

DEPÓSITO LEGAL ZU2020000153

*Esta publicación científica en formato digital
es continuidad de la revista impresa*

ISSN 0041-8811

E-ISSN 2665-0428

Revista de la Universidad del Zulia

Fundada en 1947
por el Dr. Jesús Enrique Lossada



Ciencias de la Educación

NÚMERO ESPECIAL

Año 12 N° 35
Noviembre - 2021
Tercera Época
Maracaibo-Venezuela

Characteristics that act in young people as psychological prerequisites to avoid psychological intimacy in relationships

Tatyana V. Skutina
Yulia G. Yudina
Vera V. Korshunova
Dmitry N. Kuzmin
Ekaterina V. Potapova

ABSTRACT

The article empirically substantiates the hypothesis about the severity of the characteristics of avoiding psychological intimacy in young people: low autonomy, self-doubt, the presence of an avoidant type of attachment, counter-dependence, the experienced lack of intimacy in relationships with significant adults in childhood and the needs for isolation and security in subjective perceptions of psychological intimacy. These characteristics were compared in two groups of boys and girls aged 20-25 years, the sample was 60 people. Methods were used: "Questionnaire of interpersonal dependence" (p. Girshfield, adapted by O.P. Makushina), the questionnaire "The experience of close relationships" by K. Brennan and R.K. Fraley, adapted by T.V. Kazantseva, the test for counter-dependence (B.K. Weinhold, D.B. Weinhold). The severity of closeness by significant adults in childhood, the peculiarities of subjective ideas about psychological closeness were revealed by the method of conversation and through the creation of a drawing "The image of the desired relationship". The results of the study showed that the differences between the groups are significant in all parameters stated in the hypothesis ($p \leq 0.01$). Subjective ideas about intimacy differ in the severity of the needs to be the center of your world in a relationship; in community; in observing personal boundaries; ($p \leq 0.01$); to feel safe in a relationship ($p \leq 0.05$).

KEY WORDS: youth; attitude; individual differences; parental attitude; psychological closeness; autonomy; type of attachment; young people; subjective perceptions of closeness.

*Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Counseling, Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1772-8108>. E-mail: tvforte@mail.ru

**Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Counseling, Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2063-7079>. E-mail: yudish@mail.ru

***Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Information Technologies of Education and Continuing Education, Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2042-2417>. E-mail: wera7@mail.ru

****Candidate of Pedagogical Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Information Systems, Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8489-4683>. E-mail: kuzmin_d_n@mail.ru

*****Candidate of Psychological Sciences, Associate Professor of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Counseling, Siberian Federal University, Krasnoyarsk, Russia. ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9302-5810>. E-mail: potapowa.catia2011@yandex.ru

Recibido: 27/07/2021

Aceptado: 23/09/2021

Características que actúan en los jóvenes como prerequisites psicológicos para evitar la intimidad psicológica en las relaciones

ABSTRACT

El artículo fundamenta empíricamente la hipótesis sobre la gravedad de las características de evitación de la intimidad psicológica en los jóvenes: baja autonomía, duda de uno mismo, presencia de un tipo de apego evitativo, contradependencia, la falta de intimidad experimentada en las relaciones con adultos significativos en la infancia y las necesidades de aislamiento y seguridad en las percepciones subjetivas de la intimidad psicológica. Estas características se compararon en dos grupos de jóvenes de 20 a 25 años; la muestra fue de 60 personas. Se utilizaron métodos: "Cuestionario de dependencia interpersonal" (p. Girshfield, adaptado por O.P. Makushina), el cuestionario "La experiencia de las relaciones cercanas" de K. Brennan y R.K. Fraley, adaptado por T.V. Kazantseva, la prueba de contradependencia (B.K. Weinhold, D.B. Weinhold). La severidad de la cercanía de los adultos importantes en la infancia, las peculiaridades de las ideas subjetivas sobre la cercanía psicológica fueron reveladas por el método de conversación y mediante la creación de un dibujo "La imagen de la relación deseada". Los resultados del estudio mostraron que las diferencias entre los grupos son significativas en todos los parámetros planteados en la hipótesis ($p \leq 0.01$). Las ideas subjetivas sobre la intimidad difieren en la severidad de las necesidades de ser el centro de su mundo en una relación; en comunidad, en la observación de los límites personales; ($p \leq 0,01$); sentirse seguro en una relación ($p \leq 0,05$).

PALABRAS CLAVE: juventud; actitud; diferencias individuales; actitud parental; cercanía psicológica; autonomía; tipo de apego; jóvenes; percepciones subjetivas de cercanía.

