Tatjana Stefanović-Stanojević
Faculty of Philosophy
Niš
Marina Hadži Pešić
Faculty of Philosophy
Niš

TRANSACTIONAL ANALYSIS AND ATTACHMENT THEORY: DIFFERENCES AND/OR SIMILARITY

Summary

This paper can be viewed as an attempt to connect present-day psychological theories, Attachment Theory and Transactional Analysis, based on their numerous theoretical similarities, starting from their view of the dynamics of the personality, over to the classification of individual differences.

The research was conducted on the sample of 204 female students of the Faculty of Philosophy, whose average age was 21.7. We used instruments for testing partner attachment, Experience of Close Relationship Scale, (Bartholomew and Shaver, 1988), questionnaire for the identification of driver behaviour, Drivers Check List (Hazell, 1986), and the questionnaire that provided us with the data on social and demographic characteristics.

Results are a bit surprising, primarily in terms of distributions, of both attachment patterns and transactional analysis drivers. Research results have shown there is a statistically significant correlation between the patterns of the so-called anxious partner attachment and the driver Be Strong!, as well as between the occupied attachment pattern and the drivers Please! and Hurry Up!.

Key Words: Attachment Theory, Transactional Analysis, attachment patterns, drivers

sstanja63@gmail.com; marinahadzipesic@yahoo.com

Theoretical Framework

Psychology is a relatively young science in which numerous, at first glance very different, theories coexist. This variety of theories entails differences in terms of, for instance, understanding of personality traits, or personality development in general, which implies that an entire range of psychological procedures, from understanding needs and emotions, to possible therapeutic intervention, may depend on the theoretical framework the psychologist has chosen. One should then be capable of operating outside rigid individual theories and search for common elements in the broader framework of all psychology. The fact that many psychological theories have developed instruments to assess personality traits or types is a circumstance facilitating this comparison, which also provides an empirical basis for the entire procedure.

To us, it has seemed particularly meaningful to connect theories originating from what many psychologists believe is the most important psychological school: Psychoanalysis. This research has been organized as an attempt to compare and relate two psychological schools: Attachment Theory and Transactional Analysis. Our analysis of common denominators of these two theories has been organized in such a way as to range from the theoretical investigation of personality development dynamics to the empirical comparison of classification of individual differences.

Transactional Analysis

One of the most important elements of the Theory of Transactional Analysis is the life script (scenario) theory. Bern (1972) wrote that, in the early childhood, every person writes the story of her's life, which has a beginning and an end.

The script is an unconscious lifeplan which provides an explanation why a person behaves the way he or she behaves, why the person follows one path, and not the other, and why this path is often destructive or self-destructive.

The beginning of making the script is related to the early childhood, while later in the course of life, the script is reformed and revised. The script is made up of a series of the child's early images of itself, the world, and others, and it represents decisions the child makes based on its experiences with the parents, in order to survive physically or psychologically. When the child grows up and becomes an adult person, he or she is usually not conscious of the story of his or her life that began in the childhood. Yet, in stressful situations, this person acts in the way determined by decisions and thoughts he or she made as a young child, which do not correspond to the circumstances, behaviour, cognition, or emotions of an adult, autonomous person.

There are two types of messages influencing the formation of the script: permissions allowing the growth and development of potentials the child has come to this world with, and also script messages inhibiting development (Woolams, Brown, 1979). They can be injunction when they come from the Child's ego state of the parents, and also counter-injunction, or drivers when they come from the Parent's ego state of our parents.

Drivers are parental moral and value judgments and messages the child acquires through its life, which thus drive its behaviour. The term *driver* is used to better explain their basic trait – a compulsive need to follow the messages. Indeed, the person thinks he or she will remain OK as long as he or she abides by these messages. The messages are often labelled counter-injunction because a person believes that he or she *will avoid the tragedy of injunction and the injunction themselves if he or she acts in a certain way and abides by the messages on how to live and be worthy (Žanko, 1999, p. 126)*. These are the sentences that parents use to address their children, starting with *You must* and *You should* be this or that or do this or that. Unfortunately, underneath this social façade, just like injunctions, counter-injunctions are restrictive, and result to script-based decisions. Parents often have expectations of their child, so they send to the child both verbal and nonverbal messages – sometimes even long before they start sending explicit injunctions. Counter-injunctions are most commonly received in later childhood, when the child has already mastered language.

