Developmental Analysis of Autogenetic Frameworks of Interpersonal Agency

Nancy Nordmann
National Louis University

Previously reported research produced an autogenetic model of interpersonal agency and provided confirmatory support for the model. The model consists of paradigms and frameworks of interpersonal agency that share features with developmental levels and stages of models of social development. It was the purpose of the research being reported here to test the hypothesis that the autogenetic model paradigms and frameworks demonstrate a developmental relationship to one another. To this end, interviews were conducted with 16 undergraduates at a private, residential college seeking to determine both current autogenetic functioning and the autogenetic functioning toward which they may be tending. Examples are provided from a qualitative analysis of each interview that identify the current autogenetic framework being utilized and frameworks toward which the students are directing their attention. In the majority of cases the framework to which the students are attending is 1 framework beyond the framework currently being utilized, as would be predicted if the autogenetic frameworks are developmentally related. The hypothesis that the autogenetic model fits the requirements of a social developmental model is supported.

Keywords: autogenetic, interpersonal agency, interpersonal development, social development

Previously reported research resulted in a model of interpersonal agency denoted as autogenetic (Nordmann, 2014, 2016). The research from which the autogenetic model of interpersonal agency emerged occurred in two parts. The first part involved an investigation of the relationship of life satisfaction and personality utilizing a sample of 285 men and women 40–80 years of age who were given the Life Satisfaction Index (LSI; Neugarten, Havighurst, & Tobin, 1961) and 19 personality measures. The Interpersonal Adjective Checklist (ICL) personality measure, scored for dominance (Leary, 1957), proved to be the best predictor of life satisfaction.

The second part of the research from which the model of interpersonal agency emerged involved investigation of the correlation between LSI ratings of life satisfaction and ICL dominance ratings found in the first part of the research. Twenty-seven male subjects from the original sample were chosen for an open-ended life interview to examine this relationship. The analysis of the interviews suggested that dominance as measured by the ICL reflects a sequence of paradigms of increasing interpersonal agency, denoted as autogenetic, and that the negative and positive LSI ratings are associated with a negative and positive autogenetic framework within each paradigm. The negative LSI ratings are associated with interpersonal agency privileging others and the positive LSI ratings are associated with interpersonal agency privileging the self. The autogenetic model that emerged from this research describes a sequence of paradigms representing a range of increasing complexity and adequacy of interpersonal agentic functioning, and within the paradigms, frameworks of negative and positive agentic functioning.

This sequence of interpersonal agency that emerged from the previously reported research

on life satisfaction is conceptually compatible with descriptions of social developmental sequences originally described by Kohlberg (1969) in the area of moral reasoning, Loevinger (1976) in the area of ego development (Hauser, 1976; Hy, 1996), Selman (Yeates, Schultz, & Selman, 1991) in the area of interpersonal negotiation and Noam (1990) in the area of developmental psychopathology (Borst, Noam, & Bartok, 1991; Wren, Edelstein, & Nunner-Winkler, 1990). The autogenetic model of interpersonal agency adds another area of social development to these areas of moral reasoning, ego development, interpersonal negotiation, and developmental psychopathology. Additionally, the interpersonal stances and behaviors associated with the various autogenetic levels of interpersonal agency can support observations in these and other related areas of social development and provide additional approaches to enhance development in these areas.

The Autogenetic Coding Manual that resulted from the qualitative analyses of the original interviews from which the autogenetic model of interpersonal agency emerged is presented in the Appendix. This manual is used to code the interviews of the young adults in the developmental analysis of the autogenetic paradigms of interpersonal agency that is the subject of this report.

The autogenetic model of interpersonal agency (Nordmann, 2014, 2016) provides that an individual's approach to interpersonal interaction is guided by a sequence of seven opposed frameworks of viewing and dealing with interpersonal relations as a social agent. These pairs of frameworks constitute paradigms, working models or stages that both account for an individual's perception of agency in interpersonal relations and describe the individual's interpersonal agentic behavior. These guiding hypotheses or working models are subject to revision as a result of lengthy subsequent interpersonal experience. The opposed positions regarding interpersonal agentic perception and behavior are as follows. The seven pairs of frameworks are preceded by the agentic interpersonal orientation and practice of uninvolvement and followed by the agentic interpersonal orientation and practice of personal autonomy coupled with responsiveness to others.

