



Internal Dialogues and Authenticity: How Do They Predict Well-Being?

Małgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył

To cite this article: Małgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył (2021): Internal Dialogues and Authenticity: How Do They Predict Well-Being?, Journal of Constructivist Psychology, DOI: [10.1080/10720537.2021.1983739](https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2021.1983739)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2021.1983739>



Published online: 05 Oct 2021.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)




View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Internal Dialogues and Authenticity: How Do They Predict Well-Being?

Małgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył 

The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Lublin, Poland

ABSTRACT

Previous research and theoretical considerations on potential adaptive and non-adaptive functions of internal dialogues (IDs) do not allow to clearly predict the connection between internal dialogical activity and well-being. It was hypothesized that the link depends on the type of ID and its functions. Additionally, the study aimed to explore the role of authenticity in using IDs, their frequency and effects on well-being. Participants were 214 women and 193 men, aged between 20 and 60 years. Three methods were used: the Internal Dialogical Activity Scale-Revised, the Authenticity Inventory, and the Psychological Well-Being Scale. The results confirmed that authenticity is positively associated with well-being. The only type of IDs that highly authentic people conduct more often than those with lower authenticity are identity dialogues. This type of IDs shows a positive link with well-being, whereas the general internal dialogical activity as well as ruminative, maladaptive and confronting IDs are negatively related to well-being. It was also found that higher authenticity eliminates the negative relationship of maladaptive and confronting IDs with well-being. However, this is not the case with regard to the ruminative IDs. Moreover, it transpired that in highly authentic people perspective-changing IDs are conducive to higher well-being.

Introduction

Internal dialogue (ID) is a fairly common phenomenon (Hermans & Gieser, 2012; Hermans & Kempen, 1993; Oleś et al., 2020; Puchalska-Wasył, 2016a; Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a, 2020b). However, in the 21st century, ID is still poorly understood by scientists and its relationship to well-being is unclear. IDs accompany us in a wide variety of situations. For example, when we make an important decision, we can consider the situation from many different personal perspectives (e.g. I-as an authentic person, I-as an opportunist, I-as a friend, I-as a daughter, I-as a mother, I-as a worker) or taking into account the point of view of other people or groups (e.g. my friend, my parent, my child, my boss, my co-workers). It allows us to anticipate and analyze the consequences of a given decision for each aspect of our self and for people around us. When we prepare for an important conversation, we can formulate our own

CONTACT Małgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył  wasył@kul.pl  Department of Personality Psychology, The John Paul II Catholic University of Lublin, Al. Raclawickie 14, 20-950 Lublin, Poland.

© 2021 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

arguments, but also by adopting the interlocutor's viewpoint, refute our arguments from his/her perspective and look for those that will withstand the pressure of the opponent's arguments. We also conduct IDs with people we do not have with us, who we miss, who gave us support, good advice or helped us to distance ourselves from the problem. But sometimes we also enter into a dialogue with people who accuse us, to whom we feel guilty and want to justify ourselves. These are just some of the situations in which we conduct IDs, and their diversity suggests that IDs may have different links with well-being.

How can we define ID? In this paper we assume that a person engages in ID when he/she adopts (at least) two different viewpoints in turn, and the utterances formulated (internally/silently/in one's mind or externally/aloud) from these points of view respond to one another (Puchalska-Wasyl, 2016a, 2016b; cf. Hermans, 2003). ID is one of modes of intrapersonal communication that includes among others: inner speech or covert speech (Alderson-Day & Fernyhough, 2015; MacKay, 1992), private speech (Diaz & Berk, 1992; Duncan & Cheyne, 1999; Winsler et al., 2009), auditory imagery (Reisberg, 1992), interior monolog (Hogenraad & Orianne, 1983), self-statements (Kamann & Wong, 1993), and self-talk (Brinthaup & Dove, 2012; Puchalska-Wasyl, 2014; Senay et al., 2010).

Although IDs had long been recognized by philosophers such as Thomas Aquinas, Saint Augustine, and later by Bibler, by writers such as Dostoyevsky and Hemingway, and by other thinkers like Galileo (cf. Puchalska-Wasyl, 2011), formal psychological theorizing about this phenomenon was only recently introduced at the end of the 20th and beginning of the 21st century (Hermans & Gieser, 2012; Hermans & Kempen, 1993; Markova, 2005).

The concept of ID is strongly rooted in Dialogical Self Theory (DST; Hermans & Gieser, 2012; Hermans & Kempen, 1993). Hermans (2003) conceptualizes dialogical self as a dynamic multiplicity of relatively autonomous I-positions that represent different viewpoints available to a person. Each I-position, shaped by a particular social context, is endowed with a voice (the voice of a culture, community, significant other, or a given aspect of the self) and intertwined with other I-positions, resembling people in social relationships. In this sense the concept of dialogical self allows us to study not only dialogical relationships between the self and others but also within the self. Since DST is widely regarded as a narrative theory, IDs are mainly studied in a narrative way. Over time, however, it has been noticed that people differ in the intensity of their IDs and are aware of it. Therefore, it was proposed to treat the intensity of engaging in IDs as a trait-like personality disposition and to measure it in accordance with the individual differences approach (Oleś, 2009a). This approach to the study of IDs has been developed in psychology over the past decade and will be adopted in this paper as a good complement to the difficult narrative measurement of the ID phenomenon.

According to Larsen and Buss (2005) an important function of the personality is to adapt not only to the physical and social environment, but also to the intrapsychic one. So it is about finding an agreement not only between my right and that of another person or group, but also about finding an agreement between my one right and my other right (e.g. between what I should be, and what I would like to be, or between

my aspirations and my capabilities). Internal dialogical activity, enabling negotiations and fostering reconciliation between these rationales can perform a number of adaptive and developmental function. For example, in line with psychological theorizing about this phenomenon, IDs are conducive to learning and understanding various points of view (one's own and someone else's) and clarifying beliefs, can help resolve conflicts (thanks to the understanding of opposite reasons), and allow for exploring new perspectives of our own external and internal activity. More generally, IDs seem to contribute to personality integration and development, and promote greater tolerance and a variety of interpersonal references (Oleś, 2009b, 2011).

