

Adaptation and validation of the Polish version of the Relationship Mindfulness Measure in the context of relationship distress following infidelity

Julitta Dębska, Katarzyna Walęcka-Matyja

Abstract

The aim of this study was to adapt and validate the Polish version of the Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM) and examine its psychometric properties in the context of relationship distress following partner infidelity. Two independent samples comprised adults who had experienced partner infidelity and remained in the relationship (Sample 1: $N = 187$; Sample 2: $N = 404$). Factor structure was examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). Reliability was assessed using Cronbach's α , and construct validity was examined through correlations with dispositional mindfulness (FFMQ-SF) and relationship satisfaction (RAS). Group differences were analysed using ANOVA. CFA supported a one-factor model after a residual correlation was added between items 3 and 4 ($CFI = 0.995$, $TLI = 0.986$, $RMSEA = 0.082$, $SRMR = 0.039$). Internal consistency was satisfactory ($\alpha = 0.78$). RMM scores were not significantly associated with dispositional mindfulness but showed a small negative correlation with relationship satisfaction ($r = -0.178$, $p < 0.001$). Scores also differed by time since infidelity and its disclosure. The findings suggest that relational mindfulness may capture aspects of awareness specific to intimate relationships and may operate differently under conditions of relationship distress. The Polish RMM showed promising structural and reliability characteristics, although its construct validity and potential clinical use require further investigation.

relational mindfulness, relationship satisfaction, mindfulness, scale validation, romantic relationships

INTRODUCTION

Mindfulness is a key construct in contemporary psychology and psychiatry, emphasising awareness of present experiences with openness and non-judgement [1, 2]. Although initially developed within approaches focused on the individ-

ual, mindfulness has also been examined in relation to interpersonal functioning [2, 3]. Mindfulness-based therapy has been studied across a range of psychological difficulties [4], while research on romantic relationships has examined how mindful awareness relates to partners' interactions and relationship quality [2, 5].

Relational mindfulness refers to mindful awareness during interactions with a romantic partner. The Relationship Mindfulness Measure assesses this context-specific awareness [5]. Clinical and theoretical accounts also consider mind-

Julitta Dębska, Katarzyna Walęcka-Matyja: Institute of Psychology, Faculty of Educational Sciences, University of Lodz, Łódź, Poland

Correspondence address: Julitta Dębska, julitta.debska@now.uni.lodz.pl

fulness within couple and family relationships [6, 7]. These perspectives suggest that mindfulness should be examined within the interpersonal context in which it occurs.

The original RMM validation study reported associations between relationship mindfulness and indicators of relationship quality [5]. A theoretical model links mindfulness to relationship processes through attention, emotion regulation and responses to partner behaviour [2]. Recent meta-analytic evidence suggests that mindfulness interventions can improve couple relationship satisfaction, although effects vary across studies and contexts [8].

From a clinical perspective, mindfulness and related processes, including self-compassion, may be relevant to emotional difficulties [4,9]. However, evidence concerning individual symptoms does not by itself establish benefits for couple functioning. Social and relationship outcomes require direct assessment, and intervention effects may differ by setting and comparison condition [8, 10]. This highlights the importance of considering the relationship context when examining mindfulness.

Although relational mindfulness is generally associated with positive relational functioning, little is known about how it operates in the context of relationship distress, particularly following infidelity. Individuals who experience partner infidelity often report heightened relational anxiety, increased sensitivity to threat, and persistent rumination [11, 12]. In such a context, greater relational mindfulness—by amplifying awareness of interpersonal dynamics—may increase contact with difficult emotions, unresolved hurt, and perceived relational insecurity. Consequently, relational mindfulness may be associated with lower relationship satisfaction in distressed populations, diverging from patterns observed in non-distressed couples. This interpretation is consistent with evidence suggesting that the effects of mindfulness on relational outcomes depend on contextual and relational conditions [8].

