

Andrzej Dakowicz*

Specificity of psychon structure forming the personality of transgressive and protective spouses

Abstract: *In terms of psychotransgressionism, personality is a network of five equipollent psychons, the content of which determines the personality's functioning. The strength and power of the individual psychons underlies the tendency to undertake transgressive actions. In this study, we hypothesized that transgressive spouses are characterized by greater potential strength, greater power of cognitive, instrumental, motivational, emotional, and personal psychons than protective spouses. We operationalized all psychons, created the appropriate research tools, and then studied married couples. Using the Transgression Scale developed by Studenski, we found a group of spouses with higher levels of transgression (transgressive), and a group of spouses with lower levels of transgression (protective). Transgressive wives are characterized by better knowledge about their husbands' operational sphere, and are more aware of personal beliefs than protective wives. Similarly, transgressive husbands have greater knowledge of their wives' operational sphere, stronger cognitive needs, and weaker personal needs than protective husbands. Transgressive husbands are characterized by a positive affective shift and have a greater awareness of personal beliefs than protective husbands. The potential brought into interpersonal relationships by transgressive spouses may create a climate conducive to building a satisfying marital relationship.*

Key words: *psychotransgressionism, network theory of personality, psychons (cognitive, instrumental, motivational, emotional, and personal), transgressive and protective spouses*

Introduction

A new area of psychology, psychotransgressionism, is largely focused on personality development, understood as crossing natural, symbolic and social boundaries as well as the behavioral style of the individual. A specific network of five psychons expresses the individuality of each person: cognitive – “I know that”; instrumental – “I know how”; motivational – “I strive for”; emotional – “I feel that”; and personal – “who am I”. Humans as doers take protective (palliative) and transgressive actions. The first type of action protects from physical and mental pain as well as helps maintain a relative balance in everyday life. The second type involves intentional actions that go beyond everyday reality and doing something new or in new ways (Kozielecki, 2007), which ultimately leads to development or may end in failure, because risk is an inherent feature of transgression (Kozielecki, 1983). Transgressive actions, however, have more potential opportunities to understand others, the world around us, and ourselves better.

The psychotransgressive way of understanding the functioning mechanisms of the human psyche has inspired

many researchers to seek new solutions for, among others, such issues as: globalization (Ledzińska, 2011); sustainable development (Tański, 2015); the creative process (Tokarz, 2005); entrepreneurship (Strzałecki, 2006); marketing innovations (Weryński, 2014); self-education (Wróblewska, 2008); addiction (Ślaski, 2012); risk (Studenski, 2006).

Using the newest knowledge on the functioning of the human psyche, efforts are continually made to try to determine the mechanisms influencing marital satisfaction; for example, by bringing attention to the perception of self and partner in the relationship in terms of all the Big Five features (Furler, Gomez & Grob, 2014). It is worthwhile then to use the psychotransgressive perspective to understand the still open question of the most important psychological factors associated with spousal personality, affecting the stability and quality of their marital relationship (Jankowiak, 2007). Referencing the underlying assumptions of psychotransgressionism in the construction of research tools, as well as in the course of analyzing the obtained results, opens the way to better understanding of the determinants of transgressive and protective spouses' functioning of the psychological structure. An analysis of

* Faculty of Pedagogy and Psychology, University of Białystok, ul. Świerkowa 20, 15-328 Białystok, Poland, a.dakowicz@uwb.edu.pl

studies of spouses that differ from each other in their degree of transgression enables describing the specifics of psychon structure forming their personality.

Research question

In terms of psychotransgressionism, personality is a network of five relatively stable and equipollent mental components, called psychons, that function as a whole, cementing a sense of identity and enabling interaction with the environment (Kozielecki, 2007). The cognitive psychon consists of knowledge, including knowledge of one's spouse and marital life, expanding one's cognitive space. It is hardly possible to remain close to another person among the turbulence of life (Gottman & Silver, 1999). Another important element of the cognitive psychon is relational judgment concerning the relations and bonds between the outside world and oneself, which influences how one bonds or separates from others, as well as judgment of oneself leading to tactical, facade or authentic self-representation (Kozielecki, 1987). The cognitive psychon is a sort of "subjective encyclopedia" which allows one to navigate the world (Kozielecki, 2007).