The seven intervening pairs of frameworks involve the practice of

I. Acceptance toward others/rebellion toward others;
II. Necessity toward others, conforming/escape from others;
III. Self-limitation (choosing to limit one's interpersonal agency/choosing a limited interpersonal situation);
IV. Manipulation of others/opportunism toward others;
V. Partnerships with others (single-handed effort/balanced effort);
VI. Working within systems of relations with others (determining parameters of systems of individual needs/aware of systems' parameter limitations);
VII. Independence in relation to dependents (limiting dependents/informing dependents).

The interpersonal paradigms represented by pairs of frames as illustrated in Table 1 proceed from personal passivity and reactivity in relation to others to personal activity and proactivity in relation to others. The thought encompassed by these paradigms proceeds from global, less differentiated expressions of relations with others to more complex and differentiated expressions and from more concrete to abstract reasoning. In addition, the sphere of relations represented by these paradigms expands across the range of the paradigms. These features of increasing complexity and abstraction and expanding spheres of involvement are compatible with the view that these paradigms represent a developmental sequence.

The term *autogenetic* refers to the self genesis and transformation of interpersonal agency. Interpersonal agency is the constant that undergoes transformation in the autogenetic process. This process is described through the sequence of autogenetic paradigms assumed to be developmental. The autogenetic paradigms are expressions of an individual's increasingly complex resolutions of the tension between independence and community that is experienced in being interpersonally agentic in Western culture. This tension has been observed for some time in Western culture (Freud, 1963; Rank, 1929, 1945; Angyal, 1941, 1951; Bakan, 1966, 1968, 1971), with independence receiving

Table 1
Pairs of Autogenetic Frameworks With Paradigms Indicated

	Isolation[a]	
Uninvolved	↓	
	Reaction[a]	
	Paradigm 1	
Accepting	→	Rebelling
	↓	
	Paradigm 2	
Conforming by necessity	→	Escaping
	↓	
	Paradigm 3	
Self-limiting/stinting	→	Choosing limited environment
	↓	
	Interaction[a]	
	Paradigm 4	
Manipulation	→	Opportunism
	↓	
	Paradigm 5	
Unbalanced partnership	→	Balancing partnership
	↓	
	Proactive[a]	
	Paradigm 6	
Determining system constituents	→	Managing system constituents
	↓	
	Paradigm 7	
Independent and directing dependents	→	Independent and informing dependents
	↓	
	Integrated[a]	
	→	Independent and responsive to others

[a] Category of framework engagement of self with others.

particular emphasis in U.S. culture (Kitayama & Cohen, 2007; Markus & Kitayama, 1991; Triandis, 2001).

The autogenetic process appears to proceed through frameworks in which interpersonal agency alternates between focus on others and focus on the self. The frameworks constitute paradigms which comprise the autogenetic sequence. Within each paradigm there is a framework representing dissatisfaction when focusing on others and one representing satisfaction when focusing on the self. Successful transition between the pairs of frameworks leads to an agentically more elaborated paradigm of frameworks. The sequence of paradigms proceeds from agentic uninvolvement to interpersonal agency experienced and expressed as both independent and responsive.

Interviews are conducted with 16 college-age students to test the hypothesis that the autogenetic model demonstrates a prominent feature of developmental models, namely, that guiding conceptions and behavior can be observed as proceeding toward greater elaboration of the feature under development, in this case, interpersonal agency.

Method

Participants

Six male and 10 female undergraduate students attending a private residential college enrolled in a course on interpersonal development volunteered to be interviewed concerning interpersonal relations. The interview was unrelated to course content covered at the time and no credit was earned as a result of participation in the interview.

Procedure

During the course of a largely unstructured interview on the theme of interpersonal relations, the students were asked to describe instances of interpersonal relations that bother

them, to describe how their response to such instances may have differed previously, and to present an instance of an interpersonal response which has caught their attention but which they have not tried or may be reluctant to try.

The autogenetic framework currently being utilized by the student was identified by probing the instances described as bothersome and previous responses to such instances and coding these within the model as specified by the Autogenetic Coding Manual (see the Appendix). The framework cited by each interviewee as observed, but as yet not utilized, was also coded for autogenetic framework as specified by the Autogenetic Coding Manual (see the Appendix).

The current framework of autogenetic functioning was compared with the autogenetic framework that caught each student's attention but had not been utilized. The current framework and the anticipated framework for each student were positioned on the autogenetic model of frameworks to observe (a) to what extent current frameworks and anticipated frameworks give evidence of being closely related, and (b) if the relationship is in the hypothesized direction of greater complexity of the anticipated interview findings.