Some empirical studies confirm such theorizing. The integrative IDs, which take into account and integrate all the viewpoints involved, diminish discrepancies between ideal and ought selves (Młynarczyk, 2011) as well as enhance situational self-esteem and positive emotions (Borawski, 2011). The other study shows that integrative IDs are a source of hope (support), give a sense of deep relation with someone close (bond), are a way of gaining some advice and distance from a problem (insight), and work as a factor motivating for action and development (self-guidance) (Puchalska-Wasyl, 2016a). It was also found that the general score of Oleś's (2009a) Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (the IDAS, which revised version will be used in the study presented further) correlates positively with empathy (.33, $p < .001$) measured by the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasyl, 2012). The ability to integrate different perspectives in IDs simulating social interactions can also translate into ease in generating various solutions to difficult situations (Staudinger & Baltes, 1996). The technique of imagined intergroup contact (IIC), based on activating a cognitive script of a first encounter, consists in conducting a positive ID with a member of an outgroup. Research has shown that IIC elicits more favorable outgroup attitudes, reduces prejudice and intergroup anxiety, and enhances intentions to engage in future contact (Crisp & Turner, 2012; Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Additionally, after IIC next ID focused on differences between ingroup and outgroup is characterized by lower confrontational attitude of the dialogue's author and by greater freedom of expression of the internal outgroup interlocutor (Puchalska-Wasyl, 2019a). In light of these empirical results one can suppose that IDs perform several adaptive functions, and thus, promote well-being, especially measured in accordance with an eudemonistic approach.

However, one should not think that internal dialogical activity fulfills only adaptive functions. Excessive and uncoordinated IDs can lead to a focus on one's own deliberations and problems, limiting the scope for action, particularly in terms of pro-social goals. IDs can also obfuscate unambiguous issues by analyzing them from many points of view that have been given equal status. This can result in relativism and ultimately in questioning moral principles and life priorities (Oleś, 2009b). In this context IDs classification proposed by Oleś (2009a; Oleś et al., 2020) becomes understandable. In his proposition (which will be presented in more detail further – see Measurements) not only identity and supportive IDs, but also ruminative, maladaptive and confronting IDs, among others, are distinguished. Identity IDs aim at better self-knowledge and at answering identity questions. Supportive IDs provide a sense of being understood by an inner interlocutor, who can help overcome loneliness and strengthen self-esteem. Ruminative IDs are focused on unpleasant topics that invoke feelings of weariness,

frustration, and internal breakdown. Maladaptive IDs are treated by a person as undesirable, unpleasant, and even irritating, because their content and occurrence may interfere with the performance of tasks and/or result in their avoidance. Finally, when a dialogue involves two clearly separated parts of the self that are in conflict, we call this a confronting ID.

Theoretical considerations about the adverse functions of IDs remain consistent with findings of some studies. For example, ID intensity measured as the general score of the Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (the IDAS; Oleś, 2009a) was shown to be moderately positively correlated not only with openness (from .27, $p < .01$ in adolescents, to .54, $p < .001$ in middle-aged adults), but also with neuroticism (.34, $p < .001$) measured by the Revised NEO Personality Inventory (NEO-PI-R). The connection with neuroticism (.39, $p < .001$) was also replicated using the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire-Revised (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012). In other study, stepwise regression analysis with five personality factors (NEO-PI-R) as independent variables revealed that 28% of variance in the IDAS scores was explained by a linear combination of openness and neuroticism. An analogous analysis of 30 personality facets showed that 39% of variance in the IDAS scores could be explained by a linear combination of four traits: self-consciousness (neuroticism), esthetics, feelings (openness), and self-discipline (conscientiousness; negative association) (Puchalska-Wasył et al., 2008). Taking into account that neuroticism is a negative predictor of well-being (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997), these results seem to suggest a negative relationship between IDs and well-being. Similar conclusions can be drawn from other study that sought the links of internal dialogical activity with other personality variables. The general score of the IDAS was found to correlate positively with attachment-related anxiety (.39, $p < .001$) measured by the Experiences in Close Relationships-Revised Questionnaire, and negatively with self-esteem (-.32, $p < .05$) measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale, as well as self-concept clarity (-.37, $p < .01$) measured by the Self-Concept Clarity Scale (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012).

Given the theoretical considerations on potential adaptive and non-adaptive functions of IDs and the research discussed above, it would be difficult to clearly predict the relationship between the phenomenon of IDs and well-being. Presumably, the link will be different depending on the type of ID and its related functions.

This thinking is partly confirmed by the results of three studies analyzing internal dialogical activity in the context of prayer, spiritual struggle, and well-being. Two studies found negative correlations between well-being and ruminative (-.29, $p < .001$ and -.27, $p < .01$) as well as confronting IDs (-.16, $p < .05$ and -.20, $p < .05$) (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a; Zarzycka & Puchalska-Wasył, 2020, respectively). Two studies found positive correlations between well-being and identity IDs (.16, $p < .05$ and .24, $p < .05$) (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a, 2020b, respectively). One study found a positive correlation between well-being and perspective-taking IDs (.32, $p < .01$) (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020b). It is worth noting, however, that these correlations are surprisingly weak. This may suggest that other variables (moderators) affect the analyzed relationship, which may change its direction or strength. It seems that perceived authenticity can act as a moderator in the relationship between IDs and well-being.

There are many different definitions of authenticity (Kovács, 2019; Lehman et al., 2019; Newman, 2019; Rivera et al., 2019). In this paper Kernis and Goldman's approach will be used, according to which authenticity is: "the unobstructed operation of one's true- or core-self in one's daily enterprise" (Kernis & Goldman, 2006, p. 294). It is well-known that some scientists are of the opinion that it is difficult, if not impossible, to really know one's self, or the true self may not even exist (Baumeister, 2019; Nisbett & Wilson, 1977). However, as Rivera et al. (2019) argue, subjective feelings of authenticity do uniquely contribute to well-being. The authors suggest people use these feelings of authenticity as a cue to evaluate whether they are living up to a shared cultural value of what it means to live a good life.

Kernis and Goldman (2006; cf. Goldman & Kernis, 2002) claim that authenticity can be broken down into four separate, but interrelated, components: awareness, unbiased processing, behavior, and relational orientation. Awareness involves not only knowledge on the one's multifaceted self but also acceptance of one's potentially contradictory self-aspects. It is related to being motivated to learn about different characteristics of one's own self (such as: strengths and weaknesses, dispositions and emotional states, aspirations and goals) and to integrate them into a cohesive self-structure. It is worth emphasizing that integrative IDs perform similar functions as awareness: they promote the integration of one's inherent polarities into a coherent and the same time multifaceted self-representation (Puchalska-Wasył, 2019b).

Unbiased processing reflects the relative absence of interpretive distortions in the processing of self-relevant information. It involves objectivity with respect to one's positive and negative aspects of the self: not denying, distorting, or exaggerating externally based evaluative information. As a result, people have an accurate sense of self, which is conducive to growing, developing, and increasing in complexity (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Kernis & Goldman, 2006).