The next psychon – instrumental – influences how spouses perform everyday tasks and solve unusual problems. Intelligence is an important part of this psychon, often understood as the ability to cope with new situations by referring to earlier experience and cognitive processes (see Sternberg, 1997). This certainly influences the atmosphere of married life, as problems appear, forcing the couple to make an effort to overcome them or causing emotional pressure leading to destruction.

The motivational psychon is based on needs functioning in four areas: the material world – vital needs; the cognitive (symbolic) world – cognitive needs; the social world – social needs; the internal world – personal needs. These needs are at the root of the motivation process, shape its general direction, sustain it and influence the conclusion (or abandoning) of started thoughts and actions (Kozielecki, 2007).

The emotional psychon consists of stable neuro-physiological and psychological systems, which generate emotional states and processes, moods and emotions, which are accompanied by somatic changes, characteristic facial expressions and behaviours (see Ekman, 1992). Positive emotions probably play a greater role in transgressive acts than negative ones, which Kozielecki (2007) calls the positive affective shift.

The personal psychon is a deep psychological and spiritual structure containing a person's identity and existential content. They are coded in conscious beliefs and almost inexpressible conscious states called beliefs. The most important of these are: the belief in one's own existence as a person and a causative agent; the belief in the affirmation of the world; the belief in one's own singularity and integrity; the belief in one's continuity; the belief in one's uniqueness (Kozielecki, 2007).

According to psychotransgressionism, stronger psychons create stronger and better performing networks

that increase the likelihood of transgressive behavior. Since transgressive actions modify the reality of married life to a greater degree than protective ones, we posed the following research question: How are married people with high levels of transgression (transgressive) psychologically different from those with low levels of transgression (protective)? Based on the basic assumptions of psychotransgressionism, we formed the following hypotheses:

H1: Transgressive wives are characterized by greater potential strength, greater power of individual psychons (cognitive, instrumental, motivational, emotional and personal), than protective wives.

H2: Transgressive husbands are characterized by greater potential strength, greater power of individual psychons (cognitive, instrumental, motivational, emotional and personal), than protective husbands.

Method

Group

The study included 100 married couples in their first formal marriage, with a minimum of 5 years duration. Participants had a secondary education or higher, were professionally active, and performed parental functions. The studied spouses' transgression level was determined using the Transgression Scale developed by Studenski in accordance with Kozielecki's concept of psychotransgressionism. The Transgression Scale enables quantitative estimation of a person's transgressionism through measurable outcomes of transgressive actions, their frequency, participation in achieving transgressive objectives, and relative satisfaction experienced in connection with transgressive behaviors. The developed psychometric indicators and the determined four factors – focus on domination over others, innovation used in designing new solutions, motivation to improve skills, and courage to take on new tasks – make the Scale a good tool for measuring transgression (Studenski, 2006).

Based on the results of the Transgression Scale (Studenski, 2006), we found 30 transgressive wives (with a high transgression level), 30 transgressive husbands (with a high transgression level), 30 protective wives (with a low transgression level), and 30 protective husbands (with a low transgression level).

Materials and procedure

By choosing or developing new research tools, five psychons were operationalized based on the concept of psychotransgressionism (Kozielecki, 2007). Their usefulness and accuracy were verified during the implementation of a major research project on psychological determinants of marital success from the perspective of the transgressive model of J. Kozielecki (Dakowicz, 2014a).

