesome items finally enabled elaborating the back-translation of ReSta into English by another three experienced translators. Based on the translation procedure described above, an experimental version of the Polish ReSta was administered among a bilingual group of 31 university students (22 females and 9 males) aged 20–23 ( $M = 20.35$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ). During the classes, the student participants completed the English version of ReSta in the first step, and after a one-month interval they completed the Polish version of ReSta. The performed analyses revealed that the total scale of the English ReSta and the total scale of the Polish ReSta were highly correlated ( $r = .84$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed). Furthermore, the five items of the English and Polish ReSta demonstrated the following pattern of correlations: item no. 1 ( $r = .79$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 2 ( $r = .62$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 3 ( $r = .68$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 4 ( $r = .62$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), and item no. 5 ( $r = .76$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed). The obtained findings allowed to consider the Polish ReSta as an effective translation of the original scale.

### Step 2. Investigation of the Construct and Concurrent Validity of the Polish ReSta

#### Participants and Procedure

Among 224 respondents recorded in an online database, 21 individuals were excluded since they did not complete the survey, 6 individuals provided some incomplete information, and 12 respondents indicated that during the past year they were received psychiatric treatment. As a result, the final sample utilized in this study consisted of 185 participants aged 20–32 years old ( $M = 22.59$ ,  $SD = 3.23$ ). Women represented

59.50% of the sample ( $n = 110$ ), whereas men represented 40.50% of the sample ( $n = 75$ ). Ninety-one respondents (49.19%) declared being single, whereas 94 respondents (50.81%) declared being partnered at the time of the assessment. The minimum duration of being in a relationship was 1 month, and the maximum was 276 months ( $M = 36.03$ ,  $SD = 39.62$ ). The minimum duration of being single was 1 month; moreover, 49 participants (24.90%) indicated that they had never had a romantic partner. For these participants, it was not possible to determine the duration of their singlehood. Among those participants who indicated the duration of their singlehood, the average duration of being single was determined to be 7.79 months with a standard deviation of 12.08. With respect to education, most participants ( $n = 123$ ; 66.49%) was students, whereas 62 participants (33.51%) were degree-holders.

The Polish set of online questionnaires was prepared in the programme Qualtrics. The link was distributed among university students from different faculties of the university who were also asked to encourage their acquaintances and friends, but not their partners, to participate. Participants were informed in the cover letter about the title of the research project and its aims, the identity of the principal investigator and their contact information; explanation why the individual has been asked to participate in the study; a description of the type of participation and possibility to withdraw participation and data at any time; an outline of any risks and benefits; and the method of securing additional information or asking questions. Participants were asked to provide their e-mail address in case if they would be willing to participate in the second step of the study after 1 month. Participants were assured that all information provided by them would remain confidential. In addition, in order to avoid linking participants' names and surnames with their email addresses, in regard to the informed consent box in the online survey respondents were not asked to provide their names and surnames but were only asked to indicate the option 'Yes' or 'No' as an expression of their agreement (or lack thereof) to participate in the survey under the conditions described in the cover letter. Participants did not receive any compensation for their participation in wave 1 and wave 2.

#### Measures

**Demographic Questionnaire** This questionnaire was designed by the author to obtain general socio-demographic information such as age, gender, education, place of residence, current relationship status, duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood, and any psychological or psychiatric treatments received. This instrument also included two additional questions rated in the original study by Lehmann et al. (2015). One question aimed to explore how frequently the participant wished for the opposite relationship status, i.e. "Would you sometimes prefer being in a relationship?"

(version for single respondents) and “*Would you sometimes prefer being single?*” (version for partnered respondents). This questions were rated on a 4-point scale ranging from never, seldom, sometimes to often/always. The second question was as follows: “*Is getting married a goal in your life?*”. The answer included two options: “Yes” and “No”.

**The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale** (CES-D; Radloff 1977) (Polish adaptation – Kaniasty 2003; Ziarko et al. 2013) was used to assessed depressive symptoms. It consists of 20 statements measuring the frequency of depressive symptoms which includes depressive affect (7 test items), absence of well-being (4 items), somatic symptoms (7 items), and interpersonal affect (2 items). Participants indicate the frequency of depressive symptoms in the past week using a four-point scale from 0 (*rarely, or not at all*) to 3 (*most of the time or all the time*). The sum of all items range from 0 to 60 points with higher scores indicating a higher level of depression. In the current study, Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was found to be .85.

**The Fear of Being Single Scale** (FBS; Spielmann et al. 2013) (Polish adaptation – author citation) is a six-item scale designed to measure the fear of being single among single and partnered respondents. Respondents are asked to respond to the six items using a scale from 1 (*not at all true*) to 5 (*very true*). In a series of studies, the internal consistency of the original scale ranged from  $\alpha = .83$  to  $\alpha = .87$  (Spielmann et al. 2013). In this sample, Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was determined to be .80.

**The Mental Health Continuum – Short Form** (MHC – SF; Keyes 2002) (Polish adaptation – Karaś et al. 2014). This questionnaire includes 14 items assessing emotional, psychological, and social well-being. Participants rated questions about how they have been feeling during the past month using a scale ranging from 0 (*never*) to 5 (*every day*). The MHC – SF is a reliable and valid tool (Keyes 2002). In the present study, emotional and psychological well-being subscales were used. Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was found to be .84. for emotional well-being subscale, and .86 for psychological well-being subscale.

**The Relationship Assessment Scale** (Hendrick 1988) (Polish adaptation - Monfort et al. 2014) was used to measure general relationship satisfaction. This questionnaire consisted of 7 items rated by respondents on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*not well*) to 5 (*very well*). Here, an average or total score can be calculated with higher scores indicating higher relationship satisfaction. The internal consistency of the original scale was found to be  $\alpha = .86$  (Hendrick 1988). In this sample, Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was determined to be .86.

**The Satisfaction with Relationship Status Scale** (ReSta; Lehmann et al. 2015). ReSta consists of five items rated on a four-point scale: 0 (*not at all*), 1 (*a little*), 2 (*to quite some*

*extent*), 3 (*to a great extent*). Five items are summed up to a total score, with a higher score indicating higher satisfaction with the current relationship status. ReSta was assessed to be a reliable and valid scale with its confirmed unidimensionality (Lehmann et al. 2015).