Given that infidelity constitutes a major relational stressor that disrupts emotional security and activates complex processes of coping, repair, and meaning-making, relational mindfulness may vary depending on the time elapsed since the betrayal and its disclosure. Theoreti-

cal models of relational trauma indicate that the psychological impact of infidelity unfolds along distinct temporal trajectories [13]. Immediately after disclosure, heightened arousal and vigilance may interfere with mindful relational presence, whereas over time, emotional processing and relational repair may facilitate increased awareness. Therefore, it was expected that relational mindfulness would differ depending on both the time since the infidelity occurred and the time since its discovery.

Research on relational mindfulness remains limited, and most studies have focused on general mindfulness measured with instruments such as the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire [14, 15], the Mindful Attention Awareness Scale [16], or the Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills [17]. However, such measures capture intrapersonal processes and provide limited insight into mindfulness as it unfolds within interpersonal contexts. Contemporary perspectives increasingly emphasise that mindfulness in relationships represents a distinct construct emerging within relational systems, shaped by co-regulation, attachment processes, and dynamic interaction patterns [6, 7, 18]. Moreover, research across family and developmental contexts suggests that mindfulness-based processes require adaptation to specific relational systems and may operate differently depending on contextual and interpersonal conditions [7].

To date, no validated Polish version of the Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM) has been available. Therefore, the present study aimed to adapt the RMM [5] for Polish-speaking populations and to assess its psychometric properties. The study pursued three main objectives: (1) to examine the factorial structure of the Polish RMM, (2) to assess its reliability, and (3) to evaluate its construct validity through associations with dispositional mindfulness and relationship satisfaction. Additionally, differences in relational mindfulness were analysed across groups defined by time since infidelity and time since its disclosure.

The following hypotheses were formulated:

1. Factor analysis would support a one-factor structure of the RMM.
2. Reliability coefficients for the Polish RMM would exceed 0.70.

3. RMM scores would correlate negatively with relationship satisfaction.
4. RMM scores would not correlate significantly with dispositional mindfulness.
5. RMM scores would differ by time since infidelity and time since its discovery.

METHODS

Participants

The study used two independent samples. Sample 1 ($N = 187$) was used for exploratory factor analysis (EFA), and Sample 2 ($N = 404$) for confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and validity analyses. Participants in both samples were adults aged 22–60 years who had experienced infidelity by their romantic partner at least six months before the study and had remained in the relationship. Sample 1 comprised 152 women (81.3%) and 35 men (18.7%), with a mean age of 42.82 years ($SD = 8.61$). Sample 2 had a comparable gender distribution (80.7% women and 19.3% men).

Across both samples, participants represented diverse educational backgrounds, with the majority holding higher education degrees (Sample 1: 60.4%; Sample 2: 74.2%), and were recruited from both urban and rural areas. Most respondents were in marital relationships (Sample 1: 70.6%; Sample 2: 67.6%), followed by cohabiting and non-cohabiting partnerships.

Procedure and ethical considerations

The study was conducted in 2025–2026 using an online survey platform. Participation was voluntary, anonymous, and uncompensated. Informed consent was obtained electronically before participation. The study was conducted in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki (2013) and the American Psychological Association Ethical Principles (2017). Data processing complied with the General Data Protection Regulation (EU 2016/679). The study protocol was approved by the University Research Ethics Committee (Ref. No. 7/2025).

MATERIALS

The primary aim of the study was to validate the Polish version of the Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM), originally developed by Kimmes et al. [5].

Translation and cultural adaptation

The Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM) was adapted into Polish prior to the validation phase using standard translation and back-translation procedures. The process included independent translations by bilingual psychologists, expert review to ensure conceptual and cultural equivalence, pilot testing ($N = 30$), and back-translation into English. The final version was approved by the original author and was found to be conceptually and linguistically equivalent to the original instrument.

Participants completed a set of self-report questionnaires with established psychometric properties and a demographic survey:

The Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM) [5] comprises five items assessing awareness and attention during interactions with a romantic partner. Items describe lapses of awareness and are rated on a six-point scale ranging from 1 (almost always) to 6 (almost never). Kimmes et al. [5] developed the RMM as a brief measure of mindfulness in romantic relationships. Their validation study supported a one-factor structure and showed good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.86$ at the first assessment and 0.93 at the second), together with concurrent and predictive associations with relationship quality and attachment.

The Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire–Short Form (FFMQ-SF) [14, 15] comprises 24 items assessing five dimensions: observing, describing, acting with awareness, non-reactivity and non-judging. Items are rated on a five-point scale ranging from 1 (almost never) to 5 (almost always). The Polish adaptation demonstrates satisfactory reliability (Cronbach's $\alpha = 0.68$ –0.85) and factorial validity supported by exploratory and confirmatory analyses.

The Relationship Assessment Scale (RAS) [19, 20, 21] comprises seven items assessing satisfaction with a romantic relationship, rated on

a five-point scale. The Polish version has good internal consistency ($\alpha = 0.89$) and convergent validity, with positive associations with relationship commitment and quality.

The demographic questionnaire collected information on age, gender, education, place of residence, relationship characteristics (type, duration, orientation, and monogamy), as well as details related to infidelity experience and use of psychological support.

Data analysis

Analyses were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics 29 and R (version 4.5.1). The factorial structure of the RMM was examined using exploratory factor analysis (EFA) in Sample 1 and confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) in Sample 2. Internal consistency was assessed using Cronbach’s α . Construct validity was evaluated through Pearson correlations between RMM scores, dispositional mindfulness (FFMQ-SF), and relationship satisfaction (RAS). Group differences were analysed using one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni

post hoc tests for time since infidelity and time since its disclosure. Mean RMM scores were used in all analyses, with higher scores indicating greater relational mindfulness.

RESULTS

Factor structure of the RMM

Exploratory factor analysis was conducted on the five RMM items in Sample 1 (N = 187). The Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.792, indicating that the data were suitable for factor analysis. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($\chi^2(10) = 245.229$, $p < 0.001$). Both the eigenvalue criterion (> 1) and inspection of the scree plot supported a unidimensional structure. The extracted factor explained 53.37% of the variance, with loadings ranging from 0.631 to 0.819 (Table 1). All five loadings exceeded 0.60. These findings provided initial support for a one-factor structure and informed the subsequent confirmatory analysis.

Table 1. EFA loadings of the Polish Relationship Mindfulness Measure (RMM)

No.	Polish wording used in this study	Original English wording [5]	Factor loading (λ)
1	Kiedy jestem z moją partnerką/moim partnerem, wydaje mi się, że działam na autopilocie, bez większej świadomości tego, co robię.	When my partner and I are together, it seems I am “running on automatic,” without much awareness of what I’m doing.	0.745
2	Prowadzę rozmowy z partnerką/partnerem, nie będąc w pełni uważną/uważnym.	I have conversations with my partner without being really attentive.	0.631
3	Tak bardzo koncentruję się na tym, jak chciałabym/chciałbym, aby wyglądała moja relacja z partnerem/partnerką, że tracę kontakt z tym, co robię w danym momencie, aby to osiągnąć.	I get so focused on what I want my relationship with my partner to be like that I lose touch with what I’m doing right now to get there.	0.636
4	Kiedy moja partnerka/mój partner i ja omawiamy jakiś problem lub pracujemy nad nim razem, moje reakcje często przebiegają automatycznie, bez pełnej świadomości tego, co mówię lub robię.	When my partner and I discuss an issue or work on a problem together, I behave automatically, without being aware of what I’m saying or doing.	0.799
5	Kiedy jestem z moją partnerką/moim partnerem, mówię lub robię rzeczy bez pełnej uwagi.	When I’m with my partner, I find myself saying or doing things without paying attention.	0.819

Note. Polish items reflect the version used in this validation study; English items represent the original wording of the RMM [5]. All loadings ≥ 0.60 .

Confirmatory factor analysis was conducted in the independent second sample (N = 404). Because the items were measured on ordi-

nal scales, the model was estimated using the weighted least squares mean and variance adjusted estimator (WLSMV).

Polychoric inter-item correlations in the CFA sample ranged from $\rho = 0.185$ to 0.632 (Table 2). These correlations did not, by themselves, pro-

vide a clear empirical basis for specifying a two-factor model.

