ABSTRACT
            A validation study of 30 married females and 30
married males was conducted on a theoretical model of stages in
interpersonal development developed by Bar-Yam Hassan (Bar-Yam Hassan
& Bar-Yam, 1987). According to the model, the five stages of adult
interpersonal development are: (1) Social Relatedness versus
Self-Insistence, or need for Approval; (2) Affiliation versus
Exclusion, or need for Affiliation; (3) Belonging versus Alienation,
or need for Belongingness; (4) Intimacy versus Isolation, or need for
Intimacy; and (5) Interdependence versus Interpersonal Constriction,
or need for Reciprocity. Interview data were scored for the subject's
orientation to relationships, nature of interpersonal interactions,
and interpersonal need. The present study examined in more depth the
qualitative nature and process of interpersonal development in young
adulthood from this same sample. Questions were raised regarding the
characteristics of interpersonal development in young adults, both
cross-sectionally and longitudinally, as well as the factors which
may contribute to change in interpersonal development over time.
Results generally support a developmental conception of interpersonal
relatedness in young adulthood as involving a progressive sequence of
transformations in the qualitative nature of interpersonal
relationships. (Tables are provided of stages of interpersonal
development across the life span, and in young adulthood. Ten
references are included.) (TE)

Stages of Interpersonal Development in Young Adulthood

Aureet Bar-Yam, Ed.D.

Charles River Counseling Center
1069 Washington Street,
West Newton, MA 02165
(617) 527-4610

According to Bakan (1966), human existence is characterized by a duality of yearnings, namely the yearning for 'agency' and the yearning for 'communion' - that is, a yearning to be independent and autonomous coexisting simultaneously with a yearning to be included and connected. However, an examination of Erikson's (1950, 1968) theory of psychosocial development reveals an emphasis on issues of individuation, while overlooking important aspects of development in interpersonal relatedness. Franz and White (1985) argue that Erikson, in neglecting relationship issues, does not provide a framework for understanding how individuals move from the dependency of the trust vs. mistrust stage to the mature interdependence of the adult intimacy stage. They propose a two-strand model of development, which includes two separate, but interconnected strands of individuation and attachment development.

Extending Erikson's theory to include developmental tasks in interpersonal connectedness, Bar-Yam Hassan (Bar-Yam Hassan & Bar-Yam, 1987) proposed a theoretical model of stages of interpersonal development. Each developmental task involves the emergence of new interpersonal needs and the negotiation of qualitatively different forms of interpersonal relatedness in a progressive developmental sequence. These interpersonal life-span stages and the needs at each stage are:
   (1) Incorporative Bonding vs. Withdrawal, need for Responsiveness;
   (2) Secure Attachment vs. Fear of Abandonment, need for Acceptance;
   (3) Interactive Association vs. Egocentric Disregard, need for Attention;
   (4) Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence, need for Approval;
   (5) Affiliation vs. Exclusion, need for Affiliation;
   (6) Belonging vs. Alienation, need for Belongingness;
   (7) Intimacy vs. Isolation, need for Intimacy; and
   (8) Interdependence vs. Interpersonal Constriction, need for Reciprocity;
   (9) Interpersonal Acceptance vs. Relational Distress, need for Companionship.

An initial effort toward the empirical evaluation of this model's conceptualization of qualitative changes in interpersonal development (Bar-Yam Hassan, 1988, 1989) has yielded positive results, particularly as it applied to young adult close relationships. A scoring manual for the five stages pertinent to young adult development was developed for use with interview data regarding the nature of closest relationships, and data were gathered regarding various aspects of construct validation, including: substantive validity; convergent validity; and developmental sequentiality.

2

The five stages of adult interpersonal development were: (1) Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence, need for Approval; (2) Affiliation vs. Exclusion, need for Affiliation; (3) Belonging vs. Alienation, need for Belongingness; (4) Intimacy vs. Isolation, need for Intimacy; and (5) Interdependence vs. Interpersonal Constriction, need for Reciprocity. Interview data were scored for the subject's (a) Orientation to relation-ships; (b) Nature of interpersonal interactions; and (c) Interpersonal need. The following is a brief description of these five stages.