**The Social and Emotional Loneliness Scale for Adults - Short Form** (SELSA-S; DiTommaso et al. 2004) (Polish adaptation - Adamczyk and DiTommaso 2014). The SELSA-S is a multidimensional measure of loneliness. It consists of 15 items designed to measure emotional (romantic and family) and social loneliness. The items are rated on a 7-point scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). High SELSA scores indicate high levels of emotional and social loneliness. The SELSA-S’s three subscales have high internal reliability, with Cronbach’s alphas ranging from .87 to .90, and have been shown to be a valid measure of loneliness (DiTommaso et al. 2004). In the current study, romantic loneliness subscale was used and its Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was determined to be .89.

**The Satisfaction with Life Scale** (SWLS; Diener et al. 1985) (Polish adaptation - Juczyński 2009). This scale measures an individual’s satisfaction with his/her life. The SWLS uses a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from *strongly disagree* (1) to *strongly agree* (7), yielding a possible score range of 5 (low life satisfaction) to 35 (high life satisfaction). In this sample, Guttman’s  $\lambda_2$  was determined to be .81.

## Results

### The Construct Validity of the Polish ReSta

#### Exploratory Factor Analysis

An Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was performed on the five items of the Polish ReSta. The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure verified the sampling adequacy for the analysis,  $KMO = .86$ , and Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity  $\chi^2(10) = 932.83$ ,  $p = .000$ , indicated that correlations between items were sufficiently large for exploratory factor analysis. The item intercorrelations were high ranging from .60 to .89 ( $p = .000$ ). One factor had an eigenvalue of 4.07 and explained 81.45% of the variance. The loadings of the five items of the Polish ReSta are presented in Table 1.

#### Confirmatory Factor Analysis

To examine the adequacy of the one-factor structure of the Polish ReSta, a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) was performed in the AMOS version 22. The model fit indices are presented in Table 2.

**Table 1** Items and factor loadings for the Polish ReSta

Items		Factor 1
1.	In general, how satisfied are you with your current status?	.93
2.	How often do you wish you hadn't gotten into this situation?*	.78
3	How happy are you with your current status?	.95
4.	To what extent does your current status meet your expectations?	.92
5.	Do you enjoy your current status?	.93

\*Reversed scoring

Items scored on a scale from 0 = *Not at all* to 3 = *To a great extent*

As Table 2 shows, the CFA resulted in a good model fit, except for the AGFI (values of .90 or higher indicate an adequate fit; Newsom 2012; Williams and Holahan 1994) and RMSEA (values of .08 indicate a bad fit; Williams and Holahan 1994) as criteria of the adequacy of the model. The model fit indices provided in Table 2 supported the one-factor solution and the unidimensionality of the ReSta scale as the CFA performed in the original study on ReSta.

### Mean Level Differences between Groups

First, the analysis of mean level differences between the distinguished groups was proceeded by the determination of the descriptive statistics of major study variables (see Table 3).

Second, following the study by Lehmann et al. (2015), the mean level differences in the domain of status satisfaction were determined between single and partnered individuals, between groups of single and partnered participants distinguished on the basis of the frequency of preferring an alternate relationship status in comparison to the current relationship status (i.e., never, seldom, sometimes and often/always groups), and between groups of individuals who declared that marriage is a goal in their lives and those individuals who indicated that marriage is not a goal in their lives. In addition, gender differences, which were not reported by Lehmann et al. (2015), were examined. Based on the original study by Lehmann et al. (2015) it was hypothesized that:

- Single individuals will report lower status satisfaction than partnered individuals.
- Partnered individuals who belong to never, seldom, sometimes, and often/always preferring singlehood groups will differ from one another in the domain of status satisfaction.

- Single individuals who report often/always prefer being in a relationship will report lower level of status satisfaction compared to single individuals who report never, seldom, and sometimes preferring being in a relationship.
- Single individuals who view marriage as a goal in their lives will report lower level of status satisfaction with their single status in comparison to those single individuals who do not view marriage as a goal in their lives.

With respect to gender differences - as they were not reported by Lehmann et al. (2015) - an open research question was formulated:

RQ1. Will women and men differ regarding status satisfaction?

In regard to H1, the performed analyses (see Table 3) showed that single individuals experienced lower status satisfaction than their partnered counterparts,  $F(1183) = 111.25$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $\eta^2 = .38$ .

With respect to the frequency of preferences of the alternate relationship status in the single subsample, no single individuals indicated that they would never prefer the alternate relationship status. As a result, the analysis performed on the three single subgroups distinguished on the basis of preferences of the alternate relationship status revealed a significant main effect,  $F(3,87) = 22.52$ ,  $p = .000$ ,  $\eta^2 = .58$ . The Bonferroni post hoc test revealed that these subgroups differed from one another as the often/always group reported the lowest status satisfaction, followed by the sometimes group and the seldom group with the highest status satisfaction (see Table 4).

As Table 4 demonstrates, in the current sample, none of partnered individuals indicated that they would often/always prefer the opposite relationship status. Thus, the analysis

**Table 2** model fit indices of the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) testing for one-factor model

	$\chi^2$	$df$	$\chi^2/df$	AGFI	CFI	GFI	IFI	NFI	RFI	RMSEA	RMR
One-factor model	19.41**	5	3.88	.88	.99	.96	.96	.98	.96	.13	.02

AGFI Adjusted goodness of fit index, CFI Comparative fit index, GFI Goodness of fit index, IFI Incremental fit index, NFI Normed fit index, RFI Relative fit index, RMSEA Root mean squared error of approximation, RMR Root mean square residual. \*\*  $p < .01$

**Table 3** Descriptive statistics (Means and SD) of major variables for the total sample and stratified by relationship status

Variables	Total sample ( <i>N</i> = 185) Mean (SD)	Partnered individuals ( <i>n</i> = 94) Mean (SD)	Single individuals ( <i>n</i> = 91) Mean (SD)
Satisfaction with relationship status	10.09 (4.72)	12.94 (3.00)***	7.14 (4.36)***
Life satisfaction	21.30 (5.37)	22.83 (5.16)***	19.71 (5.14)***
Relationship satisfaction	-	29.63 (4.02)	-
Fear of being single	14.67 (4.74)	15.06 (4.68)	14.27 (4.80)
Romantic loneliness	16.18 (8.92)	9.41 (5.60)***	23.18 (5.74)***
Emotional well-being	9.25 (3.31)	9.82 (3.30)	8.67 (3.24)
Psychological well-being	16.83 (6.61)	17.61 (6.38)	16.02 (6.78)
Depressive symptoms	17.62 (8.07)	17.70 (8.22)	17.54 (7.96)
Duration of a relationship (in months)	-	36.03 (39.62)	-
Duration of singlehood (in months)	-	-	7.79 (12.80)

Significant differences between partnered and single individuals, \*\*\**p* < .001

performed on the three subgroups, distinguished on the basis of preferences of the alternate relationship status, allowed to determine that there were no differences in the partnered subsample in the domain of status satisfaction in regard to frequency of preferences of the alternate relationship status,  $F(3,90) = 2.12, p = .140, \eta^2 = .14$ .