Table 2. Polychoric inter-item correlations for the Polish RMM in the CFA sample

Item	Item 1	Item 2	Item 3	Item 4	Item 5
Item 1	—				
Item 2	0.436	—			
Item 3	0.348	0.185	—		
Item 4	0.530	0.354	0.541	—	
Item 5	0.510	0.514	0.427	0.632	—

Note. CFA: confirmatory factor analysis. Correlations were estimated in Sample 2 (N = 404).

The initial one-factor model demonstrated satisfactory values of the comparative and residual-based fit indices (CFI = 0.988, TLI = 0.975, SRMR = 0.055), although the RMSEA value was elevated (RMSEA = 0.111), suggesting that the model required further examination.

Inspection of the modification indices suggested a residual association between items 3 and 4, both of which describe reduced awareness of the present moment during interactions with a partner. After their residuals were allowed to correlate, the revised one-factor model showed improved fit: $\chi^2(4) = 14.73$, CFI = 0.995, TLI = 0.986, RMSEA = 0.082 (90% CI: 0.040–0.128), PCLOSE = 0.098 and SRMR = 0.039. Given the small number of degrees of freedom, RMSEA was interpreted cautiously alongside the other fit indices.

Standardised factor loadings ranged from 0.480 to 0.836, and all freely estimated loadings were statistically significant ($p < 0.001$). Items 4 and 5 had the highest loadings, while item

3 had the lowest. The residual correlation between items 3 and 4 was significant ($r = 0.313$, $p < 0.001$). These findings support a one-factor model with an additional residual correlation between two conceptually related items.

Internal consistency

Internal consistency was assessed in Sample 2 (N = 404). Cronbach’s α was 0.78, indicating satisfactory reliability. Corrected item–total correlations ranged from 0.44 to 0.66, and removing any item did not improve α , supporting retention of all five items. Descriptive statistics for the RMM mean score are presented in Table 3. The mean was 3.88 (SD = 1.20), with observed scores ranging from 1 to 6. Skewness was close to zero (–0.03), indicating an approximately symmetric distribution, while the negative kurtosis (–0.86) indicated a relatively flat distribution.

Table 3. Descriptive statistics for the RMM score (mean of five items)

Variable	M	SD	Min	Max	S	K	α
Relational mindfulness	3.88	1.20	1	6	–0.03	–0.86	0.78

Note. M: mean; SD: standard deviation; Min: minimum; Max: maximum; S: skewness; K: kurtosis; α : Cronbach’s alpha.

These findings indicate satisfactory internal consistency and support Hypothesis 2. Internal consistency alone, however, does not establish unidimensionality.

Construct validity

Construct validity was examined using Pearson correlations between the RMM mean score, dispositional mindfulness measured with the FFMQ-SF [14, 15], and relationship satisfaction measured with the RAS [19, 20, 21].

Table 4. Pearson correlations between RMM, FFMQ-SF and RAS scores

Variables	r	N	95% CI	Significance
RMM – Observing (OBS)	−0.051	404	[−0.152; 0.051]	ns
RMM – Describing (DES)	−0.203	404	[−0.300; −0.101]	$p < 0.001$
RMM – Acting with awareness (AWA)	0.170	404	[0.068; 0.267]	$p < 0.001$
RMM – Non-judging (NONJ)	0.003	404	[−0.099; 0.105]	ns
RMM – Non-reactivity (NONR)	0.003	404	[−0.098; 0.105]	ns
RMM – FFMQ-SF total	−0.026	404	[−0.128; 0.076]	ns
RMM – Relationship satisfaction (RAS)	−0.178	404	[−0.274; −0.076]	$p < 0.001$
FFMQ-SF – RAS	0.179	404	[0.078; 0.275]	$p < 0.001$

Note. RMM: Relationship Mindfulness Measure; FFMQ-SF: Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire–Short Form; RAS: Relationship Assessment Scale; OBS: observing; DES: describing; AWA: acting with awareness; NONJ: non-judging; NONR: non-reactivity; CI: confidence interval; ns: not significant.