Authentic behavior – the third component of authenticity – is guided by an honest assessment of one's self-aspects via the awareness and unbiased processing. Thus, it reflects the behavioral output of first two components of authenticity. It consists in behaving according to one's values, needs, and preferences, which is in contrast to acting merely to please others and receive rewards or avoid punishments. Authentic behavior is choiceful "solution-oriented" behavior resulting from an conscious consideration of one's own "problems" (e.g. potentially competing motivations, beliefs, aspirations, etc.) (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Kernis & Goldman, 2006).

Relational authenticity involves being genuine rather than fake in one's relationships with close others, appreciating and striving for openness, honesty, sincerity, and truthfulness in such relationships. It means endorsing the importance of close others seeing the "real" you and relating to them in ways that makes this task easier for them (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Kernis & Goldman, 2006).

The eudemonistic view of well-being, which will be adopted in our study presented further, calls upon people to live their lives in accord with their true-self (Ryan & Deci, 2001). From this perspective, high level of psychological well-being occurs when person's life is congruent with his/her deeply held values, needs and preferences, that is, when the person is authentic. It is consistent with Rivera's et al. (2019) position, that subjective feelings of authenticity contribute to well-being. Apart from theoretical

argumentation, many studies have shown that feelings of authenticity are strongly associated with different facets of well-being. For example, perceived authenticity is positively linked to measures of subjective happiness (Sarıçam, 2015), life satisfaction (Goldman & Kernis, 2002), psychological resilience in the face of stress and adversity (Wickham et al., 2016), and self-esteem (Heppner et al., 2008). Perceived authenticity is also positively related to higher levels of intrinsic motivation (Emmerich & Rigotti, 2017) and increased motivation to pursue one's goals (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Kim et al., 2018). Additionally, authenticity also negatively predicts measures of psychological dysfunction such as negative affect (Goldman & Kernis, 2002) and anxiety and depressive symptoms (Sheldon et al., 1997). In this context the first hypothesis was posed:

H1. Authenticity is positively associated with well-being.

As it has been mentioned above, the general internal dialogical activity not only correlates positively with empathy and openness but also with attachment-related anxiety and neuroticism. At the same time it is negatively related to self-esteem (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012; Puchalska-Wasył et al., 2008) that is often treated as an indicator of well-being. Taking this into account and the fact that neuroticism is a negative predictor of well-being (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997), the second hypothesis was advanced:

H2. The general internal dialogical activity is negatively correlated with well-being.

Recent studies on the role of dialogicality in prayer and spiritual struggle (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a; Zarzycka & Puchalska-Wasył, 2020) have shown twice that well-being correlates negatively with two types of ID: ruminative and confronting. In ruminative IDs unpleasant topics are taken up, which invoke feelings of frustration and internal breakdown. Confronting IDs involve two clearly separated parts of the self that are in conflict (Oleś, 2009a). In both of these studies the Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (the IDAS) was used, which lacked the subscale of maladaptive IDs. In the study presented further maladaptive IDs were measured using the IDAS-R. Maladaptive IDs can be seen by a person as undesirable and even irritating because of their content and the fact that their occurrence may interfere with the performance of tasks (Oleś et al., 2020). In this context the third hypothesis was posed:

H3. Ruminative, maladaptive and confronting internal dialogues are negatively associated with well-being.

In two studies (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a, 2020b) using the IDAS it was found that well-being was positively related to identity IDs which aim at better self-knowledge and at answering identity questions (Oleś, 2009a). Additionally, in one of these studies well-being correlated positively with the perspective-taking subscale (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020b). In the IDAS-R used in our study an analogous subscale is called change of perspective and it refers to a change in viewpoints in the service of understanding difficult situations or seeking solutions (Oleś et al., 2020). Taking this into account the following hypothesis was advanced:

H4. Identity and perspective-changing dialogues are positively associated with well-being.

Based on the rationale of the first hypothesis one can expect that highly authentic people are characterized by high well-being. Given that and the assumptions of the other hypotheses (H2–H4) the fifth hypothesis was as follows:

H5. Highly authentic people more often conduct identity and perspective-changing dialogues and less often conduct ruminative, maladaptive and confronting dialogues in comparison to people with lower authenticity.

According to Kernis and Goldman (2006), authenticity, which includes four components, is conducive to learning about and accepting oneself, both strengths and weaknesses, positive and negative self-aspects. For highly authentic people, IDs can be a rich source of information about themselves. This also applies to such IDs which remind the person of his/her own failures and reveal weaknesses (ruminative IDs), which show internal conflicts, polarize various self-aspects (confronting IDs), and which, therefore, can sometimes even hinder undertaking daily activities (maladaptive IDs). In people with lower authenticity, these three types of ID arouse negative emotions and reduce well-being (see justification for H3). In a highly authentic person, we may not observe this negative relationship with well-being, because "unpleasant" IDs, in addition to negative emotions, also provide the truth about himself/herself. In turn, getting to know oneself helps to increase well-being. In this context, the last hypothesis was posed:

H6. Authenticity acts as a moderator of the negative relationships between independent variables:

- a. ruminative dialogues
- b. maladaptive dialogues
- c. confronting dialogues

and well-being as a dependent variable. In highly authentic people these links are insignificant.

Method

Respondents and procedure

The study included 407 adults, 214 women and 193 men, aged between 20 and 60 years. The mean age was 25.09 years ($SD=4.12$). Only one person had vocational education, 203 people (49.9%) had secondary education and 203 people (49.9%) had higher education. Most participants were single (87.7%), 11.8% had a spouse, 0.4% were divorced and widowed. Among the respondents, 33.2% came from rural areas, 46.9% came from large cities with more than 100,000 inhabitants, 19.9% from smaller cities. Among the participants 22.9% worked professionally, 39.6% studied, and 30% worked and studied simultaneously. The data were collected through a web survey. The procedure was approved by the Research Ethics Committee at the Institute of Psychology at the university where the study was conducted. The informed consent of the

participants was implied through survey completion. Three measures were used in the following order: the Internal Dialogical Activity Scale-Revised, the Authenticity Inventory, and the Psychological Well-Being Scale.