The cognitive psychon was analyzed using the Marital Partner Knowledge Questionnaire (Dakowicz, 2012). It includes four spheres: general, emotional, operational, and values. Ten open-ended items were formed for the general

Table 1. Characteristics of the spouses

Selected characteristics	Type of spouse			
	Transgressive wives (<i>n</i> =30)	Transgressive husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective wives (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective husbands (<i>n</i> =30)
Level of transgression	60.2	66.2	43.8	47.6
Age	34.3 years	35.4 years	37.6 years	39.4 years
Education	Higher	26 (86.7%)	25 (83.3%)	19 (63.3%)
	Secondary	4 (13.3%)	5 (16.7%)	11 (36.7%)
Marriage duration	11.8 years	11.4 years	14.1 years	12.9 years
Number of children	One	11 (36.7%)	11 (36.7%)	9 (30.0%)
	Two	17 (56.7%)	14 (46.8%)	13 (43.4%)
	Three	2 (6.6%)	2 (6.6%)	6 (20.0%)
	Four	0	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.3%)
	Five	0	2 (6.6%)	1 (3.3%)

sphere, such as “Favorite person in the family,” and 10 “yes/no” items for the other spheres, such as: (emotional) “My comfort depends strongly on how my partner feels”; (operational) “Lack of perspectives discourages and daunts my partner”; (values) “Material values are the most important for my partner”. The couples answered the questions for all spheres about each other first, and later they answered the same questions about themselves. By comparing the two lists, one can see which answers match, making it possible to establish the level of knowledge about the partner. The minimal result is 0 (none of the answers match) and the maximum result is 40 (all answers match).

The instrumental psychon was analysed with the help of a general intelligence scale (APIS-Z), which allows for the evaluation of the following skills: abstract-logic (classification and transformation of numbers), verbal (synonyms and new words), visual and spatial (squares and blocks), and social (behaviours and stories) (Matczak et al. 2006).

The motivational psychon was analyzed using the Individual Needs Test (Dakowicz, 2011), which can identify preferences for vital, cognitive, social, and personal needs (Reddin, 1991). In groups consisting of four types of needs, the respondents had four points to divide between statements, granting the most points to the statement which best described their goals; e.g. “I would like to eat better” (vital need); “I would like to have more time for thought” (cognitive need); “I would like to have more friends” (social need); “I would like my work to be more prestigious” (personal need).

The emotional psychon was diagnosed with the use of a semantic differential, where respondents express their emotional attitudes towards twelve concepts: three existential (e.g. life), three connected with their family background (e.g. childhood), three connected with their

current family (e.g. spouse) and three connected with work (e.g. salary) (Dakowicz, 2014b).

The personal psychon was analyzed using the Conscious Personal Beliefs Test (Dakowicz, 2012), where the respondent used a five-grade scale (1 – very rarely, 2 – rarely, 3 – sometimes, 4 – often, 5 – very often) to express their beliefs on seven significant elements of the personal psychon; e.g. “Despite changing circumstances, I feel that I have been myself all my life.”

We used SPSS 21.0 PL for Windows software for data analysis to calculate the value of the t-Student test for comparing spouses with high and low levels of transgression (Bedyńska & Brzezicka, 2007).

Results

As far as knowledge of their husbands in the general, emotional and values spheres was concerned, wives with high and low levels of transgression were not significantly statistically different from each other. There was a statistically significant difference in the operational sphere ($t(58)=2.85$; $p<0.006$), where transgressive wives had significantly better knowledge about their husbands than protective wives. When taking all four spheres together, the knowledge of transgressive wives was significantly better than that of protective wives ($t(58) = 2.10$; $p<0.04$).

Similarly, in the case of transgressive and protective husbands, their knowledge about their wives in the general, emotional, and values spheres did not differ statistically significantly. There was a statistically significant difference in the operational sphere ($t(58) = 2.77$; $p<0.007$), where transgressive husbands had significantly better knowledge about their wives than protective husbands.