**Table 4** Descriptive statistics (Means and SD) of the ReSta scores stratified by indicators of construct validity

Variables	<i>n</i> (%)	ReSta: M (SD)
Preference of the opposite relationship status among single individuals ( <i>n</i> = 91)		
Never	-	-
Seldom	51 (56.04%)	14.00 (1.41)
Sometimes	31 (34.07%)	8.73 (3.76)
Often/ Always	9 (9.89%)	2.20 (2.39)
Preference of the opposite relationship status among partnered individuals ( <i>n</i> = 94)		
Never	52 (55.32%)	13.25 (3.49)
Seldom	32 (34.04%)	13.90 (1.37)
Sometimes	10 (10.64%)	10.00 (3.00)
Often/Always	-	-
Marriage as a goal in life (in the whole sample)		
Yes	155 (83.78%)	10.13 (4.72)
No	30 (16.22%)	9.40 (6.62)
Marriage as a goal in life among single individuals ( <i>n</i> = 91)		
Yes	77 (84.62%)	7.83(4.60)
No	14 (15.38%)	5.83 (6.37)
Marriage as a goal in life among partnered individuals ( <i>n</i> = 94)		
Yes	78 (82.98%)	12.88 (3.17)
No	16 (17.02%)	14.75 (0.50)

Furthermore, the comparisons between participants who indicated marriage as a goal in their lives with those participants who indicated that marriage is not a goal in their lives were performed. In addition, such comparisons were also performed in the whole sample on the basis on the assumption that marriage may be (or not) a goal not only in single individuals' lives but also in partnered individuals' lives who may (or not) be interested in getting married or may prefer to remain in a non-marital relationship. As Table 4 presents, the vast of majority of participants in the whole sample (84.68%), as well as in the single subsample (83.33%), indicated that they perceived marriage as a goal in their lives, whereas only 15.40% participants in the total sample did not recognize marriage as goal in their lives. The pattern of distribution of answers was contrary to the distribution of the answers “Yes” and “No” to the question “*Is getting married a goal in your life?*” in the single sample in study by Lehmann et al. (2015), who noted that the majority of single individuals did not view marriage as a goal in their lives. The performed analysis revealed that, in the subsample of single individuals, participants who recognized marriage as a goal in their lives and those participants who did not recognize marriage as a goal in their lives reported similar levels of status satisfaction,  $F(1,89) = 0.83, p = .368, \eta^2 = .02$ . Similarly, in the subsample of partnered individuals showed lack of differences in regard to the perception of marriage as a goal in life,  $F(1,92) = 1.35, p = .256, \eta^2 = .05$ . Moreover, in the whole sample participants who recognized marriage as a goal in their lives and those participants who did not recognize marriage as a goal in their lives reported similar levels of status satisfaction,  $F(1, 183) = 0.18, p = .676, \eta^2 = .00$ .

Finally, expanding the study by Lehmann et al. (2015), gender differences were determined in the domain of status satisfaction. To be precise, women reported higher satisfaction

with relationship status ( $M = 10.65$ ,  $SD = 4.46$ ) than did men ( $M = .925$ ,  $SD = .500$ ),  $F(1183) = 3.99$ ,  $p = .047$ ,  $\eta^2 = .02$ .

### The Concurrent Validity of the Polish ReSta

#### *Zero-order Correlations between ReSta and Other Variables*

The zero-order correlation between status satisfaction and life satisfaction was determined as it was done in the study by Lehmann et al. (2015). Zero-order correlations also included correlations between status satisfaction and other variables that were not included in the cited study, that is, emotional well-being, psychological well-being, depressive symptoms, relationship satisfaction, romantic loneliness, duration of a relationship, duration of singlehood, and fear of being single. It was expected that:

- Status satisfaction would be positively related to life satisfaction.
- Status satisfaction would be positively related to emotional well-being.
- Status satisfaction would be positively related to psychological well-being.
- Status satisfaction would be negatively related to depressive symptoms.
- Status satisfaction would be positively related to relationship satisfaction among partnered individuals.
- Status satisfaction would be negatively related to romantic loneliness.
- Status satisfaction would be negatively related to fear of being single.

With respect to duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood, an open research question was posted since it seems possible that, on the one hand, with longer duration of a relationship and with longer duration of singlehood status satisfaction may decline, but, on the other hand, it is also possible that with longer duration of a relationship and a longer duration of singlehood people may adjust to their current status and therefore become satisfied with it.

RQ2. Will duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood be related to status satisfaction?

The zero-order correlations are presented in Table 5.

As Table 5 demonstrates, status satisfaction was positively moderately correlated with life satisfaction, positively moderately correlated with emotional well-being, and positively weakly with psychological well-being. There were also negative weak correlations between status satisfaction and depression, and fear of being single. At the same time, there was a strong positive correlation between status satisfaction and relationship satisfaction (in the partnered group), and a strong

negative correlation between status satisfaction and romantic loneliness. There was no significant correlation between status satisfaction and duration of a relationship nor duration of singlehood.

#### *ReSta Predicting Life Satisfaction, Emotional and Psychological Well-being, and Depressive Symptoms Beyond Relationship Status*

Following the original study by Lehmann et al. (2015), 3-step hierarchical regression analyses predicting life satisfaction in which status satisfaction were included in the last third step of analyses (see Table 6). In addition, expanding the cited original study, regression analyses predicting depressive symptoms (as a measure of psychological distress), emotional and psychological well-being from status satisfaction in the last third step were also performed in the current study (see Table 6).

