

## Trans Generational Transmission and its Implications on Attachment and the Functionality of Erotic Partnership

Mircea D. Radu\*<sup>vi</sup>

\*B.A. in Psychology, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, Psychology  
Department,  
University of Bucharest, Bucharest, Romania

### Abstract

**Introduction:** This research aims to present, explore and analyze the dynamics and interactions between the psychological processes within the family system and within the erotic partnership. The family functioning levels investigated in this paper concern the structural and functional aspects of the family and especially the impact and their meaning in the context of the individual's life and erotic partnership providing explanatory- interpretative models on the topic from three perspectives: psychogenealogy, psychoanalysis and humanistic psychology. The analyzed individual functioning levels revolve around two psychodynamic concepts: separation anxiety and individuation. The focus on these two concepts can be justified by the fact that they represent two basic processes that occur during the development of each individual's experiential personality harmonious and unified, achieving a very high level of activation around the age of adolescence, namely the ontological stage of young adult.

**Objectives:** The objectives and assumptions underlying the present research are based on exploratory and investigative approaches, specific to humanist experiential psychotherapy, involving the identification of the original family core-themes, the attachment styles developed and the levels of fear of individuation, but also the level of separation anxiety manifested in erotic partnerships in which the participant was employed at the time of application. Besides the aspects of explorational, there was also performed the inter-linking these concepts in order to capture the dynamic interaction and specific principles.

**Methods:** The research methodology is based on the integration of two scientific research perspectives, quantitative research through questionnaires and qualitative research through the exploration of the participants' genograms. The questionnaires constructed specifically for this research were validated by calculating Chronbach-Alpha index, post-hoc.

**Results:** The results of the statistical analysis do not support the central hypothesis of the research, so for the tested population there is no statistically significant association between core theme "abandonment (loss) vs . dependence" and ambivalent attachment style ( $\chi^2 = 2.14$ ,  $df = 1$ ,  $p > 0.05$ ). Regarding specific assumptions, all three research hypotheses were confirmed: H2 that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between separation anxiety and fear

<sup>vi</sup> Corresponding author: Mircea Radu, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Bucharest, Panduri 90, District 5, Bucharest, 050663, Romania. E-mail: mircea.radu.r@gmail.com

of individuation couple ( $r = +0.74$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ); H3, that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between separation anxiety in couples and ambivalent attachment style ( $r = +0.58$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ); H4, that there is a statistically significant positive correlation between fear of individuation and avoidant attachment style ( $r = +0.65$ ,  $p < 0.01$ ).

**Conclusions:** The psychological and psychotherapeutic implications of the central hypothesis (H1) unconfirmed can be considered the following issues: family factors do neither correlate, nor determine specific training attachment style nor is its characteristics as the attachment system influenced in one direction, as it is a dual relationship, mutual, dependent on psychological and psychophysiological systems of both the mother and the child. Also, the psychological significance of the coefficient of determination is useful in understanding that 55 % of the variation of "separation anxiety" is determined by the variation of "fear of individuation"; that 35 % of the variation of "separation anxiety" is determined by the variation "ambivalent attachment"; that 43 % of the variation of "fear of individuation" is determined by the variation "avoidant attachment".

**Keywords:** *trans generational transmission, attachment, couple, individuation*

## I. Introduction.

From a psycho-genealogy perspective, a family is a system formed by elements that correlate and influence each other, resulting in a life scenario that is built by conscious and unconscious processes (Mitrofan, Godeanu & Godeanu, 2010). Given the complexity of the processes involved in this system, there are more than one adherent functions: economical, solidarity, educational, formative-educational, resilience, emotional-therapeutic, modeling. According to the way these functions exert, the process of personal development and forming their own identity and individuation is facilitated.