In the <u>Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence</u> stage relationships are self-serving and concrete. The other person is viewed as someone who "can take care of me and provide for my needs". The interpersonal need of this stage is the need for Approval which emerges out of the awareness that others can react to and evaluate the self. This need mitigates against self-insistence and promotes the interpersonal awareness necessary for social relatedness. Self-insistence is characterized by manipulative exploitation and disregard for others, while Social Relatedness involves consideration of others in cooperative relating, but where cooperation is still oriented for self-benefit.

In the next <u>Affiliation vs. Exclusion stage</u>, as the individual's interpersonal awareness increases, the need for approval is transformed into the need for Affiliation. This is an anxious, conformity-oriented need for social approval and acceptance, mainly from peers. Affiliative relationships are dominated by a high investment in similarity, stereotyped conformity, and identity fusion. A classic example is the in-groups and cliques of early adolescence. Because of this emphasis on conformity and fusion, being excluded at this stage can be devastating, leading to low self-esteem, persistent anxiety about rejection, and over investment in approval seeking. In contrast, positive affiliation provides experiences of consensual validation, increasing social and self-confidence, and the beginnings of identity formation.

In the next, <u>Belonging vs. Alienation</u> stage, as individuals discover that they are unable or unwilling to please everyone all the time, they begin to reject the excessive fusion and over-identification of affiliation. There emerges a more individuated sense of self, and relationships become more differentiated. Individuals at this stage become more selective, actively choosing to belong to institutions, roles, and relationships which support their differentiating sense of self. Those who fail to develop this sense of belonging or fitting in, experience a sense of alienation, while those who do, are able to attain a positive consolidated sense of SELF-IN-CONNECTION-WITH-OTHERS.

In the next, <u>Intimacy vs. Isolation</u> stage, another shift occurs where sharing no longer carries the threat of fusion and loss of self. Essentially, as individuals consolidate a sense of self in connection with others they move beyond concerns with identifications to the need for deeper personal sharing, intimate connection, and mutuality in relationships. This is characterized by a deeper involvement in communication, mutual concern, support, and responsibility as well as concerns about coordinating needs for both autonomy and dependency in relationships. Failure to experience intimate mutuality leads to a sense of personal isolation, loneliness, and meaninglessnes

In the next stage, the <u>Interdependence vs. Interpersonal Constriction</u> stage, the need for intimate mutuality is transformed into a broader, deeper need for reciprocity which then facilitates the development of inter-dependence. This is based on the SIMULTANEOUS awareness of unique, distinct individuality AND Interpersonal connectedness. Interdependence is associated with a deeper sensitivity and awareness of complexity within the self and its connection with others, as well as an appreciation of the difficulties in balancing multiplicity in living. It involves an active participation and appreciation of dynamic interrelatedness, without which there is an increasing interpersonal withdrawal and constriction in relating. (A more complete description of these stages and a scoring manual is available from the author.)

Validation Study

The subjects in the initial validation study (Bar-Yam Hassan, 1988,1989) were 30 married females and 30 married males, drawn from a larger sample of young adults participating in White et al.'s (1986) combined cross-sectional/longitudinal study of family relationships. First year (1979) and third year (1981) interview regarding the subjects' closest relationships with individuals of the same and opposite gender were scored independently for stage of interpersonal development.

Interscorer reliability between three scorers ranged from r= .80 to r= .95, with an average of r= .87. Interpersonal Development scores ranged from the Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence stage to the Interdependence vs. Interpersonal Constriction stage. The modal score was in the Affiliation vs. Exclusion stage. The mean in the first year was in the transition between Affiliation and Belongingness stages, while in the third year the mean was slightly higher.

Data were gathered regarding various aspects of construct validation, including: substantive validity; convergent validity; and developmental sequentiality. Initial evidence for substantive validity was found in the high interscorer reliability of the measure (average $r= .87$). In addition, no significant gender differences were found in interpersonal development, which further testifies to the coherence of the constructs for both genders.