Measurements

The Internal Dialogical Activity Scale-Revised (The IDAS-R)

The IDAS-R designed by Oleś (2009a; Oleś et al., 2020) is a 40-item method aimed at measuring an overall level of internal dialogical activity as well as eight different types of ID. Compared to the IDAS, the original version of the questionnaire (Oleś, 2009a; Oleś & Puchalska-Wasyl, 2012), the response format has been changed on the frequency scale (1 – *never*, 2 – *rarely*, 3 – *sometimes*, 4 – *often*, 5 – *very often*). Each of the eight subscales includes 5 items. The subscales are as follows: (1) Identity Dialogues refer to questions and answers about identity, life priorities, and values. Such IDs may precede important life choices; (2) Maladaptive Dialogues are IDs that a person deems undesirable, unpleasant, and even irritating, because their content and occurrence may interfere with the performance of tasks or result in task avoidance; (3) Social Dialogues are IDs that reflect past and future conversations. The items concern the frequency of continuing conversations with others, preparing for dialogues, ending discussions, or creating alternative conversation scenarios; (4) Supportive Dialogues are IDs with loved one who gives or has given support in the past. Such IDs are a source of power, strengthen self-esteem, give a sense of closeness and serve to maintain the bond and overcome loneliness; (5) Spontaneous Dialogues are IDs that refer to the spontaneous dialogical consideration of different thoughts or opinions, as well as to the dialogical form of self-awareness; (6) Ruminative Dialogues are IDs involving blaming oneself, mulling over failures, and recalling of sad or annoying thoughts or memories. The items reflect general ruminative tendencies; (7) Confronting Dialogues are IDs conducted between two sides of the self, for example, between “good self” vs. “bad self.” Such IDs result in a sense of incoherence, polarization and even self-fragmentation; (8) Change of Perspective refers to a change in viewpoints in the service of understanding difficult situations or seeking solutions. Such IDs may consist in adopting a fruitful or conflicting perspective of an another person. For each of these subscales higher scores indicate greater frequency of that kind of IDs. It is also possible to compute an overall ID score by summing the ratings of all 40 items. The Cronbach’s alpha indices calculated for the IDAS-R in this study were presented in [Table 1](#).

The Authenticity Inventory (The AI-3)

This measure by Goldman and Kernis (2006) consists of 45 items, to which responses are given using a 5-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). The items are assigned to four subscales: (1) Awareness (12 items); (2) Unbiased Processing (10 items); (3) Behavior (11 items), and (4) Relational Orientation (12 items). The subscales measure four components of authenticity understood as they were presented in the Introduction. In the current study only the total score of authenticity was used. The Cronbach’s alpha index calculated for the total score of the AI-3 was satisfactory ([Table 1](#)), whereas one of the four subscales had unsatisfactory internal

Table 1. Correlations among measured variables and internal consistency.

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	Alpha
1. Authenticity (the AI-3)	.75***	-.22***	.16***	-.35***	-.13*	-.19***	-.05	-.37***	-.28***	-.12*	.80
2. Well-being (the PWBS)		-.20***	.15**	-.34***	-.09	-.12*	-.03	-.37***	-.27***	-.09	.76
3. Dialogicality (the IDAS-R)			.68***	.42***	.73***	.81***	.76***	.83***	.77***	.87***	.88
4. Identity dialogues				-.03	.40***	.46***	.64***	.40***	.39***	.61***	.83
5. Maladaptive dialogues					.15***	.22***	.03	.48***	.47***	.29***	.68
6. Social dialogues						.73***	.50***	.54***	.38***	.52***	.79
7. Supportive dialogues							.57***	.61***	.48***	.59***	.80
8. Spontaneous dialogues								.54***	.48***	.57***	.82
9. Ruminative dialogues									.67***	.56***	.79
10. Confronting dialogues										.64***	.80
11. Change of perspective											.69

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

consistency: Awareness ($\alpha = .85$); Unbiased Processing ($\alpha = .71$); Behavior ($\alpha = .59$), and Relational Orientation ($\alpha = .82$).

The Psychological Well-Being Scale (The PWBS)

This scale by Ryff (1989) contains 18 items rated on a 6-point Likert scale, from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 6 (*strongly agree*). The items reflect the six aspects of psychological well-being: Autonomy, Environmental Mastery, Personal Growth, Positive Relations with Others, Purpose in Life, and Self-Acceptance. Each aspect (subscale) is represented by 3 items. A Polish adaptation of the PWBS (Karaś et al., 2013) was used. In the current study, only the total score measuring the overall well-being was analyzed, because five out of six subscales had unsatisfactory internal consistency: Autonomy ($\alpha = .62$), Environmental Mastery ($\alpha = .57$), Personal Growth ($\alpha = .52$), Positive Relations with Others ($\alpha = .51$), Purpose in Life ($\alpha = .38$), and Self-Acceptance ($\alpha = .77$). The internal consistency for the PWBS total score in this study was satisfactory (Table 1).

Statistical analysis

All moderation analyses were performed using PROCESS, model 1 (Hayes, 2018). The bootstrapping method with biased corrected confidence estimates was used and 95% confidence intervals were obtained for indirect effects with 5,000 resamples. Other analyses were performed using SPSS v.24.

Results

Prior to the main analyses, descriptive statistics were calculated and the assumptions of normality were tested using the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test with Lilliefors correction (Table 2). The score in the PWBS (well-being) as well as the general score in the IDAS-R (dialogicality) and its three subscales (Identity, Social, and Spontaneous Dialogues) were slightly negatively skewed (from -0.15 to -0.51), while the other five subscales of the IDAS-R (Maladaptive, Supportive, Ruminative, Confronting, and Perspective-Changing Dialogues) and the score in the AI-3 (authenticity) were slightly positively skewed (from 0.11 to 0.65). All of the coefficients of skewness were in the range from -1 to 1 , so the skewness was not strong enough to require further attention and could be ignored (George & Mallery, 2010).

Next, Pearson bivariate correlations for all variables measured in the study were calculated. As one can see in Table 1, strong positive correlation between authenticity and well-being was found. Thus, H1 was supported. At the same time, as it was hypothesized, the negative correlation was observed between the general score in internal dialogical activity (the IDAS-R) and well-being. This correlation was weak but significant. Thus, H2 was confirmed. It also turned out that well-being negatively correlated with maladaptive, ruminative and confronting IDs. Thus, H3 was positively verified. Additionally, unexpectedly, a slight negative correlation between well-being and supportive IDs was found, which can suggest that supportive IDs can be some kind of the response on the bad mood and sense of unhappiness. Finally, the last correlational hypothesis (H4) was partially confirmed. Identity IDs correlated positively

Table 2. Distribution of scores on variables.