Family is the first environment in which a child comes into his own, the first environment in which one can assume and manifest a certain identity. That is why family gains the attribute of being "identity space" (Godeanu (Stoica), 2007 apud Mitrofan, Godeanu, 2010). The feeling of Self (Erikson, 1987) contains mechanisms for the development of inter and intrapersonal coherency and for protection against uncertainty and discontinuity. These mechanisms form in stages in the early years, through identification, introjection and behavioral modeling in the family environment. For a structured and stable identity, the environment needs to facilitate two dimensions: "exploration" and "commitment" (Marcia, 1960 apud Schwartz et al, 2000).

*Core themes* represent the sum of all events, myths and rituals that gain archetypal value and that are created by inferring symbolical roles and scenarios for the family, in order to sustain its life. Each core theme targets the polarization of attitudes, roles, types of behavior and unconscious dynamics. In a family these core themes coexist and form a constellation of core themes. One of these constellations was studied by

D. Godeanu (2008), the abandonment-loss-dependence-control, which is associated with the delay of separation from the origin family, partner dependence and codependence. Also, emotional gaps, difficulties in assuming the role-sex identity, family alliances, seeking confirmation through maladaptive behavior, difficulties in solving romantic relationship problems might be present. That leads to assuming a dysfunctional type of relating in a romantic relationship.

Cristina Denisa Godeanu (Stoica) (2011) states that the main core themes found in clinical cases for the Romanian population are: abandonment-loss vs. dependence, power vs. weakness, control vs. lack of control, rooting vs. uprooting.

After applying genograms to the participants, this study found metaphor-events characteristic to the following core themes: *abandonment-loss vs. dependence, power vs. weakness and control vs. lack of control*.

Relevant examples for the abandonment-loss vs. dependence core theme can be: "loss of identity space, loss of family wealth, loss of children, loss of life partners, loss of identity, loss due to somatic disease" (Godeanu, C.D., 2011, p.70). The source of polarization of the events is fear of loss or abandonment which provokes compulsive behaviors and emotional dependence and/or substance addictiveness. Dependence of primary attachment figures can occur, especially in the case of delay of family separation.

The power vs. weakness core theme has its roots in the way a person assumes or does not assume power in the family environment, weakness rejection, and the integration level of Persona-Shadow and other adjacent polarities like the statute, the authority, masculinity, possession versus weakness, emotional

dependence, submissiveness, substance addiction (especially alcoholism), poverty, lack of material goods, physical incapacity” (Godeanu, C.D., 2011, p.75).

The core theme „control vs. Lack of control” translates into rigidity, strict rules, intrusion and lack of boundaries and on the other hand violence, substance abuse and addiction. Usually, any element that could be related to weakness, such as: emotivity, failure, disease, vulnerability, are denied in these families because performance, wealth and emotional repression are valued. All these lead to an internal restructuring of the family based on roles such as: „head of the family”, „the scape goat” or „the general”. (Godeanu, C.D., 2011)

Mitrofan and Godeanu & Godeanu (2010) present elements of family pathology as: family genealogic disease, transgenerational transmission pathology, pathological effects of the family Shadow, „the crypt and the phantom”, secrets, parentification and the pathology of „gift” or „burden”. These are based on transgenerational inheritance mechanisms (unconscious alliances, narcissistic contracts, negation pacts, repetitions) that close the individual in psychological games and trap relationships which are unhealthy for the personality’s and family’s development.

The family pathology topic was also developed by Eric Berne (2007), who sees the life scenario as an unconscious psychological organisation and auto-adjustment system developed as a result of the accumulated failures in significant dependency relationships. Therefore it represents the attempts of the child to manage the lack of adequacy, repeated neglect, trauma and family drama.

Attachment is defined as „the reciprocal, durable, affective link between an infant and its caretaker, both of them contributing to the quality of the relationship” (Papalia, Olds & Feldman, 2010, p. 189). Because in this type of relationship physiological and psychosocial needs are met, the relationship acquires an adaptive aspect. Healthy, secure attachment relationships, don’t represent dependency relationships, but a useful base that permits and favors autonomy (Wallin, 2010; Bowlby, 2011).