Results regarding convergent validity were mixed. No significant relationship was found between Interpersonal Development and ego development (WUSCT, Loevinger & Wessler, 1970). A significant positive relationship was found between Interpersonal Development and White et al.'s (1986) Intimacy Maturity Scale ($r= .37$ & $.40$, $p< .01$), particularly for those subjects who showed successful interpersonal development ($r= .69$ & $.66$, $p< .001$). A positive relationship was found for young men ($r= .54$, $p< .001$), but not for women, between Interpersonal Development and Speisman et al.'s (1983) measure of identity development.

Longitudinal analysis evaluating the relationship between initial Interpersonal Development and status after two years, provided support for the developmental sequentiality of Interpersonal Development stages. Significant positive correlations between first and third year interpersonal development scores (total $r= .69$, men $r=.65$, women $r= .74$, $p< .001$) showed stability in relative rank ordering in interpersonal development. Chi-squares showed that significantly more subjects progressed (57%) than expected by chance ($p< .001$), while only a small number regressed ($n=9$). Moreover, 71% of the subjects in the third year scored within a half stage of their first year scores.

These results testify to the stability of relative rank ordering in interpersonal development over time, and suggest that, on the average, interpersonal development progresses in a relatively steady and linear manner. However, some subjects showed major gains and losses over this two year period (16% moved more than one stage), and this high degree of movement raised interesting questions regarding mechanisms of change.

The present study examined in more depth the qualitative nature and process of interpersonal development in young adulthood. Questions were raised regarding the characteristics of interpersonal development in young adults, both cross-sectionally and longitudinally, as well as the factors which may contribute to change in interpersonal development over time.

The results of the qualitiative analysis suggested that progression was associated with the negotiation of qualitative changes in relationships and with adequate interpersonal need satisfaction. Those subjects who progressed significantly over time did so in the context of negotiating their close relationships, which in turn, impacted on their interpersonal development. Close interaction often challenged subjects to view themselves and their relationships in new ways, which at times propelled their interpersonal development. For example, subjects who were initially fused in affiliative relationships, were confronted over time by differences within their relationships, thereby facilitating a more individuated awareness of themselves and significant others. Subjects who initially showed more individuated awareness seemed to grow through their relationships and deepening of intimacy. This process is evident in one subject's description of the changes in his relationship: "the interesting areas where we are both growing is that we've realized how we are as people and where our goals are different. We're independent in that we do have separate interests, but now we're actively taking an interest in what each other is doing."

In addition, interpersonal need satisfaction seemed to play an important role in developmental change, although in a complex manner. Adequate interpersonal need satisfaction was associated with consolidation of interpersonal development, while some dissatisfaction with the next higher stage needs appeared to be important in propelling movement. Subjects whose relationships met the challenge of their changing interpersonal needs, seemed to progress more effectively, than subjects whose needs were frustrated consistently in their relationships. Moreover, it appeared that as lower stage needs were met, subjects could then move to higher stage awareness and needs, although with some discomfort in the transition prior to satisfaction and consolidation. Thus, both the negotiation of close interaction with others and the degree of need satisfaction within relationships seem to play important roles in interpersonal development.

The results generally support a developmental conception of interpersonal relatedness in young adulthood as involving a progressive sequence of transformations in the qualitative nature of interpersonal relationships. Young adults appear to negotiate a sequence of developmental tasks in their interpersonal relatedness, which contribute to the development of more mature forms of intimacy and interdependence. This developmental process is affected by the qualitative nature of relationships, the degree to which interpersonal needs are challenged and met, and the negotiation of the balance between each new form of connectedness and its counterpoint form of estrangement.

STAGES OF INTERPERSONAL DEVELOPMENT ACROSS THE LIFE SPAN

Ages	Erikson's Stages (1950,1968)	Interpersonal Development Stages*	Interpersonal Needs
Infancy	Trust vs. Mistrust	Incorporative Bonding vs. Withdrawal	Need for Responsiveness
Toddler Age	Autonomy vs. Shame, Doubt	Secure Attachment vs. Fear of Abandonment	Need for Acceptance
Preschool Age	Initiative vs. Guilt	Interactive Association vs. Egocentric Disregard	Need for Attention
School Age	Industry vs. Inferiority	Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence	Need for Approval
Early Adolescence	(affiliation vs. abandonment Kegan, 1982)	Affiliation vs. Exclusion	Need for Affiliation
Late Adolescence to Young Adulthood	Identity vs. Role Confusion	Belonging vs. Alienation	Need for Belongingness
Young to Middle Adulthood	Intimacy vs. Isolation	Intimacy vs. Isolation	Need for intimacy (Mutuality)
Middle Adulthood	Generativity vs. Stagnation	Interdependence vs. Interpersonal Constriction	Need for Reciprocity
Old Age	Integrity vs. Despair	Interpersonal Acceptance vs. Relational Distress	Need for Companionship