In the script process, five drivers are the most significant among counter-injunctions, as follows: Be Perfect, Be Strong, Try Hard, Please (others), Hurry Up. (Kahler, Carpers, 1974). Most people have one, two or more drivers characteristic of this particular person, but one or two always prevail. Each driver has its own behavioral characteristics (words, tone, gestures, body position, facial expression). Subsequent papers by Taibi Kahler and associates showed that drivers were a part of a broader pattern called the mini script (after Stewart and Joines, 1987), which is actually a sequence of script behaviour, script emotions and beliefs in the unit of time. In other words, it is the play of the script in the time period ranging from a few seconds to a few minutes.

Driver behaviours are important for two reasons. First, they seem to be an "escape into the script". Once a person starts to behave according to the script, or to have inauthentic feelings, he or she will immediately exhibit one of the driver behaviours. This means that drivers are external indicators showing that script beliefs have been activated in this person. In other words, each driver has the form ~ I am OK until... Additionally, driver behavior points to numerous other aspects of the script and represents a grounds for a diagnostic system known as the Process Model (Kahler, 1979, Ware, 1983, Stewat and Joines, 1987). The type of scripted process can be diagnosed with the help of drivers.

The driver *Be Perfect* helps us get the respect of others by being informed, competent, which is how we avoid mistakes and incompetence. People following this driver expect of themselves, and often of others, to strive for perfection in anything they do (Kodžić, Mijalković-Blagojević, 2007). Lying at the basis of this driver is the <u>message</u> *You are OK only if everything you do is perfect and right* (Jones and Stewart, 2002), and also the early <u>decision</u> *I am not good enough*, based on the experience with parents who, mostly nonverbally, transmitted messages such as *You are not good enough, You have made a mistake again, If you do this, do it properly*. Typical <u>injunctions</u> received in the childhood by persons with this driver are *Don't be relaxed, Don't be tolerant, Don't take risks* (Klajn, 1983). Personality traits helping the person with this driver to prove his or her fundamental decision that he or she is not good enough are the feeling of guilt (everything could be better and more perfect than what he/she or other people have done), creation of chaos (so as to achieve something "even better"), excessive punctuality at work, accuracy. In a projected way, in their relationships they are rigid, intolerant, tend to search for faults. This person can hardly distinguish between what is and what is not important, thus creating confusion for him/herself and others (Žanko, 1999). Persons with this driver are liable to depression, and, accordingly, the feeling of worthlessness.

The driver *Be Strong* is typical of persons who are persevering, resistant to stress, satisfied with little things, ready to sacrifice (Žanko, 1999). They do not ask for help, nor do they receive it, they believe they can to everything on their own, and they can also suffer a lot. At the basis of this driver there lies the <u>message</u> *You are OK only if you do not allow yourself to have emotions or desires*. The early <u>decision</u> is *No one values me, no one can love me, so I shall rely on myself only* (Klajn, 1983). Showing the feeling of pain is strictly <u>prohibited</u>. Other injunctions include *Don't be a child, Don't ask anything for yourself, Don't be close to others (be independent)*. Naturally, it is clear that families in which children with this driver once grew up discouraged the expression of any feelings, not just painful ones. Behaviourally, these persons "psychologically" save others, keep helping them when they are in trouble, even when these other persons do not openly ask. To help themselves prove their fundamental decision, persons with this driver ask for things in "such a way so as not to get them, they exhibit unsociability, the feeling of boredom, of not being understood, keep their feelings to themselves, show constant and stoical endurance of everything, constant concern with other people's needs, and neglect of their own". This counter-injunctions lies at the basis of the loveless script (according to Steiner, the depressive script). Most often, these people are lonely and isolated. (1994)

The Please driver is a decent, caring, obedient person, who satisfies everyone's wishes. This individual will gain love and attention or avoid rejection if he or she pleases others by neglecting his or her own

needs (Kodžić, Mijalković- Blagojević, 2007, Hazel, 1989). Such a person is equally decent and kind with all people, so he or she may seem superficial, artificial to others. Persons with this dominant driver grew up in families in which decency and respect were cherished, where expression of negative feelings was looked upon as an act of indecency. At the basis of this driver lies the message *You are OK only if you please others.* The early decision is *No one allows me to be what I am, they do not understand me.* The early script belief is *You are not good enough, so do everything you can so that others should feel good.* Typical injunctions are *Don't feel what you feel, but what I say you should feel, Don't leave me, Don't grow up, Don't know what you want.* This counter-injunction is found with embittered and angry persons, who are angry because no one recognizes their needs, and they themselves never openly show them.