Introduction

The desire to create and maintain close relationships is viewed by most researchers as a fundamental human need (Kulikov, Pastushik, 2009). It becomes more difficult for a person to build harmonious relations in the modern world, in the world of technology and the influence of the media. There is a lengthening of the period of searching for a partner, an increase in the age of marriage, a short duration of relationships and low satisfaction with them, which can also be considered a manifestation of a deficit in the ability to form harmonious relationships. Increasingly, there are cases when a person refuses close relationships and chooses, for example, material benefits, building a career, considering romantic relationships a waste of its time.

In modern psychology, this problem is associated with a tendency to exaggerate the role of independence, personal autonomy, freedom and personal achievement and to play down the role of attachment. All this leads to various kinds of difficulties in establishing psychological closeness (Dergacheva, 2002; Melnikova, 2014).

Independence, understood as freedom from all attachments and influences, is inherently an avoidance of responsibility and an inability to create true intimacy. The fear of rejection, of losing oneself lies in alienation from people. Attachment theorists see the struggle between two competing needs for intimacy and autonomy as the central dilemma of human life (Sytko, 2011).

The ability to establish and maintain psychological closeness in interpersonal relationships is one of the most important tasks of the sixth psychosocial stage according to E. Erickson's periodization, which lasts from 20 to 25 years and marks the formal beginning of adulthood (Erickson, 1996). Avoiding situations and contacts that lead to intimacy for fear of "losing independence" can lead to self-isolation, the feeling of loneliness threatens psychological well-being at this age and in the future. It is noted that young people aged 18-24 are one of the most vulnerable groups in terms of psychological well-being (Yaremchuk, Bakina, 2021).

In addition, the importance of creating psychological and pedagogical development practices that develop the universal abilities of young people, capable of helping in resolving interpersonal and intrapersonal difficulties and problems, is noted (Smolyaninova et al., 2021).

The relationship between psychological well-being, resources for the development of interpersonal relationships and the individual characteristics of young people has been studied in a number of works (Garaa-Alandete, 2015; Fedorenko et al, 2018; Krok, 2018; Borodovitsyna, 2020).

In addition, it is noted that people with a higher level of psychological well-being are more likely to talk about their understanding of happiness in terms of intimacy and relationships with other people, and people with lower indicators - in terms of personal self-development, their own autonomy and dominance (Kartasheva, Grishina, 2015).

With such a high importance of psychological closeness for individual psychological well-being of a person, with all the relevance of the development of psychological resources for young people to create and maintain close relationships in their future family, it seems

important to us to identify not only individual psychological characteristics of young people that hinder intimacy, as has been done in a number of studies.

The aim of our research was to identify theoretically and consider in a complex a number of features of young people who act as psychological prerequisites for their avoidance of psychological intimacy in relationships. And empirically check for differences in the selected parameters in young people who do not have psychological closeness in a relationship and do not seek it, compared with boys and girls who seek and have psychological closeness in a relationship.

1. Literature Review

As a result of analyzing the psychological literature, we identified a number of individual characteristics of young people who do not seek closeness in relationships, as well as the characteristics of their interpersonal relationships with significant adults, which, in our assumption, may distinguish them from young people seeking psychological closeness.

One of the characteristics associated with the desire for an individual lifestyle, rather than close relationships, may be the desire for autonomy. However, when considering personal autonomy in the context of interpersonal interaction, it is very important to distinguish true autonomy from psychological distancing from other people and avoidance of attachment to people (Stankovskaya, 2014; Melnikova, 2014; Sergeev, 2018). E. Erickson considered autonomy in the context of the process of growing up - separation, development of the boundaries of freedom of their actions. He understood autonomy as the ability for self-regulation associated with the desire to assert itself as an independent individual who has the right to freedom of choice. From the point of view of E. Erickson, autonomy is the main new formation at the stage of development of the personality of a child aged from one to three years (Erickson, 1996; Sabelnikova, 2008). The concept of personal autonomy as a self-regulation mechanism was most fully developed within the framework of the theory of self-determination by E. Deci and R. Ryan (Ryan, R.M., Deci, E. L., 2000; Dergacheva, 2002). R. Girshfield defines autonomy as self-sufficiency, the tendency to distance from others, avoidance of long-term interpersonal relationships, the desire for loneliness. In the presence of autonomy, a person experiences its behavior as self-determined and corresponding to its values and interests (Makushina, 2007).

Counterdependence is also discussed as a characteristic of a person leading to “escape from intimacy” in psychological research (Weinhold, J.B. Weinhold, B.K., 2004; Winehold B.K., Winehold J.B., 2011); Counterdependence is understood as a form of human behavior characterized by independence, a tendency to avoid closeness with another person, distrust of the world around us (Avdeeva, 2017), as well as a violation of attachment, in which, despite the high need for relationships, a person is afraid of intimacy. B.K. Winehold and D.B. Winehold describes people with a pronounced counterdependence as self-sufficient, not experiencing cravings for other people. The main reason for this behavior is the trauma received by a person during its early development, in families where the parents were estranged from each other or were emotionally insensitive to the child (Winehold B.K., Winehold J.B., 2011).