Schaffer (2007 apud Golu,2010, p.97) distinguishes the following phases of attachment: „preattachment (0-2 months)- characterized by indiscriminative social responses; attachment forming (2-7 months) – learning the basic rules of interaction; evident attachment (7-24 months) when the child manifests protest if separated, anxiety when encountering strangers, intentional communication; goal oriented partnership (24+) moment when the relationships become bidirectional and are characterized by empathy.

Forming emotional attachments leads to

building „intern models” of diadic relationship, which are used as prototype of ulterior relationships (Cassidy&Saver, 2008; Papalia, Olds & Feldman, 2010; Wallin, 2010; Pines, 2011). These relationships have pieces of information on availability, responsivity, figure attachment receptivity and personal value.

Affective, social and cognitive competence is influenced by the type of attachment one has (van IJzendoorn & Sagi, 1997 apud Papalia, Olds & Feldman, 2010) and since forming types of attachment is highly connected with the quality of family relationship (Cranley & Werner, 1983 apud Cotigă, 2011), the idea that family dynamics is a determinant factor in structuring one type of attachment or another and the whole psyche is underlined. This hypothesis is the basis of this particular paper.

Mary Ainsworth elaborated the strange situation for evaluating attachment patterns. She discovered 3 types of interaction patterns between mother and child, which can be observed in adult behavior as well. Behaviors like availability to enter authentic and intimate relationships, feeling comfortable to depend on other people and vice versa, a high self-esteem level, personal valorization, availability for self-knowledge (Collins & Freenay, 2004 apud Stancu, 2010), they don’t lose themselves when put in a break up or loneliness situation, they are open to sexual exploration when engaged in a serious relationship, not inclined to have extra conjugal relationships, are representative for adults that have a “secured attachment” (Pines, 2011).

Developing a “anxious-avoidant” type of attachment empowers isolation and reticence in social and personal relationships (Tempelhof & Allen, 2008; Bowlby, 2011), using independence and power social masks to inhibit the exploration and attachment impulses that are associated with feelings of discomfort in intimate relationships, lack of self-confidence, emotional inhibition (Peterson, 2001; Kohlhoff&Barnett,2013), fear of individuation, fear of intimacy (Pines,2011). These persons have a weak structure of internal relationship models (Wearden, Peters, Berry, Barrowclough, Liversidge, 2008), and are dominated by desire to control so that they secure themselves (Cassidy&Shaver, 2008).

Adults that have an “ambivalent” type of attachment are often preoccupied by the question “does my partner appreciate/love/valorize me?”, they ask for high levels of intimacy, they are unsure of themselves, they invest a lot of energy in the relationship, and have high expectancies from their partners, they disregard and depreciate themselves, they tend to be jealous and have an inconsistent presence in the relationship (Tempelhof & Allen, 2008; Bucx & Seiffge-Krenke, 2010; Pines, 2011).

Statistically speaking, these 3 patterns distribute asymmetrical: secured attachment 60-75%, avoidant attachment 10-25%, ambivalent attachment 10-15% (Vondra & Barnett, 1999 apud Papalia, Olds & Feldman, 2010).

Main and Solomon (1986 apud Papalia, Olds & Feldman, 2010) identified another type of attachment: deorganised/befuddled attachment, characterised by lack of a strategy for stress endurance, contradictory, repetitive, ambivalent, consciously abnormal behaviors. They seem to be constantly afraid and disoriented (Cotigă, 2011).

This paper is based on the Mary Ainsworth distribution, with the three patterns of attachment: secure, avoidant and ambivalent attachment. That is because the investigated population is not part of a category that is prone to develop deorganised attachment. An individual is categorised in one of the patterns after an evaluation that has a good predictive validity for 1 years old (68-75%) and for young adults (80%) (Wallin, 2010). The interaction and communication patterns are maintained from childhood to adulthood, and therefore in the intimate relationships because as a „child grows the pattern becomes a characteristic of the child himself” (Bowlby, 2011, p.205). Most of the longitudinal studies over attachment suggest that the secured attachment stability is strongly mediated by the quality of parent-child and social relationships (Grossmann, Grossmann, & Kindler, 2005; Sroufe, 2005; Sroufe et al., 2005).