Variables	Min	Max	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Skewness	Kurtosis	K-S	p_{K-S}
Authenticity (the AI-3)	103	212	156.71	21.74	0.16	-0.44	0.06	.003
Well-being (the PWBS)	34	86	67.43	9.67	-0.51	-0.16	0.07	>.001
Dialogicality (the IDAS-R)	45	186	113.42	25.98	-0.15	-0.14	0.04	.200
Identity dialogues	5	25	16.65	4.56	-0.26	-0.55	0.07	>.001
Maladaptive dialogues	5	25	11.12	3.80	0.65	0.19	0.10	>.001
Social dialogues	5	25	17.69	4.43	-0.43	-0.25	0.08	>.001
Supportive dialogues	5	25	13.70	4.81	0.25	-0.59	0.07	>.001
Spontaneous dialogues	5	25	16.27	4.84	-0.24	-0.69	0.08	>.001
Ruminative dialogues	5	25	14.25	4.65	0.11	-0.70	0.06	.001
Confronting dialogues	5	24	11.14	4.46	0.57	-0.47	0.12	>.001
Change of perspective	5	25	12.59	3.93	0.24	-0.13	0.06	.001

Note. K-S – Kolmogorov-Smirnov test; p_{K-S} with Lilliefors correction.

Table 3. Comparison between low authenticity and high authenticity groups.

Variables	Low authenticity (<i>N</i> = 102)		High authenticity (<i>N</i> = 111)		Differences			
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>d</i>
Identity dialogues	15.41	3.99	17.54	5.22	-3.359	204.381	0.001	-0.46
Maladaptive dialogues	12.98	3.85	9.46	3.26	7.217	211	<0.001	0.99
Social dialogues	18.05	4.49	16.48	4.73	2.484	211	0.014	0.34
Supportive dialogues	14.53	4.83	12.03	4.68	3.841	211	<0.001	0.53
Spontaneous dialogues	16.46	4.52	15.84	5.21	0.929	211	0.354	0.13
Ruminative dialogues	16.47	4.52	12.03	4.32	7.335	211	<0.001	1.01
Confronting dialogues	12.87	4.77	9.72	4.07	5.171	199.398	<0.001	0.72
Change of perspective	12.93	3.98	11.83	3.82	2.063	211	<0.001	0.28
Dialogicality (the IDAS-R)	119.71	26.25	104.92	26.33	4.101	211	<0.001	0.57
Well-being (the PWBS)	57.64	8.72	76.28	5.37	-18.597	165.363	<0.001	-2.61

with well-being, although this correlation was weak. At the same time, contrary to expectations, there was no significant correlation between perspective-changing IDs and well-being. The moderation analysis (presented at the end of the Results section) has shed additional light on this issue.

In order to verify H5 two extreme groups were created. The 25th and 75th percentiles in the authenticity variable were used as cutoff points. Next *t-Student* test was carried out comparing the low authenticity group vs. the high authenticity group in the eight types of IDs and well-being (Table 3). As it was hypothesized, the high authenticity group conducted significantly more identity dialogues and significantly less maladaptive, ruminative and confronting IDs than the other group. When it comes to perspective-changing IDs the hypothesis was not confirmed: people with lower not with higher authenticity more often conduct this type of IDs. Thus, H5 was partially supported. It is also worth adding, that in all remaining types of IDs, except for spontaneous IDs in which there were no differences, the low authenticity group scored higher. This group had also significantly lower well-being.

The last hypothesis (H6) was verified using moderation analyses (Table 4). It was hypothesized that in highly authentic people the negative link between ruminative (H6a), maladaptive (H6b), and confronting IDs (H6c) and well-being ceases to be statistically significant. Conditional effects of the predictor (the given type of IDs) were tested at values of the low (16th percentile), medium (50th percentile), and high (84th percentile) moderator (authenticity). It transpired that there was no interaction between ruminative IDs as a predictor and authenticity as a moderator. Regardless of the level of authenticity of a person, his/her ruminative IDs were negatively related to well-being (Table 1). Thus, H6a was not confirmed. With regard to maladaptive IDs the hypothesis H6b was fully supported. The link between maladaptive IDs and well-being was negative in people with low and medium authenticity, however this link lost statistical significance in people with high authenticity. Similar pattern was observed with reference to confronting IDs. The link between confronting IDs and well-being was negative in respondents with low authenticity. In participants with medium authenticity this link was still negative and marginally significant, however it lost statistical significance in people with high authenticity. Thus the hypothesis H6c was also positively verified. To sum up, H6 was partially confirmed.

Apart these three moderation analyses presented above, another six analogical analyses were carried out. As predictors were used: the general IDAS-R score, identity, social, supportive, spontaneous, and perspective-changing IDs, respectively. It was found that in people with high authenticity there is a positive link between perspective-changing IDs and well-being, whereas in people with medium and low authenticity this link is insignificant.

Discussion

The study aimed to analyze the poorly explored relationship between internal dialogical activity, well-being and authenticity. Hypothesis 1 that authenticity is positively associated with well-being has been confirmed, which is consistent with many studies (Goldman & Kernis, 2002; Heppner et al., 2008; Rivera et al., 2019; Sariçam, 2015).

Hypotheses 2 and 3, assuming negative links between well-being and the general internal dialogical activity as well as ruminative, maladaptive and confronting IDs, were also fully supported. Two studies conducted so far have shown weak negative relations between well-being and ruminative and confronting IDs (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a; Zarzycka & Puchalska-Wasył, 2020). However, there were no reports of links between well-being and maladaptive IDs, as the measurement of these dialogues has only recently been possible thanks to the revision of the IDAS. Given the name and characteristics of maladaptive IDs, their negative relationship with well-being was hypothesized. This found a confirmation in the present study, which proves the validity of the IDAS-R subscale measuring the frequency of maladaptive IDs. The weak but negative relationship between well-being and the general internal dialogical activity established in the present study coincides with the idea that the general dialogicality is associated with neuroticism (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012; Puchalska-Wasył et al.,

Table 4. The results of the moderation analysis for the well-being (the PWBS) as a dependent variable and the authenticity (the AI-3) as a moderator.