Indeed, it is generally accepted that the family, relationships with parents make the most significant contribution to the formation of the child's personality and its subsequent relationships with other people (Hanson, 2002; Collins, N.L., Feeney B.C., 2004).

Disruption of the parent-child bond, which implies a lack or lack of emotional disposition, can have a very significant impact on self-perception and emotional connections with others. If this disconnect is not identified and overcome, it creates a habit of isolation and aloofness, which can have a profound effect on attitudes toward intimacy in adulthood. Adults who were mistreated as children, especially if they were people they trusted, learned to erect physical and psychological walls to protect them from the experiences of their unhealed childhood traumas. They may tend to fear that they will experience the same abuse or rejection when they try to bond with others in later ages (Avdeeva, 2017).

Traumatic is the lack of care and tenderness, insufficient attention to the needs of the child, as well as various negative actions in relation to him, which destroys the feeling of security and leads to a feeling of helplessness and the perception of the world as potentially hostile. Under the influence of traumatic experience, a distorted self-image is formed.

According to attachment theory, human relationships are based on a system of close and strong emotional ties established as a result of a long-term relationship between a child and a mother in the first years of its life. Attachment differs from other emotional ties in that a person experiences a sense of security and comfort, if it is reliable, or anxiety, insecurity, acute dependence and similar negative states in an attachment relationship (Bowlby, 2003; Brish, 2012). In the avoidant type of attachment, the type manifests a feeling of discomfort in

close relationships, a feeling of dependence on a person, vulnerability and emotional closeness. This type of attachment is formed when parents reject a child, do not respond to its needs, and do not support him emotionally. A person in adulthood usually avoids close relationships, keeps a partner at a distance, and also, as a rule, hides its feelings (Vasilenko, 2011). Therefore, we assumed that this type of attachment would be expressed in young people who do not seek psychological closeness.

A person's self-confidence is also an important factor in interpersonal relationships. This is not only the most important component of self-esteem, but also a person's attitude to life, where the relationship of a person to himself, to activities and to other people. Confidence (lack of confidence) of a person in himself is formed from early childhood and then manifests itself throughout its life, influencing its social position and the semantic characteristics of its life. Lack of sufficient positive attention on the part of an adult or, on the contrary, pronounced guardianship and excessive protection of the child leads to the formation of self-doubt as an experience of disbelief in oneself, in one's capabilities, which reduces activity in the process of further life and communication (Zobkov, 2019).

Based on the analysis of the literature, we put forward the following assumption for empirical verification: "Young people who do not strive for psychological closeness are distinguished from young people who seek and have psychological closeness in relationships with greater severity: the need for separateness than for compatibility, for the content of subjective ideas about psychological closeness; striving for autonomy; self-doubt; lack of closeness with significant adults in childhood; counterdependence, as well as a high frequency of avoidance type of attachment among them".

2. Methodology

Sample: 60 respondents took part in the study.

Group 1: young people - boys and girls 20-25 years old, striving and having psychological closeness at the moment or had earlier, in the amount of 30 people.

Group 2: young people - boys and girls 20-25 years old, not striving for psychological closeness in relationships, who have no experience of psychological closeness with a partner at the moment or earlier, in the amount of 30 people.

Research procedure. The work with the participants consisted of three stages.

Stage 1 of work:

- preliminary conversation;
- conducting techniques to determine the severity of autonomy, self-doubt, the presence / absence of the avoidant type of attachment, the presence / absence of counterdependence.

Stage 2 of work:

- Conversation with each member of both groups to identify relationships with parents and other significant adults in childhood and the presence of closeness with them;

Stage 3 of work:

- each respondent creates a picture on the theme "Image of the desired relationship";
- Conducting a conversation, mediated by a drawing, with each participant separately.

Yulia Kiseleva, a master's student of the Department of Developmental Psychology and Consulting of the Institute of Pedagogy, Psychology and Sociology of the Siberian Federal University, took part in the implementation of the scientific research under our scientific supervision.

2.1. Methods

The Interpersonal Dependency Questionnaire, developed by R. Girshfield in 1977, adapted by O.P. Makushina (Makushina, 2007), is used to identify the desire for autonomy and self-doubt. To determine the type of attachment, the questionnaire "Experience of close relationships" by K. Brennan and RK Fehley is used in the adaptation of T.V. Kazantseva (Kazantseva, 2008) The counterdependence test developed by B.K. Winehold and D.B. Winehold (Diagnostic portfolio, 2019). The severity of intimacy by significant adults in childhood was revealed by the method of conversation. To study subjective ideas about psychological intimacy, the creation of a drawing "The image of the desired relationship" and a method of conversation based on it were used. The method of qualitative analysis of the narrative of G.M. Breslav was used to analyze materials from interviews (Breslav, 2010). Statistical data processing was performed using Fisher's F-test.