In this paper, erotica partnership is defined as a love relationship with social and erotica implications, of minimum three months, that does not assume any change in the civil status or cohabitation. This type of relationship is often encountered in adolescents and young adults. „Erotica couples, even though they keep the nostalgia of an affective solidarity and social definitive, they reorient themselves so that they keep a quasi-permanent availability, personal autonomy, considered very important for the authenticity of life in couple” (Mitrofan, & Ciupercă, 2009, p. 78).

All these conscious processes of falling in love and choosing a partner (proximity, correspondence, similarity, complementarity) are completed by other processes, less conscious, almost unconscious studied by the humanists and psychogenealogy in particular.

Godeanu (2011, p.21) says that „the way you choose your partner and the dynamics of the relationship is built through the unconscious familial mechanisms, being the result of the inter- and trans-generational psychical transmission”. The process of making yourself aware of sexual identity and assuming the role-sex identity is amplified in a couple (Heidemarie, Hyoun, & Capaldi, 2008; Mitrofan, & Ciupercă, 2009; Godeanu, 2011; Godeanu 2011).

For all this to happen healthily, one has to know himself really well and have a high level of self-confidence. These two factors helps with personal development of at least one of the partners. If the relationship is productive and healthy, it helps the personal development of both partners. Personal development is associated with self-actualization (Maslow, 1970 apud Pines, 2011) that makes our love experiences more intense and satisfying but, at the same time, it positively correlates with a low need for romantic relationships.

Otto Kemberg (2009) thinks that the availability of entering an amorous relationship reflects the personal development level of an individual, which strenghtens the need to study the amorous partnership in regard with the individual development and individuation. That is because a person with a positive image of oneself can be vulnerable to believe in oneself and others, to realistically evaluate and confront failure.

From psychogenealogical perspective, the analysis of an amorous partnership presumes exploring five other levels: familial context, familial and communitary myths about the amorous partnership, familial uncounsciousness that becomes the base of forming role-sex identity, the intra-familial dynamics and pathological familial relationships (Godeanu, 2011). The analyze contains other inter- and trans-generational elemetns like: the crypt and the phantom, trans-generational scenario, familial secrets, trap-relationships, family loyalty, roles and role-dynamics, repetitions, unconscious alliances, methaphor-events, norms, myths, feminity, masculinity and sexual stories. The couple is the „uncounscious interfunctionality between two or more persons” (Godeanu, 2011, p. 50).

There are four different levels of leading a life in a amorous partnership (Godeanu, 2011): archaic-primitive psychological elements, oneiric elements, characterised by the desire for sublimate the subliminal level in regard with the other, myths and collective legends that consists of inter-generational dimation of common beliefs and the unwritten law elements between the two of them.

Hazan & Shaver (1988 apud Cassidy, & Shaver, 2008) conceptualized couple relationships in terms of attachment, regarding the partner as the main attachment figure at a particular moment in the relationship. Romantic love is defined as an addaptive biological process which enables attachment between the two amorous partners. Love associated with secure attachment is full of passion, trust and intimacy. Love in the avoidant attachment is made out of psychological games, lack of trust and low levels of intimacy, passion and commitment. Ambivalent attachment favors the

development of addiction and possessiveness in love, relational neurosis, skepticism and psychological games.

The pathological partnership dynamics is well observed in couple crisis, which Godeanu (2011) says they appear as a consequence of not taking the responsibility of a certain role-sex and a Familial Shadow. Nevertheless, the author says that a couple crisis can be adaptative if it provokes the partners to build their own relational style, taking their own decisions or to diminish emotional tension.