Table 2. Transgressive and protective wives' knowledge about their husbands

Spheres of knowledge	Transgressive wives (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective wives (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
General	6.10 (1.45)	6.13 (1.74)	-0.81	n.s.
Emotional	7.37 (1.52)	6.77 (1.87)	1.36	n.s.
Operational	7.33 (1.63)	6.10 (1.73)	2.85	0.006
Values	8.17 (1.53)	8.17 (1.60)	0.00	n.s.
Overall	28.97 (2.75)	27.17 (3.82)	2.10	0.040

Table 3. Transgressive and protective husbands' knowledge about their wives

Spheres of knowledge	Transgressive husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
General	5.23 (1.61)	4.97 (1.71)	0.62	n.s.
Emotional	6.93 (1.53)	6.70 (1.49)	0.60	n.s.
Operational	7.20 (1.32)	5.90 (2.20)	2.77	0.007
Values	8.53 (1.36)	8.67 (1.24)	-0.40	n.s.
Overall	27.90 (2.75)	26.23 (3.83)	1.94	n.s.

Among the four types of skills, transgressive wives obtained slightly higher results in abstract-logic and social skills, while protective wives obtained slightly higher results in verbal and visual-spatial skills. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Transgressive husbands obtained slightly better results for abstract-logic, visual-spatial and social skills, while protective husbands obtained slightly better results for verbal skills. However, these differences were not statistically significant.

Table 4. Skill levels of transgressive and protective wives

Types of skills	Transgressive wives (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective wives (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
Abstract-logic	7.47 (2.40)	6.83 (3.17)	0.87	n.s.
Verbal	5.23 (2.97)	5.43 (2.69)	-0.27	n.s.
Visual-spatial	7.70 (2.57)	7.83 (3.37)	-0.17	n.s.
Social	9.07 (2.62)	8.00 (2.74)	1.54	n.s.
Overall	29.47 (7.95)	28.10 (9.49)	0.60	n.s.

Table 5. Skill levels of transgressive and protective husbands

Types of skills	Transgressive husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
Abstract-logic	8.63 (3.02)	8.20 (2.32)	0.62	n.s.
Verbal	5.87 (3.23)	6.10 (2.59)	-0.31	n.s.
Visual-spatial	10.13 (2.85)	9.80 (2.67)	0.47	n.s.
Social	9.03 (2.91)	8.43 (2.27)	0.89	n.s.
Overall	32.33 (10.58)	32.53 (6.96)	-0.09	n.s.

As far as individual needs were concerned, transgressive wives put their personal needs first, then cognitive needs, social needs, and finally vital needs. In the case of protective wives, personal needs also came first, but the second place was taken by vital needs, then social needs, and finally cognitive needs. We did not observe statistically significant differences between the two groups.

For transgressive husbands, the first preference was cognitive needs, followed by social needs, vital needs, and finally personal needs. For protective husbands, the first preference was personal needs, followed by social needs, vital needs, and finally cognitive needs. We noticed statistically significant differences between the two groups of husbands in the case of two types of needs.

Transgressive husbands had significantly greater cognitive needs ($t(58) = 3.33$; $p < 0.001$) than protective husbands. Protective husbands had significantly greater personal needs ($t(58) = -2.67$; $p < 0.01$) than transgressive.

The emotional connotations of transgressive and protective wives looked similar: positive dominated, then neutral, and finally negative. We did not observe statistically significant differences between the two groups.

Similarly, transgressive and protective husbands had more positive emotional connotations, far fewer neutral, and the least negative. Between the two groups of husbands, there was a statistically significant difference in positive connotations. Transgressive husbands had significantly more positive connotations ($t(58) = 2.60$; $p < 0.012$) than protective.

Table 6. Individual needs of transgressive and protective wives

Types of needs	Transgressive wives ($n=30$)	Protective wives ($n=30$)	t -test	$p <$
Vital	11.97 (6.14)	13.33 (5.70)	-0.89	n.s.
Cognitive	14.57 (6.52)	12.93 (6.99)	0.94	n.s.
Social	13.90 (4.70)	13.07 (5.08)	0.66	n.s.
Personal	15.57 (6.91)	16.67 (7.62)	-0.59	n.s.