3. Results and Discussion

1 stage of work. Expression of autonomy, self-doubt, avoidant type of attachment, counterdependence in young people who are striving and not striving for psychological closeness.

All 60 respondents took part in the study at all stages, and completed all the proposed methods. On the basis of the data obtained, we compared the values of the signs of autonomy, self-doubt, avoidant type of attachment, counterdependence in young people seeking and not seeking psychological closeness and made the differences found for statistical significance using the Fisher test. The results are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Differences in autonomy, self-doubt, avoidant type of attachment, counterdependence between groups of young people seeking and not seeking psychological closeness

Comparison criteria	Fisher's φ^* criterion
desire for autonomy	5.68
self-doubt	5.31
counterdependence	3.23
having an avoidant type of attachment	6.54

As can be seen from Table 1, the differences between the compared groups turned out to be significant for all parameters put forward in the hypothesis, at the level of significance: $p \leq 0.01$ according to Fisher's test.

2nd stage of work. Differences in the severity of psychological closeness in relationships with parents and other significant adults in childhood.

While studying the severity of closeness with significant adults in childhood, we conducted a conversation with each participant about their childhood experiences of relationships with parents and other significant people. The participants were not able to openly and easily talk about their relationships in childhood, but, nevertheless, the analysis of the collected materials of conversations made it possible to highlight significant differences between the groups.

In Group 1 (young people, aspiring and having psychological closeness), most of the participants fondly recalled their childhood. Here are some typical statements for this group: "Yes, of course. As a child, I liked to spend more time with my dad, we were constantly together. When I got older, I began to communicate more with my mother, we got secrets. We can discuss anything you like ", " Yes, I love these guys very much. In childhood, they worried about me and protected me, but now it's the other way around. Sometimes there are moments when it becomes so sad and sad, you come to your dad with the book

“PippiLongstocking”, sit next to him and ask him to read like in childhood ”; “ Yes, now, having matured, these moments are lacking. When you are tired or something doesn't work out, you run to your mother with tears, and she hugs you, calms you down, strokes your head. Or you get up in the morning and have delicious pancakes for breakfast”, “Parents have always believed in me and still believe in me as in childhood. When I was little, I was constantly kissed and hugged, talked about a lot with me, discussed my “tragic” love. They believed in me, always supported my self-confidence, calling me a clever and beautiful woman. Next to them I am always that little girl”, “I do not know people closer than my parents. They love you with all your shoals and cockroaches. When I was little, my parents always arranged joint activities: hiking in nature, going to the theater. Even earlier, I studied in a vocal studio, so my mother left work to travel with me to competitions, supported me in every possible way so that I would not worry. Thanks to its for that”.

The answers of the participants in group 2 (young people who do not seek psychological closeness) are mostly opposite to the answers of the participants in group 1. In this group, most of the participants note the absence of close relations with their parents in childhood: “Since childhood I have not been close enough with my mother , often turned down when asked to kiss, hug, or tell a bedtime story. My parents didn't show me a model of how to love”, “They are not at all close, as my parents divorced when I was seven years old. Everyone started to arrange their life, but I don't seem to be there”, “It seems to me that only a mark in the passport reminds them that they have a son. Since childhood, we don't really get along with them, so I was more with my grandmother. Here is a close relationship with its”, “I would not call our relationship close, because there are still topics and experiences that I do not tell them about. Since childhood, we are at a distance with them, I lived all the time with my grandparents in another city. We are not strangers, but we are not close either”. “My grandmother says: “You were born for me”. My parents, when I was born, worked, built a career, I practically do not remember them and do not know them. Then they began to travel, but they did not take me with them, they say, traveling with children is more difficult, you will not visit all places and other excuses. I lived with my grandmother, she is my parent”, “My parents built market relations with me, as I said. If you behave yourself, you will get a toy. If you finish a quarter or half of the academic year with excellent marks, you will receive a telephone; if you finish like this for a whole year, you get a game console. After graduating from school, I got a car. While you are little, it's still funny, but then you realize that it would

be better if they just praised you or said “son, we are proud of you”, I don’t remember this since my birth”.

Having singled out the most common units of judgment, we can note that 60% of the participants from Group 2 (young people who do not seek psychological closeness) note the lack of closeness with their parents, only 17% of the participants from the opposite group note the lack of closeness with their parents. The differences between the samples are significant according to Fisher's test at $p \leq 0.01$ ($\varphi_{emp.} = 2.75$).