Independent variable	R^2	R^2_{ch}	B	t	p	95% CI	Interaction					
							Effect _L	p_L	Effect _M	p_M	Effect _H	p_H
Dialogicality (the IDAS-R)	.561	.003	.001	1.75	.081	.000; .002						
Identity dialogues	.558	.000	-.001	-0.49	.627	-.007; .004						
Maladaptive dialogues	.571	.006	.009	2.31	.022	.001; .016	-.41	<.001	-.24	.006	-.01	.958
Social dialogues	.557	.000	.000	0.06	.951	-.006; .006						
Supportive dialogues	.559	.001	.003	1.08	.281	-.003; .009						
Spontaneous dialogues	.557	.000	.002	0.61	.542	-.004; .008						
Ruminative dialogues	.570	.003	.005	1.62	.106	-.001; .011						
Confronting dialogues	.567	.006	.007	2.33	.020	.001; .013	-.30	.002	-.14	.057	.05	.651
Change of perspective	.564	.008	.010	2.64	.009	.002; .017	-.18	.097	.01	.946	.26	.042

Note. R^2 – amount of variance explained by the model; R^2_{ch} – change of variance amount explained by the model after adding moderator; CI – confidence intervals; Effect_{L,M,H} – conditional effects of the predictor at values of the low (16th percentile), medium (50th percentile), and high (84th percentile) moderator, respectively. Statistical measures for significant moderators are printed in bold type.

2008) which is a negative predictor of well-being (Schmutte & Ryff, 1997). The question, of course, arises whether IDs reduce well-being or are IDs the result of reduced well-being. It is possible that IDs appear in response to the problem. The negative relationship between well-being and supportive IDs found in this study prompts such thinking. An emerging problem, which by its nature seems to cause a reduction in well-being, may evoke a need for support, but most of all it requires analysis, reflection and self-reflection, often multi-faceted. In such a situation IDs can be helpful. As Oleś (2011) claims, self-reflection implies an assessment of oneself and one's own activity from various evaluation perspectives – one's own and others'. In this sense, internal dialogical activity is the basic form of self-reflection (Oleś, 2009b). In order to determine the direction of the relationship between IDs and well-being, experimental research is needed in the future.

Hypothesis 4 was confirmed only in the aspect of the positive (albeit weak) connection of identity dialogues with well-being, which was in line with some studies (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020a, 2020b). The positive correlation between well-being and perspective-changing IDs was not observed in the whole group, although such a link was found in one of the previous studies (Puchalska-Wasył & Zarzycka, 2020b). This discrepancy in results can be explained in the light of the moderation analysis carried out in this study, which showed that only in highly authentic people perspective-changing IDs are conducive to higher well-being. On the other hand, the verification of Hypothesis 5 revealed that people with high authenticity conduct this type of IDs significantly less frequently than people with low authenticity. At first glance, the last outcome seems to be fully consistent with thinking that highly authentic people are more oriented toward getting to know themselves and presenting themselves according to the learned truth about themselves. At the same time, they are less interested in getting to know and adapting to others, in which changing-perspectives IDs could be very helpful (Kernis & Goldman, 2006). Deeper reflection on the results obtained allows us to hypothesize, however, that perspective-changing IDs can be used by two groups of people with different levels of authenticity for different purposes. Presumably, those with low authenticity can often use perspective-changing IDs to get closer to the thinking of another person – the opponent, prepare for his/her attack, or even anticipate it. Such use of IDs does not appear to be positively connected with well-being. On the contrary, the highly authentic people are focused on getting to know their true self. So if they use perspective-changing IDs from time to time, these dialogues may be based on taking viewpoints as represented by their different self-aspects. By analyzing themselves from these various perspectives, highly authentic people expand self-knowledge, which is likely to enhance their well-being.

The verification of Hypothesis 5 also showed that the only type of IDs that highly authentic people conduct more often than those with lower authenticity are identity dialogues. As such IDs refer to questions about identity, life priorities, and values, and consequently, they lead to better self-knowledge, this finding is entirely consistent with the understanding of authenticity by Kernis and Goldman (2006; Goldman & Kernis, 2002) adopted in this article. The fact that highly authentic people more often conduct only identity dialogues also means that Hypothesis 5

was confirmed in this aspect, which assumed that they conduct ruminative, maladaptive, and confronting IDs significantly less frequently than people with lower authenticity. At the same time, as expected, in the case of the last two types of IDs, it was found that authenticity eliminates the negative relationship between them and well-being (H6b and H6c). Admittedly, in our model, the contribution of authenticity for the prediction of well-being in terms of the change of variance amount explained after adding the moderator turned out to be weak (although statistically significant). However, these moderations seem to suggest that people with different levels of authenticity perceive the functions of maladaptive and confronting IDs differently; according to DST they give them different meanings, which may translate into different well-being in these group of people. Even if the content and presence of the ID interfere with task performance (maladaptive IDs), or if the ID reveals two polarized sides of the self, causing a temporary sense of incoherence (confronting IDs), people with high authenticity see the ID as an important source of truth about the self. In this way, the pros and cons of conducting these IDs balance each other, thanks to which the well-being of these people does not decline. Contrary to Hypothesis 6a, this is not the case with regard to the relationship with the ruminative IDs. Such IDs are unpleasant, painful, and persistent, and additionally, by their very nature, not aimed at solving the problem. In this situation, the downsides outweigh the upsides of conducting ruminative IDs, and even in highly authentic people, these IDs are accompanied by a decrease in well-being. Referring to what has been said above about the direction of the relationship between IDs and well-being, one might think that in this case the decline in well-being may be the result of both an unresolved problem and the ruminative IDs themselves that constantly evoke this problem.

It should be emphasized, nonetheless, that the more authentic a person is, the less often he/she conducts ruminative IDs. This is supported not only by the negative correlation of these variables obtained in the present study. Trapnell and Campbell (1999) claim that rumination is self-focused attention, which implies the continuous analysis of situations linked with the sense of threat, harm or loss. Its regulatory function consists in reducing the discrepancy between the current and desired state of the self, although numerous studies show that it paradoxically has the opposite effect (cf. Martin & Tesser, 1996). As Trapnell and Campbell (1999) showed, rumination is usually induced by self-uncertainty and self-doubt which are negatively correlated with authenticity (Kernis & Goldman, 2006) and at the same time positively with IDs (Oleś & Puchalska-Wasył, 2012). Boyraz and Kuhl (2015) also found in their cross-sectional study a negative correlation between authenticity and rumination. Similarly, in the experimental investigation by Gortner et al. (2006), it was shown that authentic self-expression led to reduced rumination. In this context, the result of significantly higher well-being among highly authentic people is understandable, despite the fact that their authenticity does not reduce the negative relationship between ruminative IDs and well-being.

The findings should be interpreted in the light of shortcomings of the present study. First, it is worth emphasizing that when using a cross-sectional design, we cannot draw causal conclusions. It means that we cannot answer, whether IDs lower well-being

or rather low well-being induces IDs. Another weakness is that this study was based on individuals' self-reports and potential response bias was not controlled. On the other hand, the possible biased responses could have been tempered by the fact that participants completed the measures anonymously. Another limitation concerns the sample. It consisted of adults from one country, mainly young. Therefore, the results need replication with samples that include people of different statuses and ages.