Try hard is the counter-injunction prevalent in persons dedicated to work, who strive to get a reward as a result of their success in difficult matters (Hazell, 1989), and thus avoid defeat. They take up challenges and tasks too difficult for most people. For them, life is a struggle, and everything is achieved the hard way. This driver is based on the message *You are OK only if you try very hard (but, essentially, do not do it, because if you do it, you will stop trying hard).* The early decision is *I have failed, I am not as good as I think* (Klajn, 1983). This person can not stop when it is necessary, expects from others much more than they can offer, and also expects that others should make a lot of effort around him or her (Žanko, 1999). People for whom this driver was once dominant usually come from families in which parents were embittered and blamed others for their failures. They thus nonverbally send injunctions to their children: *Don't succeed and make what I have never made, Don't be satisfied with yourself, Don't make it, Don't be ambitious, Don't get what you want.* Personality traits which those with this driver use to show their decision that they have failed are: fear of failure, criticism of others, quick abstinence from struggle, comparison of themselves with others at their own expense, giving up.

A *Hurry Up* person is active and dynamic, and works quickly. This person has no time to stop and think things over, to make a contact with his or her emotions. These people are constantly on the move, they cannot stand still, because if they stop, they have to deal with themselves and their emotions, which is particularly disturbing for them (Kodžić, Mijalković-Blagojević, 2007). To others, these people seem impatient and demanding. They cannot sit back and relax. Their principal message is *You are OK only if you are in a hurry.* The early decision is *I don't belong* and *I can't think.* These persons come from the families with prevailing anxiety and tension, chaos and disorganisation, and also lack of time for dealing with the children. The child was requested to obey its parents, or suffer exclusion. If it obeys, it decides not to think with its own head, and if it starts thinking before switching to work, everyone else has already started doing something else, so the child is left alone and no one pays

attention to it. Typical <u>injunctions</u> are *Don't exist, Don't waste your time, Don't think, Don't belong*. This counter-injunction lies at the core of anxiety and psychosomatic diseases.

Basic characteristics of a personality in which this counter-injunction is dominant are: anxiety, tension, impatience, tendency to be late, unreliability, interruption of others while they speak.

These five principal drivers or counter-injunction are fundamental to different script types, and are also found in the basis of personal adaptations – important diagnostic procedures in the Transactional-Analytic psychotherapy.

The Attachment Theory

The attachment theory was created as an attempt to explain the nature and origin of human sensitivity. The founders of the theory were English psychiatrist John Bowlby (1907-1990) and Canadian clinical and developmental psychologist Mary Ainsworth (1913-1999).

Although the aim of the theory, in its initial concept (by Bowlby and Ainsworth), was to attempt to understand the pathology of children based on the inadequate relations between a child and a guardian in early childhood, even the founders themselves expanded the scope of the theory to adults and not just pathological attachment aspects. They did this using the concept of internal working model of self and others (IWM in further text). Namely, they assumed, the effects of early experiences remain in the form of IWM (cognitive attachment schemes or representations) and influence the relationships of a grown person with close relations partners, shaping behaviors, expectations, emotions and defense in important life relationships.

The dominant trends in theory development and reconciliation attempts

During the nineteen-eighties, a number of research streams directed at dealing with adult attachment stemmed from the outlined theoretical framework. The work on concept operationalization and instruments construction seemed to be one of the advantages of the attachment theory in relation to other theories which also came out of the psychoanalitical framework.

The differences noted in research approaches can most easily be understood from the aspects of the researchers' theoretical orientations. The first research stream relies heavily on the founders' orientation, so it can be deemed as clinical-psychological-psychiatric due to the fact that it is constituted mainly from Mary Ainsworth's postgraduates (Bretherton, Cassidy, Critenden, Kobak, Main, Waters). One of their important contributions is the construction of the interview for the assessment of adult attachment,

based on early childhood experiences (Adult Attachment Interview, AAI, 1985), that was developed by Mary Main and her colleagues at the University of California, Berkeley. In short, it deals with the idea that the state of consciousness in adults is a result of their parents' behavior in their early childhood. The subjects are interviewed about early family relationships upon which the conclusions are drawn in regard of their characteristics, which are then classified very similarly to the initial tripartite classification by Mary Ainsworth (Strange Situation, Ainsworth, 1978). Their assessment style resembles the psychodynamic one, and they tend to scrutinize clinical phenomena, prefer interviews and observations over question forms, and focus on small samples and individual cases.