RMM scores were negatively associated with relationship satisfaction ($r = -0.178$, $p < 0.001$), with a small effect size. The correlation with the FFMQ-SF total score was not significant ($r = -0.026$, $p > 0.05$). This pattern may suggest that the RMM captures aspects of awareness specific to interactions with a romantic partner. However, because it is intended to measure a form of mindfulness, the absence of an association with dispositional mindfulness requires cautious interpretation and further validation.

At the facet level, relational mindfulness showed a small positive association with Acting with Awareness ($r = 0.170$, $p < 0.001$) and a small negative association with Describing ($r = -0.203$, $p < 0.001$). No significant associations were found with Observing ($r = -0.051$, $p > 0.05$), Non-judging ($r = 0.003$, $p > 0.05$), or Non-reactivity ($r = 0.003$, $p > 0.05$). This pattern indicates that the RMM was associated with selected dimensions of dispositional mindfulness but not with the overall FFMQ-SF score. These findings are compatible with the possibility that relational mindfulness captures context-specific aspects of mindfulness in intimate interactions; nevertheless, additional validation studies are needed to clarify its convergence with and distinctiveness from general mindfulness.

Group differences by time since infidelity

One-way ANOVA was used to compare RMM scores across groups defined by time since infidelity (6–24, 25–60, 61–120 and > 120 months).

The groups differed significantly, $F(3, 400) = 9.49$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.066$. Bonferroni post hoc tests showed higher scores in the 6–24-month group than in the 25–60-month group ($p < 0.001$). Scores in the 61–120-month group were higher than those in the 25–60-month group ($p < 0.001$) and the > 120-month group ($p = 0.004$). No other pairwise differences were significant. Unequal group sizes warrant caution in interpreting these results.

Higher RMM scores were observed in the 6–24-month and 61–120-month groups than in selected comparison groups (Table 5). These cross-sectional differences do not demonstrate changes within individuals over time.

Table 5. Mean RMM scores by time since infidelity

Time (months)	n	M	SD
6–24	197	3.24	1.14
25–60	80	2.64	1.08
61–120	78	3.51	1.20
> 120	49	2.79	1.32

Note. RMM: Relationship Mindfulness Measure; M: mean; SD: standard deviation.

Group differences by time since discovery of infidelity

A second one-way ANOVA examined RMM scores by time since participants learned of the infidelity. The groups differed significantly, $F(3, 400) = 8.01$, $p < 0.001$, $\eta^2 = 0.057$.

The highest mean RMM score was observed in the 61–120-month group ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.22$), followed by the 6–24-month group ($M = 3.19$, $SD = 1.14$). Lower scores were observed in the 25–60-month group ($M = 2.82$, $SD = 1.17$) and the > 120-month group ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.23$).

Bonferroni post hoc tests showed higher scores in the 61–120-month group than in the 25–60-month and > 120-month groups (both $p < 0.001$). Scores in the 6–24-month group were also higher than those in the > 120-month group ($p = 0.043$). No other pairwise differences were significant. Unequal group sizes, particularly the small > 120-month group, warrant caution.

These results describe differences between groups defined by time since discovery of infidelity (Table 6); they do not demonstrate changes in relational mindfulness within individuals over time.

Table 6. Mean RMM scores by time since discovery of infidelity

Time (months)	n	M	SD
6–24	216	3.19	1.14
25–60	97	2.82	1.17
61–120	63	3.59	1.22
> 120	28	2.56	1.23

Note. RMM: Relationship Mindfulness Measure; M: mean; SD: standard deviation.

DISCUSSION

This study adapted and evaluated the Polish RMM among adults who had experienced partner infidelity and remained in the relationship. The results provide preliminary support for its one-factor structure with correlated residuals and its internal consistency. Its associations with other measures suggest that the role of relational mindfulness may depend on the relationship context, although construct validity requires further examination.

An important contribution of the present study concerns the relationship between relational mindfulness and dispositional mindfulness. While mindfulness has traditionally been examined primarily as an individual-level characteristic reflecting present-moment awareness and non-judgemental acceptance, emerging per-

spectives emphasise that mindfulness may also be expressed within interpersonal contexts. Relational mindfulness refers specifically to mindful awareness during interactions with a romantic partner and may therefore involve context-specific processes that are not fully captured by general measures of dispositional mindfulness [6, 7, 18].