With respect to life satisfaction, in the first step of hierarchical regression analysis, sociodemographic factors (i.e., gender, age and education) were not significant predictors of life satisfaction. In the second step adding relationship status added another 7.30% to the explained variance, and relationship status ( $\beta = -.29$ ) significantly predicted life satisfaction, with single status related to lower satisfaction with life. Adding satisfaction with relationship status in the final third step of the model increased the total explained variance by another 9.70% to a total of 17.30%. Satisfaction with relationship status was a significant predictor of life satisfaction ( $\beta = .40$ ), with higher status satisfaction related to higher life satisfaction. At the same time, in the final step of the model, relationship status was no longer a significant predictor (see Table 6).

With respect to psychological distress measured in the current study with The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D) [in the study by Lehmann et al. (2015) psychological distress was measured with the 12-item General Health Questionnaire (GHQ; Goldberg 1992)]. The hierarchical regression analysis using depressive symptoms as a dependent variable showed the following results: the sociodemographic variables (step 1) and relationship status (step 2) did not significantly predict depressive symptoms. Adding status satisfaction in the final step of the model significantly improved the model adding another 6.00% to the explained variance, and explained 4.70% of the total variance. Satisfaction with relationship status significantly predicted depressive symptoms with higher status satisfaction ( $\beta = -.31$ ) related to lower depressive symptoms.

With respect to emotional well-being, the following results were obtained: the significant contribution of education in the prediction of emotional well-being in the first step was determined, which however explained only 4.60% of the variance. Adding relationship status in the second step, added another

**Table 5** Zero-order correlations between major study variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1 Satisfaction with relationship status	-	.43***	.79***	-.17*	-.66***	.35***	.24**	-.19*	-.08	-.03
2 Life satisfaction		-	.43***	-.09	-.32***	.52***	.47***	-.29***	-.06	-.12
3 Relationship satisfaction			-	-.15	-.73***	.47***	.33***	-.36***	-.12	-
4 Fear of being single				-	.10	-.30***	-.21**	.23**	.02	.02
5 Romantic loneliness					-	-.34***	-.21**	.09	.17	.07
6 Emotional well-being						-	.72***	-.40***	-.09	-.01
7 Psychological well-being							-	-.34***	-.06	.14
8 Depressive symptoms								-	-.07	.02
9 Duration of a relationship									-	-
10 Duration of singlehood										-

Correlations between relationship satisfaction and the remaining variables were determined only in the partnered group. Correlations between duration of a relationship and duration of singlehood, and the remaining variables were determined in the partnered and single groups, respectively

\*\*\*  $p < .001$ , two-tailed; \*\*  $p < .01$ , two-tailed; \*  $p < .05$ , two-tailed

2.30% to the explained variance. Education ( $\beta = .25$ ) and relationship status ( $\beta = -.16$ ) significantly predicted emotional well-being in the second step. Adding status satisfaction in the final step of the model increased the total explained variance by another 8.40% to a total of 14.50%. Together with education ( $\beta = .23$ ), status satisfaction ( $\beta = .37$ ) significantly predicted emotional well-being, showing that higher education and higher status satisfaction were related to increased emotional well-being. At the same time, relationship status was no longer a significant predictor (Table 6).

Finally, with respect to psychological well-being, the following results were obtained: education (step 1) significantly predicted psychological well-being ( $\beta = .18$ ), however, it explained only 1.80% of the total variance. In the second step, relationship status did not significantly predict psychological well-being, and education remained a significant predictor of psychological well-being in this step ( $\beta = .18$ ). Adding status satisfaction in the final step significantly improved the model by adding another 3.90% to the explained variance. Both predictors, education and status satisfaction significantly predicted psychological well-being: higher education ( $\beta = .16$ ) and higher status satisfaction ( $\beta = .25$ ) were related to higher psychological well-being.

### Reliability of the Polish ReSta

Reliability of ReSta was determined, as in the original study by Lehmann et al. (2015), using the Guttman's  $\lambda_2$  as a more accurate lower bound estimate of reliability than Cronbach's alpha (Guttman 1945). Guttman's  $\lambda_2$  equalled .94 in the total sample, .91 for the group of single participants, and .92 for partnered participants. In the group of female participants Guttman's  $\lambda_2$  was .94, whereas in the group of male participants, Guttman's  $\lambda_2$  was .95.

In addition, the test-retest reliability of the Polish ReSta was determined during a one-month interval between the first and the second assessment. To be precise, among 185 eligible participants in the first assessment, 59 respondents declared willingness to participate in the second step of the study after a one-month interval. These 59 participants provided their email addresses in order to send them a link to an online survey after one month. They were informed that all information that they have provided will remain confidential. Participants have not received any compensation for their participation in the study. Among 59 respondents who declared to participate in the second assessment, five persons resigned from participation and 10 provided incomplete data. Therefore, the final analysis was performed on the sample of 44 respondents aged 20–30 ( $M = 22.76$ ,  $SD = 3.14$ ); 25 females and 19 males. The performed analyses demonstrated that after four weeks correlation between the total ReSta score in the first assessment and the total ReSta score in the second assessment was  $r = .796$  ( $p < .0001$ , two-tailed). Furthermore, after four weeks the five items of ReSta demonstrated the following pattern of correlations: item no. 1 ( $r = .776$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 2 ( $r = .620$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 3 ( $r = .665$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), item no. 4 ( $r = .636$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed), and item no. 5 ( $r = .793$ ,  $p < .0001$ , two-tailed).

### Discussion

The present study was intended to develop and validate the Polish version of the ReSta scale, which is a recently established instrument measuring satisfaction with relationship status. The procedure of establishing the Polish ReSta included the evaluation of the construct and concurrent validity of the Polish ReSta and its psychometric properties.