The researchers at the University of California, Davis, Hazan and Shaver (1987), have worked completely independently and in a different tradition. Hazan and Shaver come from the fields of personality psychology and social psychology, in accordance with which their theoretical research discourse is, mainly within the terms of personality traits and social interaction. They construct questionnaires based on self-assessment, which means that they expect the subject to choose the description that suits them best, having a clear consciousness of partner relation quality. They are interested in average, non-clinical population, and prefer simple question forms and research on large samples. They focus on adult social relationships, including friendships, romantic and marital relationships.

Although different, both research groups rely on the same initial classification (M. Ainsworth, 1978) which has conditioned the comparison of the newly acquired classifications, and the creation of the classification that we are going to rely on in our research. During the nineteen-nineties, Kim Bartholomew, a psychologist at the Simon Fraser University (Burnaby, British Columbia) in Canada, presented both traditions and compared them (Kim Bartholomew, 1991). The significant insights include the notion that there are essential differences in one of the patterns (the *avoidant* attachment group), if they are measured with different instruments. Namely, the so-called *avoidant* groups of subjects identified with AAI refuse the experience of sadness and negate the significance of attachment, while the *avoidant* subjects identified with a Hazan and Shaver questionnaire speak of high levels of subjective sadness, and fear from closeness. Based on this argument, Kim Bartholomew asserts that there are two different modalities of the so-called *avoidant* attachment, one determined by defensive self-sufficiency (rejection) and the other determined by the confusing fear of the anticipation of rejection possibilities (fearfulness). She also emphasizes that the usage of retrospective techniques such as interviews or self-reporting questionnaires which relate to actual life situations, imply the theory conceptualization differences. While interviews rely on IWM dynamics which is discovered indirectly and of which subjects are not conscious, self-report is based on the feelings and behaviors in close relationships, of which subjects are con-

scious and which they describe relatively successfully and precisely. Kim Bartholomew builds her own concept, founded on the idea of the existence of four patterns, defined by two dimensions: internal working model of self (determined by the level of anxiety) and internal working model of others (determined by the level of avoidance).

The Classification of Individual Differences

On the basis of formed insights and redefined theoretical framework, Kim Bartholomew constructed both the interviews for the assessment of parental and partner attachment (*Scharfe*, E.A, *& Bartholomew*, K. *1998*), as well as self-reporting questionnaires (RQ; Bartholomew & Horowitz, 1991 RSQ; Griffin & Bartholomew, 1994) for the assessment of partner bonds. Furthermore, based on the setting and comparing of the aforementioned instruments, she reached a classification which connected the two approaches. Since we are using Kim Bartholomew's questionnaire in our research, we will present the classification given by the author herself:

The *secure* attachment pattern is characterized by the positive model of self and the positive internal working model of others. *The positive attitude towards others* means that they are capable of achieving closeness and emotional openness in romantic relationships. On the other hand, although they are warm and gentle, thanks to *a positive image of self*, they do not hesitate to define boundaries, that is, to show negative emotions if need be – dissatisfaction, non-compliance, crying in front of a partner, etc. When they are faced with problems or sad topics, they develop numerous constructive strategies to overcome stress, including asking others for support.

The *fearful* attachment pattern is characterized by the negative model of self and the negative internal working model of others. Due to *a negative model of self* they tend to develop a high dependence on others, pronounced jealousy and an intense fear of separation. They often worry if others like them, i.e. they fear that others might experience them as stupid, unattractive or boring. Fearful persons also have *a negative model of others*, which means that they do not develop trust easily. They want contact with others, but are extremely sensitive to even the smallest sign of rejection. They avoid asking others for support, they avoid conflicts, crying in front of others, and even opening. They are also coy and confused when they have to show affection. Persons belonging to the fearful attachment pattern have difficulties in forming a romantic relationship. They are very insecure and inclined to blame themselves for all problems.

The *preoccupied* attachment pattern is characterized by the negative model of self and the positive internal working model of others. Persons belonging to this type have *a negative model of self*, so they tend to develop their self-respect based on the assessments of others, due to the

lacking self-assurance. Preoccupied persons have *a positive model of others*. They seek company and attention from others, insist on closeness in partner relationships, and they are too demanding. They also tend to open prematurely and uncritically. They confront others impulsively. They always have a notion that others do not invest themselves enough into relationships, thus they conclude that others do not appreciate them sufficiently, that others do not value them. Romantic relationships are extremely important for preoccupied persons. Due to their need to be constantly involved romantically, they often enter another relationship, as soon as the previous one is finished. And they invest themselves rapidly into the following relationship. Their romantic relationships imply anger, passion, jealousy and possessiveness.