Table 7. Individual needs of transgressive and protective husbands

Types of needs	Transgressive husbands ($n=30$)	Protective husbands ($n=30$)	t -test	$p <$
Vital	13.37 (6.19)	12.90 (4.25)	0.34	n.s.
Cognitive	16.73 (6.66)	11.67 (4.98)	3.33	0.001
Social	13.43 (6.08)	15.17 (4.79)	-1.23	n.s.
Personal	12.47 (5.73)	16.27 (5.28)	-2.67	0.010

Table 8. Emotional connotations of transgressive and protective wives

Types of connotations	Transgressive wives ($n=30$)	Protective wives ($n=30$)	t -test	$p <$
Positive	38.80 (6.32)	36.97 (7.60)	1.02	n.s.
Neutral	5.37 (4.25)	6.03 (6.00)	-0.50	n.s.
Negative	3.83 (3.94)	5.00 (4.23)	-1.10	n.s.

Table 9. Emotional connotations of transgressive and protective husbands

Types of connotations	Transgressive husbands ($n=30$)		Protective husbands ($n=30$)		t -test	$p <$
Positive	41.27	5.79	37.30	6.00	2.60	0.012
Neutral	4.87	5.86	6.93	4.73	-1.50	n.s.
Negative	2.20	2.89	3.87	3.73	-1.93	n.s.

Transgressive and protective wives were significantly different from each other in respect to their personal beliefs. In three of the seven kinds of beliefs, transgressive wives had significantly higher scores than protective wives. In the other four, the results for transgressive wives were slightly higher, but these were not statistically significant differences. Compared to protective wives, transgressive wives had a significantly greater belief in being the motive force of their own actions ($t(58) = 2.28; p < 0.026$); they were more likely to accept the world as a whole, including themselves ($t(58) = 2.33; p < 0.039$); and had a stronger feeling of being an indivisible whole ($t(58) = 1.43; p < 0.023$). If one includes all seven beliefs together, they are much stronger for transgressive ($t(58) = 2.72; p < 0.009$) than protective wives.

As far as personal beliefs were concerned, the two groups of husbands varied greatly. Out of the seven types of beliefs, in five cases transgressive husbands had significantly higher results than protective ones. In the other two types of beliefs, their results were slightly higher than those of protective husbands, but the differences were not statistically significant.

Transgressive husbands had a stronger feeling of being a person ($t(58) = 3.08; p < 0.003$), of their own existence ($t(58) = 2.11; p < 0.039$), of being the motive force behind their own actions ($t(58) = 2.38; p < 0.021$). They had a stronger acceptance of the world, including themselves ($t(58) = 3.23; p < 0.002$); and a stronger feeling of remaining themselves throughout their lives ($t(58) = 2.50; p < 0.015$). All seven beliefs taken together were significantly stronger for transgressive husbands ($t(58) = 3.20; p < 0.002$) than for protective husbands.

Discussion and summary

Both the transgressive wives (H1) and transgressive husbands (H2) taking part in the research were more frequently characterized by a greater strength of particular psychons than their protective counterparts. Transgressive wives and husbands had better knowledge of their spouse in the operational sphere. This is undoubtedly good for their relations and allows them to correctly predict the behavior of their spouse in constantly changing circumstances

Table 10. Conscious personal beliefs of transgressive and protective wives

Types of beliefs	Transgressive wives (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective wives (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
1. I am a person	4.47 (0.86)	4.07 (0.87)	1.79	n.s.
2. I exist	4.60 (0.50)	4.33 (0.76)	1.61	n.s.
3. I am the motive force behind my own actions	4.43 (0.63)	4.00 (0.83)	2.28	0.026
4. I accept the world as a whole, including myself	4.20 (0.76)	3.73 (0.94)	2.33	0.039
5. I feel I am an indivisible whole	4.20 (0.71)	3.67 (1.03)	1.43	0.023
6. I feel I have been myself all my life	4.27 (0.78)	4.07 (0.83)	0.96	n.s.
7. I am different and separate from other people	4.20 (0.96)	3.70 (1.09)	1.89	n.s.
Total	30.37 (3.20)	27.57 (4.65)	2.72	0.009