**Table 6** Hierarchical regression analysis predicting life satisfaction, emotional and psychological well-being, and depressive symptoms using gender, age, and education (Step 1), adding relationship status (Step 2), and the satisfaction with relationship status (Step 3)

	Step 1		Step 2		Step 3	
	B (SE)	Beta	B (SE)	Beta	B (SE)	Beta
<b>Life satisfaction</b>						
Constant	18.44 (4.00)		24.52 (4.17)		16.72 (4.29)	
Gender	−1.14 (0.82)	−.11	−0.30 (0.82)	−.03	−0.37 (0.77)	−.03
Age	0.10 (0.13)	.06	−0.01 (0.13)	−.01	−0.02 (0.12)	−.01
Education	0.63 (0.49)	.12	0.60 (0.42)	.11	0.47 (0.40)	.09
Relationship status	-		−3.08 (0.80)	−.29***	−0.46 (0.95)	−.04
Satisfaction with relationship status	-		-		0.45 (0.10)	.40***
ΔF	$F(3181) = 1.61, p = .188$		$F(1180) = 14.65, p = .000$		$F(1179) = 21.50, p = .000$	
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.026		.073		.097	
R <sup>2</sup>	.010		.079		.173	
<b>Emotional well-being</b>						
Constant	3.85 (2.42)		5.96 (2.59)		1.49 (2.69)	
Gender	−0.29 (0.49)	−.04	0.00 (0.51)	.00	−0.04 (0.49)	−.01
Age	0.13 (0.08)	.12	0.09 (0.08)	.09	0.09 (0.08)	.08
Education	0.86 (0.27)	.26***	0.85 (0.26)	.25**	0.78 (0.25)	.23**
Relationship status	-		−1.07 (0.50)	−.16*	0.46 (0.59)	.07
Satisfaction with relationship status	-		-		0.26 (0.06)	.37***
ΔF	$F(3, 181) = 3.97, p = .009$		$F(1180) = 4.57, p = .034$		$F(1179) = 18.03, p = .000$	
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.062		.023		.084	
R <sup>2</sup>	.046		.065		.145	
<b>Psychological well-being</b>						
Constant	10.97 (4.90)		13.86 (5.28)		7.72 (5.64)	
Gender	−0.73 (1.00)	−.05	−0.33 (1.04)	−.02	−0.38 (1.02)	−.03
Age	0.12 (0.16)	.06	0.07 (0.17)	.03	0.06 (0.16)	.03
Education	1.23 (0.54)	.18*	1.21 (0.54)	.18*	1.11 (0.53)	.16*
Relationship status	-		−1.47 (1.02)	−.11	0.60 (1.25)	.05
Satisfaction with relationship status	-		-		0.35 (0.13)	.25**
ΔF	$F(3181) = 2.16, p = .095$		$F(1180) = 2.06, p = .153$		$F(1179) = 7.74, p = .006$	
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.034		.011		.040	
R <sup>2</sup>	.018		.024		.059	
<b>Depressive symptoms</b>						
Constant	23.9 (6.05)		23.67 (6.56)		32.90 (6.93)	
Gender	−1.69 (1.24)	−.10	−1.73 (1.29)	−.11	−1.65 (1.25)	−.10
Age	−0.09 (0.20)	−.04	−0.09 (0.21)	−.03	−0.08 (0.20)	−.03
Education	−0.57 (0.66)	−.07	−0.57 (0.67)	−.07	−0.42 (0.65)	−.05
Relationship status	-		0.16 (1.27)	.01	−2.94 (1.53)	−.18
Satisfaction with relationship status	-		-		−0.53 (0.16)	−.31**
ΔF	$F(3181) = 0.80, p = .498$		$F(1180) = 0.02, p = .897$		$F(1179) = 11.58, p = .001$	
ΔR <sup>2</sup>	.013		.001		.060	
R <sup>2</sup>	.013		.010		.047	

1 = partnered status; 2 = single status; 1 = being student; 2 = high education

\*\*\* $p < .001$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \* $p < .05$

First, with respect to construct validity, the results of exploratory and confirmatory factor analyses supported the unidimensionality of the Polish ReSta determined in the original

study by Lehmann et al. (2015). Second, the mean level differences determined in the current study were generally coherent with findings obtained by Lehmann et al. (2015). More

specifically, single individuals reported lower level of status satisfaction than partnered individuals. This pattern of results supported H1 and was fully consistent with the findings obtained by Lehmann et al. (2015). The lower level of status satisfaction among single individuals may be, in turn, related to the notion that one of the fundamental human motivations is the desire for enduring intimate relationships (Spielmann et al. 2013). Moreover, most people generally prefer being in a relationship than being single (Greitemeyer 2009), and most single individuals have a more positive attitude towards living together than towards living without a partner (Poortman and Liefbroer 2010). As a result of this desire and the positive attitude towards living with a partner, in case of not having fulfilled them, single individual may be less satisfied with their single status than partnered individuals whose desire for having a partner is satisfied.

Furthermore, the current study also tested hypotheses concerning the differences in the domain of status satisfaction with respect to frequency of preference for the alternate relationship status. First, in the current study - contrary to the Lehmann et al.' (2015) study - the group of single individuals who never preferred the opposite relationship status and the group of partnered individuals who often/always preferred the opposite relationship status were not distinguished. The subgroups (*never, seldom, and sometimes preferring singlehood*) of partnered individuals did not, however, differ in regard to the levels of status satisfaction. These findings did not support H2 and they were not congruent with Lehmann et al.' (2015) findings demonstrating that all subgroups (*never, seldom, sometimes, and often/always preferring singlehood*) differed from another. In turn, among single individuals, differences emerged between the subgroups (*seldom, sometimes, and often/always preferring being partnered*), but contrary to the study by Lehmann et al. (2015) - differences emerged between all of these groups - not only as in the study by Lehmann et al. (2015) - between these individuals who experienced often/always preference for being in a relationship) and other groups. Therefore, H3 was also not supported by the obtained results. In regard to the differences in the domain of status satisfaction between single individuals who viewed marriage as a goal in their lives and individuals who did not view marriage as a goal in their lives, the performed analyses did not replicate the results obtained by Lehmann et al. (2015), and therefore they did not confirm the assumed H4. More specifically, in the current investigation, the vast majority of single participants declared that they perceive marriage as a goal in their lives, whereas only 14 participants (15.38%) did not recognize marriage as a goal in their lives. The pattern of distribution of answers "Yes" and "No" to the question "*Is getting married a goal in your life?*" was contrary to the distribution of answers in the study by Lehmann et al. (2015) who noted that the majority of single individuals did not view marriage as a goal in their lives. Similarly, also in the

whole sample, such differences in the domain of status satisfaction were not observed.