The *dismissing* attachment pattern is characterized by the positive model of self and the negative internal working model of others. Persons with the dismissing attachment pattern are composed, an even cold or arrogant. When they are faced with problems or sad contents, they distance themselves from the contents, tend not to give any significance to the problems and they especially try not to look for support from anyone. Persons belonging to this pattern have *a positive model of self*, which means that they have a high self-confidence. "Dismissing" persons also have *a negative model of others*. They are cynical and too critically oriented towards others. They avoid situations where it may come to tender exchanges. Their friendships are superficial, with similar hobbies or activities, before any emotional openness. The romantic relationships of these persons are characterized by the lack of intimacy. They try not to pay much attention to the relationship itself and they avoid conflicts or any emotional play.

Research Methodology

The Problem and Hypotheses

The problem of the research is to attempt connecting the described classifications for a more complete personality development consideration.

In accordance with thus defined problem, the *fundamental hypothesis* of the research deals with the expectation of a possible connection of the attachment patterns with the transactional theory drivers, based on the fact that the formation of patterns, as well as drivers, occurs in the early childhood on the basis of actions of parents, that is, guardians of children.

Specific hypotheses:

1. The existence of the positive statistical connection between the attachment patterns with at least one negative IWM – of self or others (preoccupied, fearful and dismissing) and TA drivers is expected.

2. The existence of the negative statistical connection between the attachment pattern with both IWM of self and others positive (the secure attachment pattern) and TA drivers is expected.

The sample

The sample was made up of female students of the Faculty of Philosophy in Nis (N=204), coming from the following departments: Psychology, Pedagogy, English, and History. The selection of the sample (age, sex, student status) was conditioned by the availability of the population, but also by the fact that precisely this generation suffered not only their personal, adolescent transition but also an external, social transition. An important additional fact to justify this sample is the fact that ladies studying at the Faculty of Philosophy in Nis are being educated for future work with people, so that, potentially, they will influence generations in the period in which transition will no longer be the social reality of this part of the world.

The Instruments

The following instruments have been used in the research:

Close Relationship Questionnaire, (Bartholomew and Shaver, 1988), the questionnaire for the assessment of partner attachment. It consists of 36 claims, which relate to examinees' attitudes towards romantic partners. The answers are on the seven-level Likert scale. Based on given answers (and after recoding specific claims), the arithmetic means for the dimensions which are in the foundation of partner attachment patterns are calculated: *anxiety* and *avoidance*, which are then transformed using formulas into the attachment patterns[1].

Drivers Check List (Joseph William Hazell, 1986), is a questionnaire for the assessment of the dominant driver behavior. It consists of 50 claims, 9 for each driver, from which to choose all of the claims that "a person does more than other people". For each driver, among 9 claims those that best describe a person's behavior are chosen. The remaining 5 claims point to one essential characteristic of each driver, and only one should be chosen of all of them. Based on given answers, each claim characteristic of our behavior, is scored with 1 within each driver, while

---

[1]The *secure* attachment pattern = dismissing *3.2893296 + anxious *5.4725318 - 11.5307833.

The *fearful* attachment pattern = dismissing * 7.2371075 + anxious * 8.1776446 - 32.3553266.

The *preoccupied* attachment pattern = dismissing * 3.9246754 + anxious * 9.7102446-28.4573220.

The *dismissing* attachment pattern = dismissing * 7.3654621 + anxious * 4.9392039 - 22.2281088.

claims 1, 3 and 5 are scored with two in every driver. 4 points are added to the acquired result in accordance with the choice of one of five essential characteristics of all 5 drivers.

The list of basic socio-demographic data.

Results and Discussion

Distribution of Attachment Patterns

Table 1. Distribution of attachment patterns

Attachment Pattern	Frequency	Percentage
Avoidant pattern	0	0%
Secure pattern	0	0%
Preoccupied pattern	13	6.4%
Fearful pattern	191	93.6%
Total	204	100%

In the tested sample we identified only two attachment patterns: the so-called preoccupied and fearful pattern (Table 1). Such a distribution is barely comparable with any response distribution found so far in Europe or America (van Ijzendoorn & Sagi, 1999), and it is not even possible to compare with the ones from Asia and Africa, to which Serbian results are much closer in terms of childhood attachment pattern distributions. This distribution is different even from the distributions that have been found so far in Serbia (Stefanović-Stanojević, T., 2002, 2004,2005) so that, certainly, it requires caution, and calls for further investigation.