Stage 3 of work. Differences in the content of subjective ideas about psychological closeness.

The third, final stage of the study was a conversation mediated by a drawing on the topic: "The image of the desired relationship." Currently, images are increasingly used in psychological research and in various areas of psychotherapy, their specific effectiveness is noted in comparison with verbal means (Curtis, R. 2016; Faranda, F. 2016, Zalevskaya, 2019). The drawing, according to our plan, allowed the participants to express both conscious and unconscious, including emotional, aspects of their ideas about psychological closeness in a figurative and symbolic form, to come into contact with their inner experience of close relationships or their absence in the process of creating the drawing, which created favorable conditions for subsequent conversation.

To create a drawing, the participants were offered paints (watercolors, gouache), brushes, white paper. The process of creating a picture and a conversation for each participant was given 35-40 minutes. After the participant completes the drawing, the participant is invited to talk about its feelings, about the image he made. If it is difficult for the participant to talk about its feelings on its own behalf, then he is offered the option to identify himself with any part of the picture and talk about its feelings.

In addition, each participant, if it was not voiced by him independently, was asked to describe its ideas about psychological closeness, to answer in detail the questions: “What kind of relationship would I like with my partner?”, “How do I see my desired relationship?”.

After analyzing the participants' drawings, together with the material from the drawing-mediated conversation, we identified the phenomena characteristic of each of the groups. It is noteworthy that the works of the two groups differ significantly in color.

Figures 1, 2, 3, drawn by young people not seeking psychological intimacy, were considered typical examples.

Figure 1. "Image of the desired relationship" of young people, not seeking psychological closeness.



Figure 2. "Image of the desired relationship" of young people, not seeking psychological closeness.



Figure 3. "Image of the desired relationship" of young people, not seeking psychological closeness



In the pictures above, group members who are not seeking psychological intimacy use darker, colder shades. Most of the drawings have a compositional center around which dark colors prevail. If there is an image of a light spot, often with a predominance of warm tones, then the authors associated it with their inner world, their personal space.

The members of this group are characterized by the description of themselves as the center of their world, and an indication of caution to let someone into their world: “I see myself as the center, I feel good in my world. It is quite interesting here, but I will let you into my world carefully, gradually. I don’t want people to burst into my territory and build their own rules”, “I am the sun here, and my rays can reach the ground, but they seem to be afraid and direct their light and warmth to themselves, and not to the outside world. It’s already more usual when you give warmth to yourself”, “I see myself here as the center of everything. Such a bright yellow sun, and around me is a whirlpool of events, and these events are very diverse”.

Describing the drawings, the participants note the importance of personal boundaries and freedom: “One of the most important for me is that they are not “strong” hugs, not close, but there is space around me. This means that relationships are not some kind of shackle, but I have personal freedom (personal space)”, “It is important not to merge into each other, but to have my own space (at this point the girl separated the sheets), knowing that you are loved and support, even when not around. It is important for me to have something of my own, where the partner has no place where I can take care of myself”, “I did not completely paint over this space between a man and a woman, but left small distances so that everyone had freedom. That was where to take a breath of fresh air, and not completely immerse yourself in a relationship”. Figures 4 and 5, drawn by young people seeking psychological closeness, are discussed below.

The first thing we can notice in the pictures above in the text is the presence of bright colors. This is typical for most of the drawings of the respondents in this group. Participants compare relationships with an “explosion” of emotions, thereby depicting bright flashes, fireworks, intertwining bright colors (“For me, relationships are an explosion, fireworks of emotions! I want to keep this feeling of fireworks, brightness, colors, as long as possible”, “Relationships are a whole fountain of emotions. The most different, colorful, bright. Moments of dark and sad. But all these emotions go to the middle, and in it your union.

And you live all these emotions together”, “Relationship is a spark between two, which grows into such a fire. It burns hot that no one and nothing can approach it”).

Figure 4. "Image of the desired relationship" of young people, seeking psychological closeness



Figure 5. "Image of the desired relationship" of young people, seeking psychological closeness



Drawings are dominated by red, a bright, warm color that evokes strong emotions that creates a sense of excitement or intensity. In contrast to the color red, participants often use blue in their drawings, associating it with feelings of calmness or serenity. One of the participants, describing its drawing, said: “On the orange path, you already have small problems, but if you overcome them, you will find yourself in a calm, peaceful, blue background. Blue here for me is a stable, strong relationship”.