Table 11. Conscious personal beliefs of transgressive and protective husbands

Types of beliefs	Transgressive husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	Protective husbands (<i>n</i> =30)	<i>t</i> -test	<i>p</i> <
1. I am a person	4.57 (0.50)	4.00 (0.87)	3.08	0.003
2. I exist	4.47 (0.63)	4.10 (0.71)	2.11	0.039
3. I am the motive force behind my own actions	4.33 (0.61)	3.93 (0.69)	2.38	0.021
4. I accept the world as a whole, including myself	4.40 (0.62)	3.80 (0.80)	3.23	0.002
5. I feel I am an indivisible whole	4.10 (0.99)	3.70 (1.02)	1.54	n.s.
6. I feel I have been myself all my life	4.40 (0.50)	3.97 (0.81)	2.50	0.015
7. I am different and separate from other people	4.17 (1.12)	3.73 (1.14)	1.48	n.s.
Total	30.43 (3.42)	27.23 (4.27)	3.20	0.002

(Karakurt et al., 2013). It also allows the couple to share tasks according to their individual preferences, to make plans, take up activities together, and gain satisfaction from their realization. In the case of general and emotional knowledge, as well as the knowledge of values, both types of marriages obtained above average results, but there were no statistically significant difference.

Similarly, as far as abstract-logic, verbal, visual-spatial and social skills were concerned, there were no statistically significant differences between transgressive and protective spouses. Both wives and husbands from both types of marriages received a slightly below average score in all the skill types (Matczak et al., 2006).

There were no statistically significant differences between transgressive and protective wives with respect to their vital, cognitive, social, and personal needs. There was, however, a visible difference with regard to the order of needs in both groups. Among transgressive wives, personal needs dominated, with cognitive needs second, social needs third, and vital needs last. For protective wives, personal needs also came first, but later came vital and social needs, and finally cognitive needs.

The stronger a given group of needs, the more probable it is for a motivational process to start with the aim of fulfilling these needs and achieving psychological equilibrium (Miner, Dowson & Malone, 2013). In the case of transgressive wives, the fulfilling of personal needs is strongly connected with the need to gain knowledge about the world and oneself, which may in consequence lead to better contact with reality and improving the quality of marital dialogue (Baniak, 2004). For protective wives, fulfilling personal needs is strongly connected to vital needs, which may in consequence lead to excessive focus on oneself and the deterioration of the quality of the marital relationship.

The intensity and order of individual needs strongly differentiated transgressive and protective husbands. For transgressive husbands, cognitive needs were the strongest, followed by social and vital needs, and finally personal needs. For protective husbands, the order of needs was reversed. Personal needs were the strongest by far, followed by social and vital needs, and finally cognitive needs.

Taking this order of individual needs into account, one would expect transgressive husbands to frequently be subject to motivational processes leading to better knowledge of the world around them and themselves. This may significantly affect better understanding of the realities of marital and family life, and therefore result in taking the adequate steps to improve happiness in marriage (Goleman, 2006). In the case of protective husbands, one would expect the frequent appearance of motivational processes leading to fulfilling personal needs. This may in consequence lead to a greater focus on oneself rather than on the marital relationship or family life, as well as less empathy, which leads to a deterioration of marital satisfaction (Sitarczyk & Waniewski, 2002).

The emotional climate of transgressive and protective wives did not show any differences between these groups. In both groups, positive connotations were the most numerous, there were far fewer neutral connotations,

and negative connotations were the least frequent. In the case of men, there was a similar set of connotations. There was however one statistically significant difference. Transgressive husbands showed many more positive emotional connotations than protective ones. Koziellecki described this as a positive affective shift (2007). A positive emotional balance causes spouses to pursue their own goals, in spite of obstacles in themselves and the outside world (Ślaski, 2010).