Naturally, we may say that this is not surprising and that such a distribution is a result of the unfortunate years in which these young ladies grew up (social crisis, bombardment, etc.), so that it is logical that effects of transition have their most devastating effect in the domain "governed" by emotions. Yet, we rather tend to suggest that, before interpreting such drastic results, we should repeat the study on the same or similar sample.

Drivers Distribution

Table 2. Drivers distribution.

Drivers	Frequencies	Percentages
Please (others)	48	23.5%
Be perfect	21	10.3%
Be strong	88	43.1%
Hurry up	13	6.4%
Try hard	34	16.7%
Total	204	100%

As seen in Table 3, in the tested sample the driver "Be strong" is dominant. It is typical of persons ready to sacrifice, of people who are satisfied with small things and willing to provide help to other people. Isn't this description reminiscent of a woman in a patriarchal society, who is the pillar of the family? It is quite possible that this behavioural model was transferred to children, now young women participating in our research, through a transgeneration script process (Noriega, 2007). The second driver by frequency also supports our explanation: Please. We hope that a new research on a larger sample will provide new, much needed explanation of obtained distributions.

Correlations between attachment patterns and TA drivers

Table 3. Correlation between attachment patterns and drivers (Phi)

	Be strong	**The please**	**Be Perfect**	**Hurry Up**	**Try hard**
Be strong	1.000 204	-0,483** 0.000 204	-0.295** 0.00 204	-0.227** 0.001 204	-0.390** 0.00 204
The please	-0,483** 0.000 204	1.000 204	-0.188** 0.07 204	-0.145* 0.39 204	-0.248** 0.00 204
Be Perfect	-0,295** 0.000 204	-0.188** 0.07 204	1.000 204	-0.088 0.209 204	-0.151* 0.031 204
Hurry Up	-0,227** 0.001 204	-0.145* 0.39 204	-0.088 0.209 204	1.000 204	-0.117 0.097 204
Try hard	-0.390** 0.00 204	-0.248** 0.00 204	-0.151 0.031 204	-0.117 0.097 204	1.000 204
Fearful pattern	**0,146*** 0.037 204	-0.139* 0.47 204	0.022 0.751 204	-0.178* 0.011 204	0.063 0.372 204
Preoccupied pattern	-0.146* 0.037 204	**0.139*** 0.47 204	-0.022 0.751 204	**0.178*** 0.011 204	-0.063 0.372 204

Results suggest there are statistically significant correlations between the fearful pattern and the driver *Be strong*. The occupied pattern is statistically most significantly correlated with the drivers *Please* and *Hurry up*.

We shall attempt to interpret these empirical connections between some attachment patterns and some transactional analysis drivers by means of theoretical aspects: childhood personality development aspect and adult partner relations aspect.

Theoretical Parallel: Fearful Pattern and Driver Be Strong

1. Childhood

TA: Families in which there was a prohibition of showing own feelings and desires. They were taught to take care of the needs of others, and neglect their own, because in the early childhood they created an inversely symbiotic relation in their own family, paying attention to the needs of their parents.

AT: Parents were overburdened with their own needs, and they did not provide their child with a meaningful strategy to cope with the difficulties of life. Overwhelmed with fear that the parent would fail to resolve life's difficulties, the child belonging to this pattern often ends up caring about such a parent.

2. Partner Relations

TA: Short, chaotic, dependent relationships, which can be linked to the early decision lying at the basis of the driver *Be strong: No one values me and no one can love me, so I shall not show my feelings*. Persons exhibiting the Be strong driver prove their fundamental decision that they are not loved by asking the impossible of their partner, which results in their belief that they are not understood, in keeping their emotions to themselves, lack of sociability, the sense of boredom. Usually, they are alone and isolated.

AT: Partner relations are short and chaotic, due to the negative model of the others preventing them from showing emotions (*If I open up, I will be mocked*). Most often, these people are lonely and tend to fantasize, where their own needs are not satisfied.