Most often, the entire paper space is covered in the drawings of this group of participants. In the conversation, the participants report that they see this as a reflection of the relationship as complementarity, where they are separate, and together create an alliance,

complement each other with the best qualities: “It is important for me that there are some common values, interests, and the white strokes are an image of the fact that, in spite of the fact that there is something in common, everyone in a relationship has its own interests, its own affairs, and they sometimes intersect in the spheres of another”; “I started to drip colored spots and they started to combine so well that I realized that this is the relationship. You can be completely different, not combining and not matching each other at first sight, but now you have connected, and something incredible and beautiful has formed”, “a relationship is an exchange of energies. Ideally, you give and receive in return. Together you form something beautiful, such a huge whirlwind of emotions and feelings”.

For the analysis of the conversation, semantic units were identified, grouped by categories and concepts, according to the method of narration of G.M. Breslava (Breslav, 2010). The differences between the groups in terms of the analyzed aspects of perceptions of psychological closeness in relationships are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Differences in the content of subjective ideas about psychological closeness between groups of young people seeking and not seeking psychological closeness.

Comparisoncriteria	Fisher's φ^* criterion		
	number of respondents in the group		Fisher's φ^* criterion
	seekingpsychologicalcloseness	notseekingpsychologicalcloseness	
confidence	16	13	0,78
need for community, for unity	17	4	3.71
need for a separate personal space	8	23	4.06
the need to respect and respect personal boundaries in a relationship	7	17	2.70
the need to feel secure in a relationship	5	12	2.04
the need to be the center of your world in a relationship with a loved one	4	14	2.94

Statistical analysis according to Fisher's criterion showed that the differences found are significant at the level of $p \leq 0.01$ in terms of the following parameters: the need for

community; the need for unity; the need to respect and respect personal boundaries in relationships; the need to be the center of your world in a relationship with a loved one. At a significance level of $p \leq 0.05$, the need to feel secure in a relationship. There were no significant differences in the gender parameter of confidence.

As can be seen from Table 2, at a significance level of $p \leq 0.01$ according to Fisher's criterion, a group of young people who do not strive for psychological closeness are distinguished by: a greater severity of needs associated with separateness, separation, such as: needs in a separate personal space, in respecting personal boundaries in a relationship. The expressiveness of the need to be the center of one's world in relations with a loved one is also more consistent with the egocentric tendency. As the statements in the conversation showed, the expressed need to feel safe in relationships, the experience of the threat of being hurt in relationships, prevents the young people of this group from opening their inner world and their personal boundaries to another, to get closer. In contrast, a group of young people seeking psychological closeness is distinguished by a more pronounced need for community and unity. At the same time, according to the results of the conversation, they do not experience community and closeness as a threat to their individuality, separateness, or their inner world. Differences between the groups in terms of the severity of the need to feel secure in relationships also turned out to be significant at the significance level of $p \leq 0.05$ according to Fisher's test. However, more often than not, young people with different attitudes towards psychological closeness put different meanings into understanding security in relationships. So, young people who do not seek psychological closeness associated safety with keeping a distance in a relationship with a partner, building solid boundaries, keeping significant areas of their inner experience inaccessible to a partner. While young men and women seeking intimacy in a relationship talked about security as trusting a partner, confidence in its support in a difficult situation, confidence that purely personal information given to him during close communication will not be disclosed to them.

There were no significant differences in subjective perceptions in such an aspect of psychological closeness as trust in the compared groups.

Thus, our assumption that among young people who do not strive for psychological closeness, in the content of subjective ideas about psychological closeness, the need for separateness is more pronounced than for compatibility, has found its empirical confirmation.

Thus, summing up the results of the empirical research, we can say that our assumption that young people who do not seek psychological intimacy have a more pronounced need for isolation than for togetherness in the content of subjective ideas about psychological intimacy, and in particular in observing and respecting personal boundaries in relationships; to be the center of their world in relationships ($p < 0.01$); to feel safe in relationships ($p < 0.05$), has found its empirical confirmation. The assumption was also confirmed about the differences between young people striving and not striving for intimacy in terms of the severity of the desire for autonomy; self-doubt; lack of intimacy with significant adults in childhood; counter-dependence, as well as a high frequency of occurrence among them of the avoidant type of attachment ($p \leq 0.01$).

A comparison of the quantitative change in the desire for autonomy according to the method of "Interpersonal Dependence Questionnaire" (Makushina, 2007) and the content of the respondents' individual ideas about the desired relationship allows us to conclude that young people who avoid psychological intimacy autonomy looks more like a tendency to distance themselves from others, avoiding long-term interpersonal relationships associated with the fear of being hurt in a relationship, the desire to protect themselves from perceived threats from a partner.