Despite the shortcomings noted, the current study makes a useful contribution to the theory (especially DST by Hermans) and research on the relationship between IDs and well-being. Moreover, it indicates the important (but until now not explored) role of authenticity in using IDs, their frequency, functions and their effects on well-being. When considering the future research, it would be reasonable, as it was mentioned above, to establish the influence direction between "problematic IDs" and well-being using an experimental design. For example, it would be worth checking whether the increase in IDs is observed (immediately) after the participants have learned about the problem to be solved and how this affects well-being. Or, whether IDs increase after the participants' mood have been decreased. It would be also interesting to see if the link between IDs and well-being is mediated or moderated by other variables. Research according to the narrative approach is also desirable to replicate the results obtained in this study.

Conclusions

Taken together, the aim of the study was to explore the relationship between IDs, well-being and authenticity. It has been confirmed that authenticity is positively associated with well-being, which is in line with many studies. Negative links between well-being and the general internal dialogical activity as well as ruminative, maladaptive and confronting IDs, were also observed. The only type of IDs that highly authentic people conduct more often than those with lower authenticity are identity dialogues. This type of IDs shows a positive albeit weak relationship with well-being. It was also found that only in highly authentic people perspective-changing IDs are conducive to higher well-being. Therefore, it is possible that perspective-changing IDs can be used by two groups of people with different levels of authenticity for different purposes. Additionally, it transpired that higher authenticity eliminates the negative relationship between maladaptive and confronting IDs and well-being. However, this is not the case with regard to the relationship with ruminative IDs. The results should be replicated in studies where the limitations of the current study will be minimized. In order to determine the direction of the relationship between IDs and well-being, experimental research is needed in the future.

Acknowledgement

Special thanks go to Ilona Warchoł for her assistance in the research.

ORCID

Małgorzata M. Puchalska-Wasył  <http://orcid.org/0000-0003-4295-8308>

References

- Alderson-Day, B., & Fernyhough, C. (2015). Inner speech: Development, cognitive functions, phenomenology, and neurobiology. *Psychological Bulletin*, 141(5), 931–965. <https://doi.org/10.1037/bul0000021>
- Baumeister, R. F. (2019). Stalking the true self through the jungles of authenticity: Problems, contradictions, inconsistencies, disturbing findings—and a possible way forward. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 143–154. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268019829472>
- Borawski, D. (2011). Wpływ aktywizowania myślenia dialogowego na sytuacyjną samoocenę i emocje [The influence of dialogical thinking on situational self-esteem and emotions]. In P. Oleś, M.M. Puchalska-Wasył, & E. Brygoła (Eds.), *Dialog z samym sobą* (pp. 201–223). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Boyraz, G., & Kuhl, M. L. (2015). Self-focused attention, authenticity, and well-being. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 87, 70–75. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.07.029>
- Brinthaupt, T. M., & Dove, C. T. (2012). Differences in self-talk frequency as a function of age, only-child, and imaginary childhood companion status. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 46(3), 326–333. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2012.03.003>
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2012). The imagined contact hypothesis. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 125–182.
- Diaz, R. M., & Berk, L. E. (Eds.). (1992). *Private speech: From social interaction to self-regulation*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Duncan, R. M., & Cheyne, J. A. (1999). Incidence and functions of self-reported private speech in young adults: A self-verbalization questionnaire. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science/Revue Canadienne Des Sciences du Comportement*, 31(2), 133–136. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0087081>
- Emmerich, A. I., & Rigotti, T. (2017). Reciprocal relations between work-related authenticity and intrinsic motivation, work ability and depression: A two-wave study. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 8, 307. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2017.00307>
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference, 17.0 update*. Pearson.
- Goldman, B. M., & Kernis, M. H. (2002). The role of authenticity in healthy psychological functioning and subjective well-being. *Annals of the American Psychotherapy Association*, 5, 18–20.
- Gortner, E. M., Rude, S. S., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2006). Benefits of expressive writing in lowering rumination and depressive symptoms. *Behavior Therapy*, 37(3), 292–303. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2006.01.004>
- Hayes, A. F. (2018). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach* (2nd ed.). Guilford Press.
- Heppner, W. L., Kernis, M. H., Nezek, J. B., Foster, J., Lakey, C. E., & Goldman, B. M. (2008). Within-person relationships among daily self-esteem, need satisfaction, and authenticity. *Psychological Science*, 19(11), 1140–1145. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02215.x>
- Hermans, H. J. M. (2003). The construction and reconstruction of a dialogical self. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 16(2), 89–130. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530390117902>
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Gieser, T. (Eds.). (2012). *Handbook of dialogical self theory*. Cambridge University Press.
- Hermans, H. J. M., & Kempen, H. J. G. (1993). *The dialogical self: Meaning as movement*. Academic Press.
- Hogenraad, R., & Orianne, E. (1983). A penny for your thoughts': Imagery value and periodicity of interior monologue. *Journal of Mental Imagery*, 7, 51–61.
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 943–950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.014>
- Kamann, M. P., & Wong, B. Y. L. (1993). Inducing adaptive coping self-statements in children with learning-disabilities through self-instruction training. *Journal of Learning Disabilities*, 26(9), 630–638.