Results

The 16 students interviewed represent autogenetic functioning across the first 13 of the 16 autogenetic frameworks. Autogenetic functioning in the initial three quarters of the autogenetic sequence among young, college-age adults is consistent with viewing interpersonal paradigms as a developmental sequence spanning the adult life cycle. It would not be expected that young adults would express interpersonally agentic frameworks that include independence and agentic behavior toward dependents. These frameworks and the framework of integration of personal independence and responsiveness to others constitute the majority of the upper quarter of the autogenetic sequence.

Results of the interviews are reported incorporating student narratives and in the order of increasing complexity of autogenetic frameworks used by the students. Additionally, the autogenetic functioning to which each student was attending, but had not yet utilized, is reported. For reporting purposes, the names of the students have been changed. The reports consist of the wording the students used to the closest extent possible.

Uninvolved (One Student)

Sean reports being Asian/Caucasian raised with the Asian side of the family and that his world consisted primarily of relatives. He moved seven times in 14 years. It was not until fourth grade that he spent more than 1 year in the same school. He was tall and lanky, wore glasses, and was brainy. He was fun loving until 4 years of age, after which he became very shy. He reports having become very solitary and does not make many friends. He expects little of people and idealizes the possibility of friends as friends forever. He reports being self-enclosed and sees himself as an outsider. He does not want to change people or dictate to them. If he gets in over his head, he experiences helplessness and retreats back into himself. He wants to keep his life "really simple" and not too complicated and this he says directly reflects his relationships with others. He says he kind of takes things as they come, wants to enjoy life, whereby to maintain his motivation. There is some reference to acceptance, but Sean's firm description of his interpersonal agency is that of uninvolvement.

Sean responds that nothing comes to mind in terms of interpersonal relations that has caught his attention. He did not complete the quarter. His advisor implied this to be the result of personal problems to which he succumbed.

Sean gives evidence of uninvolvement in terms of interpersonal agency and going forward demonstrates further regression into uninvolvement. Sean's experience suggests that isolation as a lack of interpersonal agency is difficult to overcome.

Acceptance (Two Students)

Trudy reports having been seriously involved in athletics since she was young and getting hurt at some point. She continued sports despite her parents' strong desire that she not do so. As with close friends she feels she could express her point of view as they will be in her life forever. Her main concern is to be happy. She functions on her own a lot. She will be nice to anyone. She has a lot of acquaintances and a few close friends. She reports the friendships

just sort of happen. She will do anything for her friends, but expects nothing of them. She feels able and influential, although she is not interested in influencing others. She likes stability and peacefulness. Nonetheless, she sometimes likes to say things that shock people and sometimes she feels rebellious. She likes the feeling that comes with being rebellious.

Trudy gives evidence of functioning autogenetically as accepting in that she accepts her friends and expects nothing from them and friendship just happens, will last forever, and is not agentically of her making or maintained by her. She describes movement toward rebellion, experienced as agentic, which is the framework following acceptance.

David reports growing up in a Korean family with two older sisters. His father was strict and physically punished him, which he reports he still does. He moved into a house in a middle-class White neighborhood when he was 7. He did not quite understand the situation there, but thinks that for the first time he was experiencing discrimination of some kind. His high school was not very good and he did not take studying seriously, but he had some friends who were just there. He became involved in the youth group at his Christian church and had friends there. As a result of the contrast between the two situations he oriented toward the church friends who were inspired by a young youth director who engaged the group and with whom he had a good relationship and experienced a big change. The church fired the youth director after about 6 months for not being conservative enough. David was hurt and both he and the group declined functionally. He tends to be easily persuaded and to be the passive toward the dominant person. He reports having about four friends in college whom people say are immature because they like to play with kid-type toys like transformers and to wrestle. They live on the same floor and none of them know very many other people. He reports no interest in finding a girlfriend. He just has friends, not a close person. Finding someone does not appeal to him, going through the hassle and confusion. He would like to have someone to just "kinda" talk over things with other than someone he has to worry about. Perhaps in future if he feels repressed he might lash out, but so far he has shown no indication of rebellious behavior, only playing off rather than being serious.

David evidences functioning autogenetically as accepting in that he is passive and has what he calls "just friends." He does not want a close friend as that would involve hassle and having to worry about someone. These feelings can be seen as representative of the framework uninvolved; however, David does not appear to be expressing a desire not to be bothered or uninvolved generally, only a desire to keep things simple. Also, he has real interactions with friends rather than fantasized or idealized interactions and enjoys the childlike play in which they engage. There is no sense of lack of involvement, but rather of acceptance of a simple status quo. He indicates circumstances that could lead to rebellion on his part. Rebellion is the framework following acceptance.