Theoretical Parallel: Driver Please and Preoccupied Pattern

1. Childhood

TA: Persons with this predominant driver were raised in families in which there was a code of decency and appreciation, where expression of negative feelings was considered impolite. Typical prohibitions are: *Do not feel what you feel, but what I tell you to feel, Do not leave me, Do not grow up, and Do not know what you want…*

AT: If the mother is only selectively available and responsive to the child's signals, the child, "hungry" for her attention, will choose to send only those signals that will be responded to. Therefore, the child satisfies the mother's needs, neglecting its own, to gain the mother's love it falls ill, refuses to eat, or… In any case, such a child is immature and liable to excessive attachment.

2. Partner relations

TA: In partner relations, these persons neglect their own needs, and satisfy the needs of the partner. They are often angry or displeased, because, since they do not express their needs openly, their perception is that others cannot recognize their needs.

AT: The occupied pattern typically implies a negative model of the self, and a positive model of others. In order to make up for the perception of their own impropriety, persons of this type invest themselves into the relationship too much, expecting that the partner will provide the same attention in return and thus help them improve the image of themselves. Practically, this means they tend to enter symbiotic relationships, and are angry if the partner fails to respond to such intensive needs.

Theoretical Parallel: Driver Hurry Up and Occupied Pattern

1. Childhood

TA: These children grew up in families in which stalling was not accepted, which were anxious, tense and impatient. The child was asked to abide by the parents' desires, or face exclusion.

AT: Persons belonging to the occupied pattern run away from the negative image of themselves, and thus yearn to satisfy others' needs and so secure their own existence.

2. Partner relations

TA: In relationships, these persons cannot relax or be relaxed. They keep running around, because if they stop, they would have to think things over and dedicate some time to themselves and their own emotions, which is quite disturbing for them. They are very anxious, which prevents them from assessing and organizing their own time and the time of others. This leads to conflicts. Their final psychological pay off is desperation, the feeling of being insulted and angry.

AT: Persons belonging to the so-called *occupied* pattern are usually concerned with others in order to escape the negative image of themselves. Due to the constant need to be loved, they are hard to put up with, very anxious, and excessively demanding. They exhaust their partner by asking questions such as: *Do you love me, how much do you love me?* If the partner fails to respond persistently to this excessive need for proving love, or if he or she is bothered by possessiveness, they tend to feel insulted, unloved, and forsaken.

Conclusion

Results of our research suggest:

First, an unexpected distribution of partner attachment patterns in our sample. As pointed out above, the most prevalent pattern was that of anxious attachment (93.6%), and, to a much smaller percent, (6.4%), the occupied attachment pattern. Other patterns were not found in our study. The data we thus got contradict all the research done so far, whether in the world, or a few years ago in Serbia (also with the population of students).

Second, driver distribution is a bit more favourable, since all drivers appear in the tables in some percentage. However, we can still claim

that the most prevalent driver in our sample was Be strong (43.1%), followed by Please (23.5%).

Third, we have found statistically significant correlations between the anxious attachment pattern and the driver Be Strong, and the occupied attachment pattern and the driver Please and Hurry Up.

At present, it seems to us most reasonable to interpret these data by means of many years of changes in our society, transition, i.e. all things related to changes in the social and cultural values. On the other hand, social changes influence the change of value systems within the family, creating a vicious circle, hard to get out of. As a result, we find changes in the upbringing of children, their educational styles, new messages, prohibitions and moral values that parents emit to their children, verbally, but even more often nonverbally. Even commoner is the case in which parents, themselves torn between old and new values, send one group of verbal messages, yet a completely different group of nonverbal ones. Naturally, this breeds confusion in children: What is right and What am I to do? Perhaps one of the solutions is to retreat, have only short-term relationships, shun the expression of emotions… However, since this is the first study relating the concepts of the two theories, we should expect that future research on a larger sample will provide new ideas and offer new explanations.

References

Ainsworth, M.D. S. (1967), Infancy in Uganda: *Infant care and the growth of love.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Ainsworth, M., (1989), *Attachment beyond infancy*, American Psychologist, No 44, 709-716. Ainsworth, M.D.S. & Eichberg, C.G. (1991), *Effects on infant-mother attachment of mother's unresolved loss of an attachment figure on other traumatic experience.* In C. M. Parkes, J. Stevenson-Hinde & P. Marris (Eds.) *Attachment across the life cycle* (pp 160-183) London:Routledge.

Bern, E, (1972), What do you say after you say hello? New York,Grove Press.