- Karaś, D., Kłym, M., & Ciecuch, J. (2013). Eudajmonistyczny dobrostan psychiczny a kształtowanie poczucia tożsamości w sferze edukacyjnej i zawodowej [Eudaimonic psychological well-being and identity formation in educational and occupational domains]. *Psychologia Rozwojowa*, 18(1), 87–101.
- Kernis, M. H., & Goldman, B. M. (2006). A multicomponent conceptualization of authenticity: Theory and research. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 38, 283–357.
- Kim, J., Christy, A. G., Schlegel, R. J., Donnellan, M. B., & Hicks, J. A. (2018). Existential ennui: Examining the reciprocal relationship between self-alienation and academic amotivation. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 9(7), 853–862. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1948550617727587>
- Kovács, B. (2019). Authenticity is in the eye of the beholder: The exploration of audiences' lay concepts of authenticity across five domains. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 32–59. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268019829469>
- Larsen, R. J., & Buss, D. M. (2005). *Personality psychology: Domains of knowledge about human nature*. McGraw-Hill.
- Lehman, D. W., O'Connor, K., & Carroll, G. R. (2019). Acting on authenticity: Individual interpretations and behavioural responses. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 19–31. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1089268019829470>
- MacKay, D. G. (1992). Constraints on theories of inner speech. In D. Reisberg (Ed.), *Auditory imagery* (pp. 121–149). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.
- Markova, I. (2005). *Dialogicality and social representations*. Cambridge University Press.
- Martin, L. L., & Tesser, A. (1996). Some ruminative thoughts. In R. S. Wyer (Ed.), *Ruminative thoughts: Advances in social cognition* (Vol. 9, pp. 1–47). Erlbaum.
- Młynarczyk, M. (2011). Dialogi rozbieżnych Ja [Dialogues of discrepant selves]. In P. Oleś, M. M. Puchalska-Wasył, & E. Brygoła (Eds.), *Dialog z samym sobą* (pp. 224–251). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Newman, G. E. (2019). The psychology of authenticity. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 8–18. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000158>
- Nisbett, R. E., & Wilson, T. D. (1977). Telling more than we can know: Verbal reports on mental processes. *Psychological Review*, 84(3), 231–259. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.84.3.231>
- Oleś, P. (2009a). Czy głosy umysłu da się mierzyć? Skala Wewnętrznej Aktywności Dialogowej (SWAD) [Is it possible to measure the voices of a mind? The Internal Dialogical Activity Scale (IDAS)]. *Przegląd Psychologiczny*, 52, 37–50.
- Oleś, P. (2009b). Dialogowość wewnętrzna jako właściwość człowieka [Internal dialogicality as a human characteristic]. In J. Koziński (Ed.), *Nowe idee w psychologii* (pp. 216–235). GWP.
- Oleś, P. (2011). Dialogowe Ja: zarys teorii, inspiracje badawcze, ciekawsze wyniki [Dialogical self: Outline of the theory, research inspiration, and more interesting results]. In P. Oleś, M.M. Puchalska-Wasył, & E. Brygoła (Eds.), *Dialog z samym sobą* (pp. 143–171). Wydawnictwo Naukowe PWN.
- Oleś, P. K., Brinthaup, T. M., Dier, R., & Polak, D. (2020). Types of inner dialogues and functions of self-talk: Comparisons and implications. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 11, 227. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2020.00227>
- Oleś, P. K., & Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2012). Dialogicality and personality traits. In H. J. M. Hermans & T. Gieser (Eds.), *Handbook of dialogical self theory* (pp. 241–252). Cambridge University Press.
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M., Chmielnicka-Kuter, E., & Oleś, P. (2008). From internal interlocutors to psychological functions of dialogical activity. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 21(3), 239–269. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720530802071476>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2011). Dialogicality and creativity. In R. A. Jones & M. Morioka (Eds.), *Jungian and dialogical self perspectives* (pp. 85–99). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2014). When interrogative self-talk improves task performance: The role of answers to self-posed questions. *Applied Cognitive Psychology*, 28(3), 374–381. <https://doi.org/10.1002/acp.3007>

- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2016a). Coalition and opposition in myself? On integrative and confrontational internal dialogues, their functions, and the types of inner interlocutors. *Journal of Constructivist Psychology*, 29(2), 197–218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10720537.2015.1084601>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2016b). Determinants of integration and confrontation in internal dialogues. *Japanese Psychological Research*, 58(3), 248–260. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jpr.12115>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2019a). Can imagined intergroup contact change (internal) dialogues on differences between ingroup and outgroup? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 60(2), 181–188. <https://doi.org/10.1111/SJOP.12524>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2019b). Similarity to imagined interlocutor and integration of viewpoints in internal dialogues. *International Journal of Psychology: Journal Internationale de Psychologie*, 54(5), 659–667. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ijop.12514>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M., & Zarzycka, B. (2020a). Internal dialogue as a mediator of the relationship between prayer and well-being. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 59(4), 2045–2063. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-019-00943-2>
- Puchalska-Wasył, M. M., & Zarzycka, B. (2020b). Prayer and internal dialogical activity: How do they predict well-being? *Psychology of Religion and Spirituality*, 12(4), 417–427. <https://doi.org/10.1037/rel0000255>
- Reisberg, D. (Ed.). (1992). *Auditory imagery*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Rivera, G. N., Christy, A. G., Kim, J., Vess, M., Hicks, J. A., & Schlegel, R. J. (2019). Understanding the relationship between perceived authenticity and well-being. *Review of General Psychology*, 23(1), 113–126. <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000161>
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2001). On happiness and human potentials: A review of research on hedonic and eudaimonic well-being. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 52, 141–166. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.52.1.141>
- Ryff, C. D. (1989). Happiness is everything, or is it? Explorations on the meaning of psychological well-being. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57(6), 1069–1081. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.6.1069>
- Sarıçam, H. (2015). Life satisfaction: Testing a structural equation model based on authenticity and subjective happiness. *Polish Psychological Bulletin*, 46(2), 278–284. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ppb-2015-0034>
- Senay, I., Albarracín, D., & Noguchi, K. (2010). Motivating goal-directed behavior through introspective self-talk: The role of the interrogative form of simple future tense. *Psychological Science*, 21(4), 499–504. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797610364751>
- Sheldon, K. M., Ryan, R. M., Rawsthorne, L. J., & Ilardi, B. (1997). Trait self and true self: Cross-role variation in the Big-Five personality traits and its relations with psychological authenticity and subjective wellbeing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(6), 1380–1393. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.6.1380>
- Schmutte, P. S., & Ryff, C. D. (1997). Personality and well-being: Reexamining methods and meanings. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73(3), 549–559. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.3.549>
- Staudinger, U. M., & Baltes, P. B. (1996). Interactive minds: A facilitative setting for wisdom-related performance? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(4), 746–762. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.71.4.746>
- Trapnell, P. D., & Campbell, J. D. (1999). Private self-consciousness and the five-factor model of personality: Distinguishing rumination from reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 76(2), 284–304. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.76.2.284>
- Wickham, R. E., Williamson, R. E., Beard, C. L., Kobayashi, C. L., & Hirst, T. W. (2016). Authenticity attenuates the negative effects of interpersonal conflict on daily well-being. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 60, 56–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrp.2015.11.006>
- Winsler, A., Fernyhough, C., & Montero, I. (Eds.). (2009). *Private speech, executive functioning, and the development of verbal self-regulation*. Cambridge University Press.
- Zarzycka, B., & Puchalska-Wasył, M. M. (2020). Can religious and spiritual struggle enhance well-being? Exploring the mediating effects of internal dialogues. *Journal of Religion and Health*, 59(4), 1897–1912. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10943-018-00755-w>