The difficulties of assuming role-sex identity in a couple come from difficulties in assuming identity space. All the mythologies of identity space and role-sex identity can generate great difficulties like: initiating and/or maintaining an amorous partnership, manifesting the role-sex identity as it was established, establishing a residence, establishing boundaries in the household, permitting myths and mythologies interference with their own needs in the couple. If the lot completes with the influence of the Familial Shadow, there can occur difficulties like: the decision of having children, identity confusion, identifying with parental model, handling couple crisis, contaminating roles and building trap scenarios.

Loyalty in couples generates unity and can favor the appearance of behaviors like: „the self-sabotage of one of the partners and programming to fail so that he/she is not superior to the other; developing the same type of somatic affection, disease as a consequence of loss by death of the partner; giving up to the professional development for being in concordance to the other's needs; giving up personal needs to keep the relationship if they can endanger the relationship; choosing a partner that can correspond to the family needs, so that the familial mythology can last longer and to avoid seclusion; scheduling the children to choose a certain profession so that it corresponds to the family myths (Godeanu, 2011, p. 90-91).

Another problem that regards the partnership dynamics is the dependence phenomenon. The dependent personalities search for emotional support and stability to satisfy their love and belonging needs (Hoogstad, 2008), they tend to avoid loneliness, they search for relationship and make huge efforts to not be abandoned, but they are incapable to live a real intimate relationship (Stancu, 2010).

Regarding amorous partnership pathology there are a few psychological mechanisms that are to be considered (Stancu, 2010): fusion with the other that doesn't give the possibility to make authentic contact with the self and the relationship is only symbiotically consumed; relational avoidance, which means the involvement of a third person as an mediator, contact

avoidance and having compulsive behavior, phantasms, unconsciously scheduling difficulties in accepting role-sex identity, psychological games, inadequate and destructive self expressing, low level of libido and addictive behaviors that come as a compulsion because of the intimacy avoidance.

When entering an amorous partnership, the individual is not a void, but brings along the experiences and the trans-generational baggage that he acquired in the original family. Needs, expectancies and norms. Strengthening the importance of the feeling of a unified and harmonious self, there are two natural processes that develop regarding the independence of the self:

*Separation anxiety* is defined as being an emotional state of neurotic intensity, of acute fear that has as phantasmatic object the separation of an attachment figure. This process appears in the first fragment of childhood when it persists and blocks an harmonious development. It represents a pathological aspect of personal development.

*Individuation* is a biological, physiological, necessary and natural process of „forming and customing of an individual, especially developing the psychological individual as a distinct being, from the collective psychology. Individuation is a differentiation process with the intention of developing the personality” (Jung, 2004, p. 473). Jung (2004) sees this process as a facilitator of the transcendence duty through which it expands the conscious area. A low level of self-feeling correlates with fear of individuation and intimacy, therefore the risk of losing oneself in relation to the other is higher (Sperling, 1987; Godeanu, S., 2011, Schaeffer, 2012;).

## **II. Methods**

The type of sampling chosen for this research was the simple random sampling type, while respecting the methodological norms for sample build-up. Before starting the tests, the respondents read and signed the Informed Consent form. The sample consisted of 30 people, aged 18 to 25 ( $m=21.53$ ,  $SD=1.5$ ). In terms of gender, the sample was comprised of 10 men and 20 women. All 30 respondents interviewed had been, at the time of the research, in an erotic partnership for at least 3 months ( $m=22.97$ ,  $SD=21.58$ ). None of the respondents was at that time in a formalized, official and law-admitted marital relationship.