Distribution of preference for the alternate relationship status as well as distribution of perception of marriage as a life goal, which is different in the current study than in the original Dutch study by Lehmann et al. (2015), may be related to at least two factors. The first factor involves the cultural specificity of Polish society which is predominantly pro-marriage and pro-family (Żurek 2016), and the fact that 90% of Polish people point to marriage as a model of family chosen for themselves (Demographic situation in Poland. Report of Government People Council 2014). The second factor includes age and developmental differences between the Polish and Dutch samples used in both studies. It should be emphasized that Lehmann et al.' (2015) sample consisted of participants aged 20–67 with the mean age of 38.90, and therefore it consisted not only of young adults but also of middle and old young adults. As a reminder, the age range of participants in the current study was 20–32 ( $M = 22.59$ ,  $SD = 3.23$ ). As can be seen, the sample used in the current study was much younger than Lehmann and colleagues' sample (2015). These age differences are naturally related with developmental differences which include various numbers and ranges of relational experiences that in general could be classified as positive and negative experiences. It is reasonable to expect that in Lehmann et al.' (2015) sample we could find not only never-married individuals, but also divorced or widowed individuals, as well as people who remarried and individuals who had children. In turn, individuals in the current sample were predominantly young adults for whom it is precisely the end of education, formation of a lifestyle and life philosophy, and starting a family that are important life goals which enhance their well-being (e.g. Rydz 2011; Salmela-Aro et al. 2012). Participants in the current study may have had fewer experiences in the domain of intimate relationships than the older participants in Lehmann et al.' (2015) sample. The initial entry into adult roles of a partner/spouse, that is, being mostly at the beginning of formation – not ending – of mature intimate relationships, may be related to more positive expectations of finding and keeping a partner, as well as positive expectations of a well-functioning and satisfying relationship. In turn, older participants in Lehmann et al.' (2015) sample, because of having more and more varied relational experiences, may have different attitudes towards their singlehood and being in a relationship as verified by their past (also negative) experiences. As a result of these different relational experiences, single participants in Lehmann et al.' (2015) sample might have not considered marriage as their priority, and considered the possibility of being involved in other form of a relationship than marriage. The above-mentioned assumptions are justified in light of the suggestions made by Hertel et al. (2007), who also speculated that young people who have less experience (including also less problems) in the

domain of relationships may have some illusions about marriage or just hold a very positive view of intimate relationships, as opposed to individuals who are likely to gain more experience with age (the positive experience of forming a relationship as well as the negative experience of a relationship breaking up). Therefore, regarding the possibility that young people, as opposed to older people, may hold more positive notions of being in a relationship and marriage and that Polish young adults hold a view of marriage as an important life goal and recognize marriage as an appropriate context for childbearing (Mynarska et al. 2014), we might explain the lack in the current sample of single individuals who would never prefer the alternate relationship status as well as the lack of partnered individuals who would often/always prefer the alternate relationship status. Additionally, the positive views of being in a relationship and marriage may at the same time help to understand the lack of differences in the level of status satisfaction between partnered individuals representing different preferences for the alternate relationship status as well as a similar lack of differences in regard to perceiving marriage as a life goal or not.

Finally, in the current study, RQ1 was formulated in regard to the possibility of gender differences in the domain of status satisfaction. The performed analyses demonstrated that women reported higher levels of status satisfaction than men. As previously mentioned, gender differences were not reported by Lehmann et al. (2015). The pattern of gender differences observed in the current study could be compared with prior studies, for example, with those showing that women are more satisfied with their family life whereas men report greater satisfaction with their leisure activities (Daig et al. 2009) or with the study by Simon and Barrett (2010), who found that relationship status was more important for young women's than for young men's emotional well-being.

Attempting to evaluate the concurrent validity of the Polish ReSta, this study also provided results concerning the associations between status satisfaction and other variables. The performed analyses demonstrated that there was a moderate positive correlation between status satisfaction and life satisfaction, which supported H5. In addition, there was a moderate positive correlation between status satisfaction and emotional well-being (H6), and a weak positive correlation between status satisfaction and psychological well-being (H7). This pattern of results supported hypotheses H6 and H7, and was also confirmed by the regression analysis predicting these outcomes from status satisfaction. Furthermore, there were significant negative correlations (though weak in magnitude) between status satisfaction and depressive symptoms (H8), and fear of being single (H11). The direction of these correlations was in line with hypotheses H8 and H11. In regard to duration of being in a relationship and duration of singlehood, an open research question (RQ2) was posed. The obtained results demonstrated,

however, that there was no association between these variables and status satisfaction.

Among other correlations observed in the current study, what draws special attention is the strong positive correlation between status satisfaction and relationship satisfaction (H9), and between romantic loneliness (H10). This strong positive correlation between status satisfaction and relationship satisfaction raises the crucial question about the mutual links between them. To be precise, this correlation that is high in magnitude calls for an investigation of incremental validity, that is, “the degree to which a measure explains or predicts some phenomena of interest, relative to other measures” (Haynes and Lench 2003, p. 457). In addition, a strong negative correlation between status satisfaction and romantic loneliness opens further directions of longitudinal studies aimed at understanding whether causal, reciprocal or reversed relationships exist between these constructs.

Furthermore, the performed hierarchical regression analyses replicated the results obtained by Lehmann et al. (2015) and demonstrated that status satisfaction had a greater explanatory value in predicting life satisfaction and psychological distress (measured in the current study in terms of depressive symptoms). Analogically to the study by Lehmann et al. (2015), in the current study an individual's status satisfaction was a significant predictor of life satisfaction and depression, whereas relationship status turned out not to be a predictor of these outcomes after inclusion in the model status satisfaction. The performed hierarchical regression analyses also included additional constructs, that is emotional and psychological well-being, that were not investigated in the study by Lehmann et al. (2015). With respect to these outcomes, once again, an individual's status satisfaction was predictive of emotional and psychological well-being, while relationship status did not operate as a predictor. In light of these findings it appears that well-being is not related to the objective state of having a romantic partner or not, but it is rather associated with the degree to which people are satisfied or not with this objective circumstance of having a partner or not (i.e. relationship status) (see Kaczmarek 2016).

Finally, using Guttman's  $\lambda_2$ , the reliability of the Polish ReSta was determined to be high. In addition, expanding the original study by Lehmann et al. (2015), the current investigation also determined high test-retest reliability of the Polish ReSta over a lag of one month.