This is consistent with what T. V. notes. Kazantseva "avoidance of intimacy is a personality trait that indicates the lack of formation of personal autonomy" (Kazantseva, 2011), meaning genuine mature personal autonomy. In a collective psychological portrait of a person with a fear of intimacy, the author lists such traits as workaholism, perfectionism, negativism, arrogance, narcissism. Our study revealed other distinctive features of young people who do not show the desire for psychological intimacy, not necessarily because of fear. Moreover, the severity of a number of them, such as self-doubt, counter-dependence, can be significantly reduced in therapeutic or developmental practices, which in the future can increase the level of psychological well-being of such young people and contribute to their building healthier partnerships and family relationships in the future, since the level of psychological well-being is higher in people for whom happiness is more associated with love, friendship, intimacy and relationships (Kartasheva, Grishina, 2015).

Conclusion

Young people today are increasingly replacing the basic need for intimacy with the need for self-sufficiency. The study of the psychological characteristics of young people, boys and girls who do not strive for psychological closeness, can shed light on the understanding of the psychological background of this phenomenon.

As a result of the analysis of the literature, we can say that the topic of avoidance of intimacy in modern society is gaining more and more relevance and is increasingly becoming a subject of study. The originality and novelty of our research is in the use of both quantitative and qualitative methods. In addition to quantitative techniques, we included drawing-mediated conversation in the study.

The conducted empirical research has confirmed our hypotheses. We can imagine a more complete portrait of a person who does not seek psychological closeness. Such young people are distinguished by the desire for independence and autonomy, they respect their personal boundaries, treat their personal space with trepidation, not wanting to let others near them who are not ready to accept them as they are. These are people who have avoidant attachment and counterdependency. All of this is due to the lack of sufficient intimacy with significant adults in childhood, which also makes a significant contribution to the development of self-doubt.

The combination of verbal and figurative-symbolic means, namely the proposal to express in the drawing the image of the desired relationship, made it possible to more fully understand the subjective ideas of young people about psychological closeness, the peculiarities of their experience of psychological closeness in childhood and current experience. We saw that a group of young people who do not strive for psychological closeness are distinguished by describing themselves as the center of their world, and an indication of caution and even fear of letting someone into their world. Letting someone into their lives means breaking their personal boundaries. Participants of the second group, on the contrary, see relationships as complementary, where each of the partners is isolated, but together they create a union, into which each brings its own unique qualities, enriching and complementing each other.

The study concluded that the lack of desire for psychological closeness is not equal to the desire for healthy personal autonomy. Our research shows that this is often not a personal choice of a person, but a result associated with a lack of reliable close relationships in

childhood and with incomplete separation processes in the future. As shown by the results obtained, this is due to the feeling of a child who grew up in such conditions of distrust of the world, self-doubt, and isolation, which are the reasons why young people do not strive to build close relationships. Thus, the lack of striving for a close attitude of young people looks like a “choice without choice” made from a lack of psychological resources, and not from equally available alternatives.

The results obtained prompt us to raise the question of the need to develop and implement practices to support young people in the development of opportunities for a positive experience of psychological intimacy. The practices will be aimed at psychological education of parents about the consequences of preference for such individualistic values as career, personal life, self-development to the detriment of investing strength and resources in building psychologically safe close healthy relationships in the family, with their children.

References

Avdeeva, N.N. (2017). Attachment theory: modern research and perspectives. Modern foreign psychology. Electronic journal. Vol. 6. No. 2. P. 7–14. DOI: [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.17759/JMFP.2017060201](https://doi.org/10.17759/JMFP.2017060201)

Borodovitsyna, T.O. (2020). Features of psychological well-being of students of various training profiles. World of Science. Pedagogy and psychology, No. 4(8). Available at: <https://mir-nauki.com/PDF/45PSMN420.pdf>

Bowlby, J. (2003). Affection. Edited and introductory article by G. V. Burmenskaya; Translated from English by N.G. Grigorieva and G.V. Burmenskaya. Moscow: Gardariki, (OJSC Mozhaiskopolygraphic combine). P. 447.

Breslav, G.M. (2010). Fundamentals of psychological research. Moscow: Publishing house Academy. P. 496.

Brish, K.H. (2012). Attachment disorders therapy: From theory to practice. Moscow: Cognito-Center. P. 316.

Collins, N.L., Feeney B. C. (2004). An attachment theory perspective on closeness and intimacy. Handbook of closeness and intimacy. New Jersey, P. 163 – 189.

Curtis, R. (2016). The Use of Imagery in Psychoanalysis and Psychotherapy. Journal Psychoanalytic Inquiry, No. 36 (8), P. 593 – 602. DOI: [10.1080/07351690.2016.1226033](https://doi.org/10.1080/07351690.2016.1226033)

Dergacheva, O.E. (2002). Autonomy and self-determination in the psychology of motivation: the theory of E. Deci and R. Ryan. Modern psychology of motivation. Moscow: Smysl, 2002. P.103 - 121.

Diagnostic portfolio for determining the propensity to addictive behavior. Tula: Regional Center "Development", 2019. P. 80.