Consistent with this perspective, the present findings showed no significant association between relational mindfulness and overall dispositional mindfulness, alongside small associations with selected FFMQ-SF facets. One possible interpretation is that the RMM captures mindful awareness as it is experienced within a specific relational context, whereas the FFMQ-SF assesses broader individual tendencies across situations. At the same time, the absence of a significant association with overall dispositional mindfulness should not be treated as conclusive evidence of discriminant validity. Further validation studies, including analyses in non-distressed samples and with additional interpersonal mindfulness measures, are needed to clarify the relationship between relational and dispositional mindfulness.

One of the most theoretically important findings of the study is the negative association between relational mindfulness and relationship satisfaction. Although previous research conducted in non-distressed samples has typically reported positive associations between mindfulness and relationship quality, the present results suggest that this relationship may be context-dependent. In the current sample—individuals who experienced infidelity and remained in the relationship—higher relational mindfulness may reflect increased awareness of relational difficulties, emotional distance, and unresolved hurt. From this perspective, mindfulness does not necessarily function as a mechanism that directly enhances well-being, but rather as a process that increases contact with present-moment experiences, including those that are emotionally challenging. This interpretation is consistent with models of post-infidelity adjustment, which emphasise heightened vigilance, rumination, and sensitivity to relational threat [11, 12]. Greater awareness of relational processes may amplify perceived discrepancies between expectations and current relational reality, thereby

lowering subjective satisfaction, at least temporarily. Importantly, meta-analytic findings indicate that while mindfulness is generally associated with improved relationship outcomes, these effects are relatively small and vary substantially depending on contextual factors, particularly in distressed populations [8]. Furthermore, recent experimental research suggests that mindfulness-based interventions do not always lead to superior social or relational outcomes compared to active control conditions, despite improving emotional functioning [10]. Together, these findings support the interpretation that mindfulness may enhance awareness and emotional processing without necessarily translating into immediate improvements in subjective relational well-being.

RMM scores differed between groups defined by time since infidelity and time since its disclosure. These findings suggest differences between people at different stages following infidelity, but they do not establish changes within individuals over time. Longitudinal studies are needed to examine whether relational mindfulness changes and how any changes relate to emotional adjustment and relationship repair.

Several limitations should be acknowledged. The sample comprised people who had experienced infidelity and remained in the relationship, limiting generalisability to other populations. Self-report measures may introduce common method bias, and the cross-sectional design precludes causal inference. The residual correlation added during CFA also requires replication in an independent sample.

Future research should adopt longitudinal and dyadic designs to better capture the dynamic nature of relational mindfulness and its role in relationship processes. As suggested in recent literature, examining mindfulness within relational systems rather than solely at the individual level may provide a more comprehensive understanding of its mechanisms and effects [22].

The Polish RMM showed promising structural and reliability characteristics in adults who had experienced partner infidelity and remained in the relationship. Further research is needed to clarify its construct validity and clinical utility. The findings highlight the importance of examining mindfulness within its interpersonal con-

text, particularly where relationships involve distress or recovery following infidelity.

Author contributions

Julitta Dębska and Katarzyna Wałęcka-Matyja contributed equally to this work and share first authorship.

Funding

The authors received no funding for this research.

ORCID: Julitta Dębska: 0009-0008-7214-7024; Katarzyna Wałęcka-Matyja: 0000-0001-8222-729X