* For a full description of these stages see: Bar-Yam Hassan, A. & Bar-Yam, M. (1987). Interpersonal development across the life span: Communion and its interaction with agency in psychosocial development. In J. A. Meacham (Ed.), *Contributions to Human Development*, vol. 18: *Interpersonal Relations: Family, Peers, Friends.* pg. 102-128

STAGES OF INTERPERSONAL DEVELOPMENT IN YOUNG ADULTHOOD

Social Relatedness vs. Self-Insistence   **Need for Approval**

Relationships are essentially self-serving and concrete and others are viewed as neccessary for taking care of my needs.

Social Relatedness = cooperation for self-benefit - to obtain concrete goals or psychological rewards (i.e., approval and liking).

Self-Insistence = manipulative exploitation and disregard for others.

Affiliation vs. Exclusion   **Need for Affiliation**

Relationships are dominated by an anxious, conformity-oriented need for social approval and acceptance.

Affiliation = relationships are characterized by a high investment in similarity, conformity, identity fusion, and the use of consensual validation.

Exclusion = social rejection - experienced as devastating to the self contributing to persistent social anxiety and low self-esteem.

Belonging vs. Alienation   **Need for Belongingness**

Relationships are more differentiated and complex, reflecting a more clearly individuated sense of self in connection with others.

Belonging = relationships reflect an active choice to belong to reference groups, roles, and institutions which support the sense of self.

Alienation = emerging sense of self does not fit in - self experienced as unacceptable, interpersonal distancing, estrangement and anomie.

Intimacy vs. Isolation   **Need for Intimacy**

Relationships reflect a need for deeper personal sharing, intimate connection, and mutuality in coordinating dependency and autonomy.

Intimacy = deeper involvement in communication, mutual concern, respect, support, and responsibility.

Isolation = lack of deeper sharing and mutuality leads to a sense of personal isolation, loneliness, and meaninglessness.

Interdependence vs. Interpersonal   **Need for Reciprocity**
        Constriction

Relationships reflect a need for reciprocity and an appreciation of dynamic and complex interrelatedness. Awareness of the need to balance multiplicity.

Interdependence = active social participation based on a full awareness of both distinct, unique individuality and interpersonal connectedness.

Interpersonal Constriction = lack of reciprocity, decline in connectedness, social estrangement, and interpersonal impoverishment.

References

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Bar-Yam Hassan, A. & Bar-Yam, M. (1987). Interpersonal development across the life span: Communion and its interaction with agency in psychosocial development. In J. A. Meacham (Ed.), *Contributions to Human Development,* vol. 18: *Interpersonal Relations: Family, Peers, Friends.* p. 102-128.

Bar-Yam Hassan, A. (1988). Interpersonal development in young adulthood. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Boston University.

Bar-Yam Hassan, A. (1989). Beyond Erikson: Stages of interpersonal development and their manifestation in young adulthood. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association. Spring, 1989. Boston, MA.

Erikson, E. H. (1950). *Childhood and society*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Erikson, E. H. (1968). *Identity: Youth and crisis*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Franz, C. E., & White, K. M. (1985). Individuation and attachment in personality development: extending Erikson's theory. *Journal of Personality,* 53, 224-256

Loevinger, J., & Wessler, R., (1970). *Measuring ego development: Volume 1*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Speisman, J. C., White, K. M., Costos, D., Houlihan, J., & Imbasciati, C. (1983). Paper presented at the American Psychological Association meetings, Anaheim, California.

White, K. M., Speisman, J. C., Jackson, D., Bartis, S., & Costos, D. (1986). Intimacy maturity and its correlates in young married couples. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 50, 152-162.