In this research, three main instruments have been used out of which two *questionnaires* especially created for this analysis and a *genogram*. The questionnaires were created in order to give a quantitative ground for the investigation of attachment type and the functionality of the erotic partnership. For these particular research instruments, an internal consistency quotient has

been calculated. Thus, for the “safe attachment” scale we have  $\alpha = 0.64$ , for the “avoidant attachment scale”,  $\alpha = 0.75$ , for the “ambivalent attachment” scale,  $\alpha = 0.71$ . Meanwhile, the “separation anxiety” scale has  $\alpha = 0.72$  and the “fear of individuation” scale has  $\alpha = 0.76$ . According to working standards, all statistical parameters respect the fidelity threshold.

### III. Results

The results reported for each hypothesis allow the following statistical and psychological inferences:

*Central Hypothesis (H1)*, which has not been confirmed, stated that there is no statistically significant correlation between the abandonment (loss) vs. addiction core theme. H1 also stated that the ambivalent attachment type has as main psychological significations the following aspects: the familial factors do not correlate and do not specifically determine the forming of the attachment type, neither its characteristics, because the attachment system is not influenced from just one perspective. This idea is justified by the fact that the attachment system is a dual and mutual relationship that depends on psychological and physiological systems of both the mother and the child.

Another argument that supports the information of the hypothesis is that the core themes create difficulties in their analysis, exploration and diagnosis because one must consider the degree of awareness and the extent to which the individual takes on the role in the unconscious dynamics of the individual’s family. These two elements often imply a difficult endeavor of personal development and self-knowledge. Furthermore, the self-development degree and the status of the individuation’s process are parts that contribute to the overall perception of the family, the self, the world and of society. Given that the average on the “individuation fear” scale is relatively low ( $m = 27.9$ ,  $SD = 6.66$ ) and that the distribution is asymmetrically positive, we can definitely state that the individuation process is oriented towards the family of origin, individuality and psychological autonomy, placing the negative family elements in the background. This allows the attachments system’s structures to develop harmoniously and be reorganized by the experiences the individual has been through. A healthy psychological separation has taken place, and this separation affirms that the core themes based on abandonment (loss) vs. addiction of the family of origin are not decisive factors of forming an ambivalent attachment style.

A final argument for disaffirming H1 relies on the age characteristics of the respondents. For the late adolescence stage, the conflict between identity synthesis

and identity confusion is specific. By solving this conflict, the self acquires stability, coherence and unity. If solving the conflicts happens in a supportive family context, the identity is reinforced, thus facilitating the individual’s development (Meeus, 2011).

The specific hypothesis (H2) has been confirmed. H2 stated that there is a statistically significant, positive correlation between the separation anxiety in a romantic relationship and the fear of individuation. From a psychological perspective, this emphasizes that the emotional state of nervous tension and strong fear that have as phantasm object correlate with “difficulties in establishing the boundaries of the Self, masochistic tendencies, difficulties in experimenting real intimacy” (Schaeffer, 2012, p. 90), difficulties in forming and particularizing the Self, difficulties expressing and taking on their personal identity. In the context of a romantic partnership, the separation anxiety and fear of individuation correlate and form pathological systems with narcissist valences in which the Self is not differentiated from the non-Self and appears when the degree of family loyalty is very high (Godeanu, 2011), thus obstructing the natural process of individuation in which differences between the partners appear (Eiguer, 1994, apud Godeanu, 2001).

The third hypothesis, H3, has also been confirmed and it allows the formulation of several inferences regarding the correlation between anxiety separation and the ambivalent attachment type: preoccupation with the partner’s feelings of love, appreciation and valorization, which is specific to the ambivalent attachment type, as well as the insecurity in relation to the partner, are fueled and determined in proportion of 35% ( $r^2 = 0.35$ ) by separation anxiety. The concern related to the partner’s feelings of love leads to tension build up regarding the separation, the development of limitative system with regard to the perception of the self, the world and life, to adopting maladaptive life approaches and experiencing intense psychophysiological and psychosomatic feelings. (Bowlby, 2011; Cassidy & Shaver, 2008; Schaeffer, 2012).

Through the confirmation of the fourth hypothesis, H4, one can advocate that the fear of individuation correlates with an avoidant attachment style. The psychological implications of this hypothesis support and enrich the field of attachment research.