REFERENCES

1. Kabat-Zinn J. *Full Catastrophe Living*. New York: Delacorte; 1990.
2. Karremans JC, Schellekens MPJ, Kappen G. Bridging the sciences of mindfulness and romantic relationships: A theoretical model and research agenda. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*. 2017;21(1):29–49. doi:10.1177/1088868315615450.
3. Siegel DJ. *The Mindful Brain*. New York: Norton; 2007.
4. Khoury B, Lecomte T, Fortin G, et al. Mindfulness-based therapy: A comprehensive meta-analysis. *Clin Psychol Rev*. 2013;33(6):763–771.
5. Kimmes JG, Jaurequi ME, May RW, Srivastava S, Fincham FD. Mindfulness in the context of romantic relationships: Initial development and validation of the Relationship Mindfulness Measure. *J Marital Fam Ther*. 2018;44(4):575–589. doi:10.1111/jmft.12296.
6. Cordova JV. *The mindful path to intimacy: Cultivating a deeper connection with your partner*. New York: Guilford Press; 2025.
7. Lo HHM. *Mindfulness for children, adolescents, and families: Integrating research into practice*. Cham: Springer; 2024. doi:10.1007/978-3-031-51943-7.
8. Voldstad A, Zeas-Sigüenza A, Skolzkov A, Walthaug M, Montero-Marín J, Kuyken W. The effect of mindfulness interventions on couple relationship satisfaction: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Consult Clin Psychol*. 2025;93(6):427–442. doi:10.1037/ccp0000954.
9. Roczon P, Holas P, Rusanowska M, Krejtz I, Nezelek JB. The interplay between self-compassion and mindfulness in the explanation of depression and anxiety in depressed individuals. *Arch Psych Psychother*. 2025;27(2):16–28.
10. Wong ETF, Lee EKP, Mo PKH, Xu Z, Zhang D, Woo J, et al. Effects of a mindfulness-based intervention versus a so-

- cial contact control in alleviating loneliness among older adults: A randomised controlled trial. *BMJ Ment Health*. 2026;29(1):e302197. doi:10.1136/bmjment-2025-302197.
11. Beltrán-Morillas AM, Valor-Segura I, Expósito F. Unforgiveness motivations in romantic relationships experiencing infidelity: Negative affect and anxious attachment to the partner as predictors. *Front Psychol*. 2019;10:434.
 12. Onaylı S, Erdur-Baker Ö, Kordoutis P. The relation between rumination and emotional reactions to infidelity in romantic relationships. *Athens J Soc Sci*. 2016;3(1):63–76.
 13. Gordon KC, Baucom DH, Snyder DK. An integrative intervention for promoting recovery from extramarital affairs. *J Marital Fam Ther*. 2004;30(2):213–231.
 14. Bohlmeijer E, ten Klooster PM, Fledderus M, Veehof M, Baer R. Psychometric properties of the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire–Short Form. *Assessment*. 2011;18(3):308–320.
 15. Radoń S, Rydzewska M. Validation of the Polish version of the Short Form of the Five Facet Mindfulness Questionnaire. *Ann Psychol*. 2018;21(3):279–298. doi:10.18290/rpsych.2018.21.3-5.
 16. Brown KW, Ryan RM. The benefits of being present: Mindfulness and its role in psychological well-being. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 2003;84(4):822–848.
 17. Baer RA, Smith GT, Allen KB. Assessment of mindfulness by self-report: The Kentucky Inventory of Mindfulness Skills. *Assessment*. 2004;11(3):191–206.
 18. Dębska J. Differentiation of self and relational mindfulness in the dyadic adaptation model in the face of stressful external factors. *Fides Ratio*. 2025;61(1):111–121.
 19. Adamczyk K, Kleka P, Frydrychowicz M. Psychometric functioning, measurement invariance, and external associations of the Relationship Assessment Scale in a sample of Polish adults. *Sci Rep*. 2022;12:22157. doi:10.1038/s41598-022-26653-6.
 20. Hendrick SS, Hendrick C, Adler NL. Romantic relationships: Love, satisfaction, and staying together. *J Pers Soc Psychol*. 1988;54(6):980–988.
 21. Monfort SS, Kaczmarek LD, Kashdan TB, et al. Capitalizing on a partner's success: Examining associations of trait mindfulness, affective empathy, and perceived partner responsiveness. *Pers Individ Dif*. 2014;68:149–153.
 22. Leavitt CE, Karremans JC. Mindfulness and relationships: A special issue on recent developments. *J Soc Pers Relat*. 2023;40(5):1319–1331. doi:10.1177/02654075231166711.