Bowlby, J., (1951.), *Maternal Care and Mental Health*, Geneva, World Health Organization,

Bowlby, J. (1969), *Attachment and loss: Vol 1 Attachment,* New York : Basic Books.

Bowlby, J. (1988), *A secure base*, New York: Basic Book.

Bowlby, J., (1977), *The making and breaking of affectional bonds*, *Etiology and psychopatology in the light of attachment theory. II Some principles of psychotherapy*, British Journal of Psychiatry, 130:201-210.

Cassidy,J., & Berlin, L. J. (1994) *The insecure/ambivalent pattern of attachment*: Theory and research. Child Development 65,971-991.

Hazell, W (1989), *Drivers as mediators of stress response,* broj 4, 212-214

Kahler,T& Carpers,H.(1974) The miniscript, Transactional Analysis Journal, 4(1), 26-42.

Kahler, T. (1979), Process therapy in brief, Little Rock:Human development Publications

Klajn, M (1983), Kako birati supružnika [How to Choose a Spouse], Beograd, Vuk Karadžić

Kodžić, D, Mijalković-Blagojević (2007), Ako bi ti rekli da možeš ponovo da biraš [If You Were Told You Could Choose Again], Beograd, Dom Omladine

Lorentz, K. (1957), *Instinctive behavior. New York*, International Universities Press.

1246

Main, M. & Hesse, E. (1990), *The insecure disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern in infancy: Precursors and sequelae.* In M. Greenberg, D. Cicchetti, & E.M.Cummings (Eds.) *Attachment during the preschool years: Theory, research and intervention* (pp 161-182) Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Noriega, G.(2007), Lectures at the Workshop of TA World Conference, San Francisco

Stefanović Stanojević Tatjana (2002), *Bliske partnerske veze,* Psihologija,vol 35, br.1-2, str 81-97. Beograd,

Stefanović Stanojević Tatjana, (2004), *Adult attachment and prediction of close relationships*, Scientific Journal Facta Universitatis, Vol.3, N.1, pp 67-812004.

Stefanović Stanojević Tatjana (2005) *Studenti: Ljubavni odnosi i opasnost od AIDS-a.* Zbornik: Ličnost u višekulturnom durštvu, tema broja: Psihosocijalni aspekti društvene tranzicije u Srbiji, 268-284, Novi Sad.

Stener, C. (1974), Scripts people live, New York: Grove Press

Stewart, I.& Jones, V. (1987), TA today: a new introduction to transactional analysis, Nottingham and Chapel Hill: lifespace Publishing

Zazo, R., (1980.) *Poreklo čovekove osećajnosti [The Origins of Human Sensibility]*, Beograd.

Žanko, N (1999), Osnove transakcijske analize [Fundamentals of Transactional Analysis], Zagreb, Alinea

Ware, P.(1983), Personalty adaptations, Transactional analysis Journal, 13(1), 11-19

Woolams, S. & Brown, M.(1979), TA: the total handbook of transactional analysis, Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall

Татјана Стефановић-Станојевић, Марина Хаџи Пешић, Ниш

КЛАСИФИКАЦИЈА ИНДИВИДУАЛНИХ РАЗЛИКА: ТЕОРИЈА АФЕКТИВНОГ ВЕЗИВАЊА И ТРАНСАКЦИОНА АНАЛИЗА

Резиме

Рад се може разумети као покушај повезивања актуелних психолошких теорија, Теорије афективног везивања и Трансакционе анализе, на основу бројних теоријских сличности, почев од сагледавања динамике личности, до класификације индивидуалних разлика.

Истраживање је спроведено на узорку од 204 студенткиње Филозофског факултета, просечне старости 21,7 година.Употребљени су инструменти за испитивање партнерске афективне везаности, Цлосе Релатионсхип Qуестионнаире, (Бартхоломеw анд Схавер, 1988), упитник за идентификацију драјверског понашања, Дриверс Цхецк Лист (Хазелл, 1986) као и упитник за добијање података о социо-демографским карактеристикама.

Резултати су донекле изненађујући, пре свега у погледу дистрибуција, како образаца афективне везаности, тако и драјвера трансакционе анализе. Резултати истраживања су показали да постоји статистичка значајна корелација између обрасца тзв. бојажљиве партнерске афективне везаности и драјвера Буди јак, као и обрасца окупиране афективне везаности и драјвера Угоди и Пожури.

Кључне речи: теорија афективног везивања, трансакциона анализа, обрасци афективног везивања, драјвери