Erickson, E. (1996). Identity: youth and crisis. Moscow: Progress.

Faranda, F. (2016). Image and Imagination: Deepening Our Experience of the Mind. Journal Psychoanalytic Inquiry, No. 36 (8), P. 603 – 612. DOI.org/10.1080/07351690.2016.1226037

Fedorenko, E. Yu., Skutina, T.V., Kalinovskaya, K.S., Potapova, E.V. (2018). Trait Anxiety Index Among Students with Different Levels of Xenophobia. Journal of Siberian Federal University. Humanities & Social Sciences. No. 11(2). P. 185 – 191. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370-0179.

Garaa-Alandete J. (2015). Does meaning in life predict psychological well-being? The European Journal of Counselling Psychology. Vol. 3 (2). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5964/ejcop.v3i2.27>

Hanson, R, J. (2002). Mother Nurture: A Mother's Guide to Health in Body, Mind, and Intimate Relationships. New York: Penguin.

Kartasheva Yu. V., Grishina N.V. (2015) Existential correlates. Psychological well-being. Scientific research of graduates of the Faculty of Psychology of St. Petersburg State University / ed. A.V. Shaboltas. - St. Petersburg: Publishing house C. - St. Petersburg University.

Kazantseva, T.V. (2008). Adaptation of the modified methodology "experience of close relations". Izvestia of the Russian State Pedagogical University named after A.I. Herzen. P. 139 - 144.

Kazantseva T. V. (2011) New in the research of psychological intimacy. Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Ser. 12. 2011. Issue 2.

Krok, D. (2018) When is Meaning in Life Most Beneficial to Young People? Styles of Meaning in Life and Well-Being Among Late Adolescents. Journal of Adult Development. No. 25. P. 96 – 106. [HTTPS://DOI.ORG/10.1007/S10804-017-9280-Y](https://doi.org/10.1007/S10804-017-9280-Y)

Kulikov, L.V., Pastushik, M.M. (2009). Review of foreign studies on the problem of emotional closeness. Bulletin of St. Petersburg State University. Series 12. Issue. 4.

Makushina, O. P. (2007) Portfolio for determining the propensity to addictive behavior. Tula: Regional Center "Development", 2007. P. 80.

Melnikova, V.B. (2014). Autonomy of personality: an overview of foreign approaches to problems. Psychological research. Vol. 7. No. 37. P. 9.

Ryan, R. M., Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. American Psychologist. Vol. 55. P. 68 – 78.

Sabelnikova, N.V. (2008). Methods of studying attachment in the process of age-related development in modern foreign psychology. Bulletin of St. Petersburg University. Series 12. Issue 3. P. 36 - 47.

Sergeev, S.M. (2018). Autonomy as a factor of social identity. Materials of the IV International Scientific and Practical Conference, Armavir State Pedagogical University. P. 95 - 98.

Smolyaninova, O.G., Rostovtseva, M.V., Yudina, Yu.G., Korshunova, V.V., Potapova, Ye.V. (2021). Project-based activity as a mechanism of reflection development in students of psychology and education studies. J. Sib. Fed. Univ. Humanit. Soc. Sci. No 14(3). P. 385 – 395. DOI: 10.17516/1997-1370- 0730.

Stankovskaya, E.V. (2014). To say «yes» to oneself: existential-analytical perspective on autonomy. Psychology Journal of the Higher School of Economics. Vol. 11. No. 4. P. 136 – 145

Sytko, M.V. (2011). Emotional attachment in the structure of significant personality relationships. Young Scientist. No. 11. Vol. 2. S. 119 - 122.

Vasilenko, M.A. (2011). Child's attachment to mother as an early factor. Izvestiya of the Russian State Pedagogical University named after A.I. Herzen. P. 20 - 28.

Winehold B.K., Winehold J.B. (2011). Escape from proximity. Getting rid of your relationship from counterdependence - the other side of codependency. St. Petersburg: IG Ves.

Weinhold, J.B. Weinhold, B.K. (2004). Counter-Dependency: The Flight from Intimacy. Trafford Publishing. P. 272

Yaremchuk, S.V., Bakina, A.V. (2012). Subjective well-being of young people and its relationship with the psychological distance to objects of the socio-psychological space of the individual in the context of the COVID-19 pandemic. Social Psychology and Society. Vol. 12. No. 1. P. 26 - 43. DOI: 10.17759/sps.2021120103

Zalevskaya, Ya.G. (2019). Psychological analysis of drawings. Problems of modern pedagogical education. P. 32. DOI: 10.15507/1991-9468

Zobkov, V.A. (2019). Substantive characteristics of a person's self-confidence. Bulletin of the Udmurt University. Vol. 29. Issue 1. P. 128.