Because the anxious-avoidant type of attachment is operationalized through a tendency of isolation of reservation, both in social relations and romantic partnerships (Bowlby, 2011; Tempelhof & Allen, 2008), there is a use of social masks that impersonate independence and power in order to inhibit

the exploration and attachment impulses associated with feelings of discomfort in the case of intimate relationships, lack of self-confidence and lack of trust, emotional inhibitions (Peterson,2001; Kohlhoff & Barnett, 2013). This favors the development of “difficulties in establishing Self boundaries, masochistic tendencies and difficulties in experimenting real intimacy” (Schaeffer, 2012,p.90), difficulties in constructing the Self, difficulties expressing and taking on the identity the individual has constructed. It is as if the whole life of the psyche would be isolated and in continuous change, without ever reaching balance, a stable point where it can begin self-disclosure and participate in building a harmonious relationship with the partner.

Specific for the interaction of the two variables is either the devaluation behavior of sexual intimacy, either out of fear of intimacy and the lack of the ability of being intimate. In terms of erotic partnerships, the interaction between avoidant attachment and fear of individuation becomes what Godeanu (2011) named the “symptom couple”, based on trap-situations which the individual cannot overcome, cannot break, situation that comes along with maladaptive behaviors: not taking on the sexual identity, lack of commitment, difficulties in relating and communicating, not taking on identity space or a feeble structure of inter and trans-generational boundaries.

#### **IV. Conclusions**

As for conclusive remarks, this research has fulfilled its objective of investigating the intra-psychiatric and intra-familial dynamics. One must emphasize that, through data analysis, in order to be able to participate in a harmonious and satisfying romantic relationship, a separation between the family scenario and the unfolding of the whole process of individuation is necessary, as well as it is necessary for strengthening the Self and developing mandatory resources. Attachment, by acting as a moderating variable, intervenes in the attachment-exploration and fusion-isolation dynamics.

ANNEXES

**Table 1:** Correlation between the core theme and the attachment style

The core theme * stil_at					
		stil_at			Total
		confident	avoidant	ambivalent	
The core theme	weakness.vs.power	9	3	0	12
	control.vs.lack of control	4	0	0	4
	abandon_dependance	11	1	2	14
Total		24	4	2	30

**Table 2:** The correlation between the core theme and the attachment style

Chi-Square Tests					
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (2-sided)	Exact Sig. (1-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	2.143 <sup>a</sup>	1	.143		
Continuity Correction <sup>b</sup>	.536	1	.464		
Likelihood Ratio	2.916	1	.088		
Fisher's Exact Test				.483	.241
Linear-by-Linear Association	2.071	1	.150		
N of Valid Cases	30				

**Table 3:** Pearson correlation between separation anxiety and fear of individuation

Correlations			
		FI_score	AS_score
FI_score	Pearson Correlation	1	.743**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	30	30
AS_score	Pearson Correlation	.743**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	30	30



**Table 4:** Pearson correlation between the anxiety separation and the ambivalent attachment style

<b>Correlations</b>			
		AS_score	AMB_score
AS_score	Pearson Correlation	1	.586**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001
	N	30	30
AMB_score	Pearson Correlation	.586**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001	
	N	30	30

**Table 5:** Pearson correlation between fear of individuation and anxious-avoidant attachment style

<b>Correlations</b>			
		FI_score	EVI_score
FI_score	Pearson Correlation	1	.659**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	30	30
EVI_score	Pearson Correlation	.659**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	30	30