Despite the merits of the current investigation two major limitations ought to be considered. First and foremost, the Polish version of ReSta was developed and validated in a relatively small sample of young adults who mostly represented university students and individuals who were degree-holders. Also, test-retest reliability of the Polish ReSta was determined on a small sample size. Therefore, future studies need to be performed on a larger sample size. With connection to first limitation, the current sample also consisted of

heterosexual, never married, childless individuals. Regarding this specificity of the sample the obtained results cannot be generalized to non-heterosexual individuals, individuals in middle and late adulthood, individuals of different relational history (i.e., separated, divorced, widowed), and individuals with children. Therefore, until the broadening of the representativeness of the samples utilized in future studies, the Polish ReSta should be used with caution in reference to samples of other sociodemographic characteristics than those of the current sample. Second, the test-retest stability of the Polish ReSta was carried out during a short interval of time, that is over a lag of one month. Therefore, further studies would benefit from investigating the test-retest stability over longer periods of time. In addition, the pattern of results obtained in the current study, which showed a strong correlation between relationship status and relationship satisfaction, sets the direction of future research aimed at investigating incremental validity of ReSta in reference to instruments measuring relationship and marital satisfaction, for example in comparison to the Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS; Hendrick 1988). Future studies could consider investigating such dimensions of incremental validity as incremental discriminant validity, incremental criterion validity, incremental predictive validity and incremental discriminative validity (see Haynes and Lench 2003).

**Conflict of Interest** The author declares that she has no conflict of interest and no funding source to report.

**Compliance with Ethical Standards** All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

The author adhered to institutional ethical guidelines in the conduct of this study (i.e., Polish Psychological Society were followed in the treatment of participants).

## Appendix: Skala Satysfakcji ze Statusu Związku

Poniższe pytania mają na celu poznanie Państwa satysfakcji z aktualnego *statusu związku*. Określenie “aktualny status związku/sytuacja” odnosi się zarówno do życia w pojedynkę, jak i życia w związku z partnerem/partnerką w zależności od Pana/Pani aktualnego statusu związku. Odpowiadając na poniższe pytania, prosimy o odniesienie tych pytań jedynie do aktualnej sytuacji bycia w związku lub życia w pojedynkę i o *nieodnoszenie* tego pojęcia do innych aspektów swojego życia.

Odpowiadając na pytania, prosimy o skupienie się na swojej *aktualnej sytuacji bycia w związku lub życia w pojedynkę*.

	W ogóle	Trochę	Do pewnego stopnia	W dużym stopniu
--	---------	--------	--------------------	-----------------

1. Ogólnie rzecz biorąc, jak bardzo jesteś zadowolony/–a ze swojego obecnego statusu związku?
2. Jak często żałujesz, że znalazłeś/–aś się w tej sytuacji?\*
3. Jak bardzo jesteś szczęśliwy/–a ze swojego obecnego statusu związku?
4. W jakim stopniu Twój obecny status związku spełnia Twoje oczekiwania?
5. Czy lubisz swój aktualny status status związku?

\* Pytanie wymaga zrekodowania

**Open Access** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made.

## References

- Adamczyk, K., & DiTommaso, E. (2014). Psychometric properties of the Polish version of the social and emotional loneliness scale for adults (SELSA-S). *Psychological Topics*, 23(3), 327–341 UDK – 159.923.33.072-057.875(438).
- Bernard, J. (1972). *The future of marriage*. New York: Bantam Book.
- Cierpiakowska, L., & Sęk, H. (2015). Wyzwania dla psychologii klinicznej w XXI wieku [challenges for clinical psychology in the XXI century]. *Nauka*, 2, 69–85.
- Daig, I., Herschbach, P., Lehmann, A., Knoll, N., & Decker, O. (2009). Gender and age differences in domain-specific life satisfaction and the impact of depressive and anxiety symptoms: A general population survey from Germany. *Quality of Life Research*, 18(6), 669–678. doi:10.1007/s11136-009-9481-3.
- Demographic situation in Poland. Report of Government People Council (2014). Warszawa: Zakład Wydawnictw Statystycznych. Retrieved from [www.stat.gov.pl/Raport.pdf](http://www.stat.gov.pl/Raport.pdf).
- Diener, E., Emmons, R. A., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The satisfaction with life scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49, 71–75.
- DiTommaso, E., Brannen, C., & Best, L. A. (2004). Measurement and validity characteristics of the short version of the social and emotional loneliness scale for adults. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 64(1), 99–119. doi:10.1177/0013164403258450.
- Duch-Krzyszczek, D. (1995). Małżeństwo, seks, prokreacja [Marriage, sex, procreation]. In A. Titkow & H. Romański (Eds.), *Co to znaczy być kobietą w Polsce [What it means to be a woman in Poland]* (pp. 175–188). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Instytutu Filozofii i Socjologii PAN.