There was a statistically significant difference between the two groups of spouses in the awareness of their personal beliefs. Transgressive wives had a stronger belief in being the motive force behind their own actions; in accepting the world as a whole, including themselves; and in being an indivisible whole. Compared to protective husbands, transgressive ones felt more themselves; had a stronger feeling of their own existence; had a stronger feeling of being the motive force behind their own actions; were more willing to accept the world as a whole, including themselves; and felt that they had been themselves throughout their lives.

This is far from the neuroticism frequently connected to higher levels of marital conflicts and decreased satisfaction with the created relationship (Iveniuk et al., 2014). This greater awareness of their personal beliefs gives transgressive spouses the ability to build their own identities, which in effect mobilizes them to take steps to change their marriage, family life, and the wider environment they function in. They are therefore able to overcome their own limitations and the limitations of the world around them. They can transcend and distance themselves from this reality, as well as relate to it. They set goals and tasks for themselves. They design the future and work to be who they are not, but can be and want to be. This mode of operation corresponds to the characteristics of people with an active noetic sphere. There has been much empirical evidence gathered to demonstrate that high activity of the noetic sphere is associated with a sense of meaning of life and mental health (Popielski, 1996). This undoubtedly helps them find their place in the world and gives them a sense of purpose in their activities (Popielski, 1994), which also leads to the fulfillment of love, which is a constant creative act (Fromm, 1976).

The presented result analysis indicates significant differences between spouses with higher and lower transgression levels. Further research to deepen analysis of the noted correlations would be worthwhile. An important aspect of this type of research would be a result analysis strategy taking into account the marriage as a pair, capturing the relationship dynamics, which would highlight the specificity of the psychotransgressive approach.

Reference

- Baniak, J. (2004). Znaczenie dialogu w małżeństwie. *Małżeństwo i Rodzina*, 1, 25–28.
- Bedyńska, S., & Brzezicka, A. (2007). *Statystyczny drogowca. Praktyczny poradnik analizy danych w naukach społecznych na przykładach z psychologii*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo szkoły Wyższej Psychologii Społecznej „Academica”.