\*\* . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

## References

- Berne, E. (2007). *What do you say after Hello?* Bucharest: Trei.
- Bowlby, J. (2011). *A basic safety*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Bucx, F., & Seiffge-Krenke, I. (2010). Romantic relationships in intra-ethnic and inter-ethnic adolescent couples in Germany: The role of attachment to parents, self-esteem and conflict resolution skills. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 128-135.
- Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (2008). *Handbook of attachment*. New York: The Guildford Press.
- Cotigă, A.C. (2011). The relationship between maternal emotional availability, complications at birth and infant emotional development. In I. Mitrofan, *Validation studies and applied research of psychology and psychotherapy unification in educational, personal and clinical development* (pp. 147-297). Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.
- Erikson, E. (1987). *Childhood and society*. London: Paladin Grafton Books.
- Godeanu, C. D. (2011). Trap relationships in the addict family: a transgenerational approach. In I. Mitrofan, *Validation studies and applied research of psychology and psychotherapy unification in educational, personal and clinical development* (pp. 9-143). Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.
- Godeanu, S. (2011). Choosing the partner – myths, secrets, repetitions. Bucharest: SPER.
- Godeanu, S. (2011). *The couple: trans generational freeze frame*. Bucharest: SPER.
- Golu, F. (2010). *Human development psychology*. Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.
- Grossmann, K.E., Grossmann, K., & Schwan, A. (1986) *Capturing the wider view of attachment: A reanalysis of Ainsworth's Strange Situation*. In C. E. Izard & P.B. Read (Eds.), *Measuring emotions in infants and children* (pp. 124–171). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Heidemarie, L.K., Hyoun, K.K., & Capaldi, D.M. (2008). Interaction and relationship development in stable young couples: Effects of positive engagement, psychological aggression and withdrawal. *Journal of Adolescence*, 815-835.
- Hoogstad, J. (2008). Choice Theory and Emotional Dependency. *International Journal of Reality Therapy*, 63-68.
- Jung, C.-G. (2004). *Psychological types*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Kernberg, O. (2009). *Love relationships*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Kohlhoff, J., & Barnett, B. (2013). Parenting self-efficacy: Links with maternal depression, infant behaviour and adult attachment. *Early Human Development*, 249-256.
- Meeus, W. (2011). The study of adolescent identity formation 2000-2010: a review of longitudinal research. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 75-94.
- Mitrofan, I., & Ciupercă, C. (2009). *The psychology of the couple's relationship*. Bucharest: SPER.
- Mitrofan, I., Godeanu, D., & Godeanu, S. (2010). *Psychogeology*. Bucharest: SPER.
- Papalia, E.D., Olds-Wendkos, S., & Feeldman-Duskin, R. (2010). *Human development*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Peterson, M. (2001). *Attachment, trust and exchange orientation: a mediational model*. Maine: The University of Maine.
- Pines, A.M. (2011). *The paths of falling in love*. Bucharest: Trei.
- Schaeffer, B. (2012). *Love or addiction?* Bucharest: Trei.
- Schwartz, J.S., Mullins, L.R., Waterman, A.S., & Dunham, R.M. (2000). Ego identity status, identity style and personal expressiveness: an empirical investigation of three convergent constructs. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 504-521.
- Sperling, M., (1987) Ego identity and desperate love. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 51, 600-605
- Sroufe, L. A. (2005). Attachment and development: A prospective, longitudinal study from birth to adulthood. *Attachment and Human Development*, 7, 349–367.
- Sroufe, L.A., Egeland, B., Carlson, E.A., & Collins, W. A. (2005). Placing attachment experience in developmental context. In K. Grossmann, K. E. Grossmann, & E. Waters (Eds.), *Attachment, from infancy to adulthood: The major longitudinal studies* (pp. 48–97). New York: Guilford Press.
- Stancu, I. (2010). The mechanisms of intimacy in the couple relationship. Applications in therapy. dissertation. Bucharest: Bucharest University Press.
- Tempelhof, T.C., & Allen, J.S. (2008). Partner-specific investment strategies: Similarities and differences in couple and associations with sociosexual orientation and attachment dimensions. *Personality and individual differences*, 41-48.
- Wallin, D.J. (2010). *The attachment in psychotherapy*. Bucharest: Trei.