- Dykstra, P. A., & Fokkema, T. (2007). Social and emotional loneliness among divorced and married men and women: Comparing the deficit and cognitive perspectives. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1), 1–12. doi:10.1080/01973530701330843.
- Gibb, S. J., Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2011). Relationship duration and mental health outcomes: Findings from a 30-year longitudinal study. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 198(1), 24–30. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.110.083550.
- Goldberg, D. (1992). *General health questionnaire (GHQ-12)*. Windsor: Nfer-Nelson.
- Greitemeyer, T. (2009). Stereotypes of singles: Are singles what we think? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 39, 368–383. doi:10.1002/ejsp.542.
- Guttman, L. (1945). A basis for analyzing test–retest reliability. *Psychometrika*, 10(4), 255–282.
- Haynes, S. N., & Lench, H. C. (2003). Incremental validity of new clinical assessment measures. *Psychological Assessment*, 15(4), 456–466. doi:10.1037/1040-3590.15.4.456.
- Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 50(1), 93–98. doi:10.2307/352430.
- Hertel, J., Schütz, A., DePaulo, B. M., Morris, W. L., & Stucke, T. S. (2007). She's single, so what? How are singles perceived compared with people who are married? *Zeitschrift für Familienforschung*, 2, 139–158.
- Juczyński, Z. (2009). *Narzędzia pomiaru w promocji i psychologii zdrowia [Measurement instruments in the promotion and psychology of health]*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych PTP.
- Kaczmarek, L. D. (2016). *Pozytywne interwencje psychologiczne. Dobrostan a zachowania intencjonalne [positive psychological interventions. Intentional activity and well-being]*. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Zysk i S-ka.
- Kaniasty, K. (2003). *Kłęska żywiołowa czy katastrofa społeczna? Psychospołeczne konsekwencje polskiej powodzi 1997 roku [Natural or social catastrophe? Psychosocial consequences of 1997 flood in Poland]*. Gdańsk: Gdańskie Wydawnictwo Psychologiczne.
- Karaś, D., Ciecuch, J., & Keyes, C. L. M. (2014). The Polish adaptation of the mental health continuum-short form (MHC-SF). *Personality and Individual Differences*, 69, 104–109. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.05.011.
- Keith, P. (2003). Resources, family ties, and well-being of never-married men and women. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 42(2), 51–75. doi:10.1300/J083v42n02\_05.
- Keyes, C. L. M. (2002). The mental health continuum: From languishing to flourishing in life. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 43(2), 207–222.
- Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Newton, T. L. (2001). Marriage and health: His and hers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(4), 472–503.
- Lehmann, V., Tuinman, M. A., Braeken, J., Vingerhoets, A. J. J. M., Sanderman, R., & Hagedoorn, M. (2015). Satisfaction with relationship status: Development of a new scale and the role in predicting well-being. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 169–184. doi:10.1007/s10902-014-9503-x.
- Levis, B., Rice, D. B., Kwakkenbos, L., Steele, R. J., Hagedoorn, M., Hudson, M., Baron, B., Thombs, B. D., & the Canadian Scleroderma Research Group. (2015). Using marital status and continuous marital satisfaction ratings to predict depressive symptoms in married and unmarried women with systemic sclerosis: A Canadian scleroderma research group study. *Arthritis Care & Research*, 68(8), 1143–1149. doi:10.1002/acr.22802.
- Mandal, E. (2008). *Miłość, władza i manipulacja w bliskich związkach [Love, power and manipulation in close relationships]*. Wydawnictwo PWN: Warszawa.
- Mellor, D., Stokes, M., Firth, L., Hayashi, Y., & Cummins, R. (2008). Need for belonging, relationship satisfaction, loneliness, and life satisfaction. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 45(3), 213–218. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2008.03.020.
- Mirecki, R. M., Chou, J. L., Elliott, M., & Schneider, C. M. (2013). What factors influence marital satisfaction? Differences between first and second marriages. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, 54, 78–93. doi:10.1080/10502556.2012.743831.
- Monfort, S. S., Kaczmarek, L. D., Kashdan, T. B., Drazkowski, D., Kosakowski, M., Guzik, P., Krauze, T., & Gracanic, A. (2014). Capitalizing on the success of romantic partners: A laboratory investigation on subjective, facial, and physiological emotional processing. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 68, 149–153. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2014.04.028.
- Mynarska, M., Baranowska-Rataj, A., & Matysiak, M. (2014). Free to stay, free to leave: Insights from Poland into the meaning of cohabitation. *Demographic Research*, 31(6), 1107–1136. doi:10.4054/DemRes.2014.31.36.
- Newsom, J. T. (2012). Some clarifications and recommendations on fit indices. Retrieved from [http://www.upa.pdx.edu/IOA/newsom/semclass/ho\\_fit.pdf](http://www.upa.pdx.edu/IOA/newsom/semclass/ho_fit.pdf).
- Peplau, L. A., & Perlman, D. (1982). *Loneliness: A sourcebook of current theory, research, and therapy*. New York: Wiley.
- Poortman, A. R., & Liefbroer, A. C. (2010). Singles' relational attitudes in a time of individualization. *Social Science Research*, 39(6), 938–949. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2010.03.012.
- Proulx, C. M., Helms, H. M., & Buehler, C. (2007). Marital quality and personal well-being: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 69(3), 576–593. doi:10.1111/j.1741-3737.2007.00393.x.
- Radloff, L. S. (1977). The CES-D scale: A self-report depression scale for research in the general population. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 1(3), 385–401. doi:10.1177/014662167700100306.
- Rydz, E. (2011). Important life decisions of young people. In E. Rzechowska, S. Steuden, D. Musiał, E. Rydz, & M. Tatala (Eds.), *Contemporary interpretations of the theory of positive disintegration* (pp. 25–43). Lublin: Towarzystwo Naukowe Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego Jana Pawła II.
- Salmela-Aro, K., Read, S., Korhonen, T., Vuoksimaa, E., Rose, R. J., & Kaprio, J. (2012). Young adults' developmental task-related goals modify the association between self-focused goals and depressive symptoms. *Applied Psychology: Health And Well-Being*, 4(1), 106–125. doi:10.1111/j.1758-0854.2011.01064.x.
- Simon, R. W., & Barrett, A. E. (2010). Nonmarital romantic relationships and mental health in early adulthood: Does the association differ for women and men? *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 51(2), 168–182. doi:10.1177/0022146510372343.
- Spielmann, S. S., MacDonald, G., Maxwell, J. A., Joel, S., Peragine, D., Muise, A., & Impett, E. A. (2013). Settling for less out of fear of being single. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 105(6), 1049–1107. doi:10.1037/a0034628.
- Trzebińska, E. (2008). *Psychologia pozytywna [the positive psychology]*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwa Naukowe i Profesjonalne.
- Wadsworth, T. (2016). Marriage and subjective well-being: How and why context matters. *Social Indicators Research*, 126, 1025–1048. doi:10.1007/s11205-015-0930-9.
- Whitton, S. W., & Kuryluk, A. D. (2012). Relationship satisfaction and depressive symptoms in emerging adults: Cross-sectional associations and moderating effects of relationship characteristics. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 26(2), 226–235. doi:10.1037/a0027267.
- Williams, L. J., & Holahan, P. J. (1994). Parsimony-based fit indices for multiple-indicator models: Do they work? *Structural Equation Modeling*, 1(2), 161–189.
- Ziarko, M., Kaczmarek, L. D., & Haładziński, P. (2013). Polish version of Centre for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale (CES-D): Results of a preliminary study on the psychometric properties of the scale. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 1, 51–61. doi:10.5114/cipp.2013.40637.
- Żurek, A. (2016). Polish singles – Between family life and independence. In K. Adamczyk (Ed.), *Singlehood from individual and social perspectives* (pp. 55–75). Kraków: Wydawnictwo Filip Lohner.