- Dakowicz, A. (2011). Potrzeby indywidualne małżonków zadowolonych i niezadowolonych ze swojego związku. *Edukacja. Studia, badania, innowacje*, 3, 99–105.
- Dakowicz, A. (2012). Psychologiczna analiza małżonków o wysokim i niskim poziomie transgresji. In: T. Rostowska & A. Lewandowska-Walter (Eds.), *Małżeństwo i rodzicielstwo a zdrowie* (pp. 79–101). Toruń: Wydawnictwo Adam Marszałek.
- Dakowicz, A. (2014a). *Powodzenie małżeństwa. Uwarunkowania psychologiczne w perspektywie transgresyjnego modelu Józefa Kozielckiego*. Białystok: Trans Humana Wydawnictwo Uniwersyteckie.
- Dakowicz, A. (2014b). The affective sphere of spouses with high or low relationship satisfaction. *Progress in Health Sciences*, 4(2), 96–101.
- Ekman, P. (1992). *Telling lies. Clues to deceit in the marketplace, politics and marriage*. New York: W.W. Norton.
- Fromm, E. (1976). *To Have or to Be?* New York: Harper and Row.
- Furler, K., Gomez, V., & Grob, A. (2014). Personality perceptions and relationship satisfaction in couples. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 50, 33–41.
- Goleman, D. (2006). *Social intelligence: The new science of social relationships*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Gottman, J.M., & Silver, N. (1999). *The seven principles for making marriage work*. New York: Crown.
- Iveniuk, J., Waite, L.J., Laumann, E., McClintock, M.K., & Tiedt, A.D. (2014). Marital Conflict in Older Couples: Positivity, Personality, and Health. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 76, 130–144.
- Jankowiak, B. (2007). Problematyka jakości i trwałości relacji partnerskich w teorii i badaniach. *Przegląd Terapeutyczny*, 3, 1–25.
- Karakurt, G., Tolhurst Christiansen, A., MacDermid Wadsworth, S.M., & Weiss, H.M. (2013). Romantic Relationships Following Wartime Deployment. *Journal of Family Issues*, 34, 1427–1451.
- Kozielecki, J. (1983). Działania transgresyjne: przekraczanie granic samego siebie. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 3, 505–517.
- Kozielecki, J. (1987). *Koncepcja transgresyjna człowieka. Analiza psychologiczna*. Warszawa: PWN.
- Kozielecki, J. (2007). *Psychotransgresjonizm. Nowy kierunek psychologii*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „ŻAK”.
- Ledzińska, M. (2011). Merely a threat? Worldwide transformation as a chance of development – psychological reflection. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 42, 235–246.
- Mateczak, A., Jaworowska, A., Ciechanowicz, A., & Stańczak, J. (2006). *Bateria testów APIS-Z. Podręcznik*. Warszawa: Pracownia Testów Psychologicznych Polskiego Towarzystwa Psychologicznego.
- Miner, M., Dowson, M., & Malone, K. (2013). Spiritual Satisfaction of Basic Psychological Needs and Psychological Health. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 41, 298–314.
- Popielski, K. (1994). *Noetyczny wymiar osobowości. Psychologiczna analiza poczucia sensu życia*. Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Popielski, K. (1996). Aktywność podmiotowo-osobowa – dynamika i rozwój egzystencji. In: K. Popielski (Ed.), *Człowiek – wartości – sens. Studia z psychologii egzystencji. Logoteoria i nooteoria. Logoterapia i nooterapia* (pp. 443–447). Lublin: Redakcja Wydawnictw Katolickiego Uniwersytetu Lubelskiego.
- Reddin, B. (1991). *Tests for the output oriented manager: a self-assessment guide*. London: Kogan.
- Sitarczyk, M., & Waniewski, A. (2002). Empatia a zadowolenie z małżeństwa. *Małżeństwo i Rodzina*, 3, 28–32.
- Ślaski, S. (2010). Zachowania transgresyjne – próba psychologicznego pomiaru. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 53, 4, 401–416.
- Ślaski, S. (2012). *Motywacyjno-osobowościowe wyznaczniki zachowań transgresyjnych i ochronnych*. Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Kardynała Stefana Wyszyńskiego.
- Sternberg, R.J. (1997). *Introduction to psychology*. Orlando: Harcourt Brace College Publishers.
- Strzałecki, A. (2006). Transgresja polskich menedżerów w warunkach transformacji ustrojowej. In: E. Aranowska & M. Goszczyńska (Eds.), *Człowiek wobec wyzwań i dylematów współczesności. Księga jubileuszowa dedykowana Profesorowi Józefowi Kozielickiemu* (pp. 108–132). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Naukowe SCHOLAR.
- Studenski, R. (2006). Skłonność do ryzyka a zachowania transgresyjne. In: M. Goszczyńska & R. Studenski (Eds.), *Psychologia zachowań ryzykownych. Koncepcje, badania, praktyka* (pp. 128–142). Warszawa: Wydawnictwo Akademickie „ŻAK”.
- Tański, M. (2015). Joseph Kozielicki's Concept of Transgressive Man and the Problems of Sustainable Development. *Problemy Ekorozwoju – Problems of Sustainable Development*, 10, 1, 61–66.
- Tokarz, A. (2005). *Dynamika procesu twórczego*. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Jagiellońskiego.
- Weryński, P. (2014). Marketing self-diagnostic tool for smes – assumptions of the project. *Journal of Positive Management*, 4, 92–109.
- Wróblewska, W. (2008). The Need for Reflection on Self-education of Students. *The New Educational Review*, 14, 184–190.