Conforming (Two Students)

Sally reports having gone to a girls' school from sixth grade on and talks to her mother every day sharing all her personal experiences with her. Her mother went through a hormonal imbalance when Sally was young and Sally did not get much unconditional love or caring. The two of them have gone through therapy. As a result, she constantly searched for approval. She does not like people who hurt other people or use other people and tries to keep those people out who do not do what they should do. She does not like levels. She just wants everyone to be equal. Making other people happy makes her happy. She reports doing what she has to do, but because she wants to. She notes if in a position where someone might get hurt, let them know and that it is not intentional, that you really do not have a choice.

What has caught Sally's attention is the behavior of a friend who does what she wants to do rather than what she has to do, like go dancing rather than do her biology homework.

Sally gives evidence of functioning autogenetically as conforming, whereby she does what has to be done and expresses having to do things because you do not have a choice. What has caught her attention are those who do what they want to do instead of what they should do which represents the framework of escape, the framework following conforming.

John reports having a father with high expectations for him. He never really had a say. He was doing things his father wanted him to do.

Now he does what his father wants him to do, work hard, because it is right. He grew up in a working-class neighborhood but moved in high school. He did not get along with people in his high school because they were snobby. In high school he rebelled and did not work hard. When he was younger he was nonconfrontational and easygoing. Generally, he was friendly and shy and the nondominant one in relationships. He likes people who are open-minded, who just accept views and are different from him. He does not like people who follow the rules and do what people expect them to do. He likes things that are just crazy and mysterious. He would like to meet someone like the character Neal Cassidy in *On the Road* by Jack Kerouac. Just watching him or listening to him would be exciting. He would like to be like him, do whatever you want, fly off, go at any moment, and have no cares or worries, just live life looking for kicks.

John evidences having moved autogenetically from accepting to rebellion to conforming, whereby he still does what his father wants him to do, but now because it is right. He would like to escape to a life of doing whatever you want and looking for kicks. Escape is the framework following conforming.

Escape (One Student)

Matthew reports problems with his family and himself. They are not communicating, just yelling in general directions at each other. He has been in college for 5 years and summer school every year and has not come to a conclusion about what he wants to do. His parents want him to be a professional. He is stir-crazy and wants and dreams of driving around the country. He feels owned by his parents who pay for everything. He feels his years in school have not helped him academically. In high school he did not have any close friends and in his freshman year in college he did not go to classes and just hung out with different people. He was suspended and sent home for a quarter which made him more indecisive and less confident. What he has to show for college are all the people he has known. He was in two relationships in college over four of the years and they did not end well. He is not interested in and does not have anyone now to depend on. When getting to know people it ends and they are gone. He puts trust in his friends although their faces change and he does a lot of driving around in the car with them. He has finagled staying in school. He spends most of his time at another private residential college in the vicinity involved with Asian American issues. He does not want to go home after graduation or be in this area of the country. He complains of never having gotten to go on spring break. But he has taken brief trips during the year to Toronto and the Mall of America. His friends see this as escapist jaunts and do not want to go with him. He views his parents as personally oppressive and the school administration as bureaucratically oppressive; however, they represent a system in which he can maneuver. He sees dealing with them as avoiding trouble.

In terms of other approaches that have caught his attention he notes that other people kind of go through the steps though it is not what they want to do. He reports that they say, "I just don't want to do this, but I am gonna go do it." He envies a friend who is going to law school after graduation who likes the idea of getting into law school, and even though she does not want to go through the motions, she is going to.

Matthew evidences functioning autogenetically in terms of escape. Escape features in most every aspect of his life. Another way of functioning that has caught his attention and he envies is choosing to limit oneself by stinting, characterized by going through the motions even though one does not want to. Limiting oneself is one framework beyond escape.

Choosing to Limit Oneself (One Student)

Lynette reports her parents divorcing 7 years previously which bothered her at the time because her father started dating someone. When younger she attended a lot of different schools and that affected her a lot. She was obedient and fit in everywhere she went and made a lot of friends. She had always done what her mother said, but in he early teen years she was rebelling and was not doing well in school. Her parents sent her to Puerto Rico to live with an aunt. The culture and the household were very strict with girls and that experience changed her. Her mother and she are very much alike and demanding. She cannot be as vocal or as rebellious as her mother, although she has been known to fight and fight, if she thinks she is

right. It bothers her that her boyfriend is not considerate of her feelings. She compromises or just blows it off and apologizes even though she feels she has done nothing wrong. She does not like leaving an argument unless it is resolved. She does not want to keep fighting or not ever see the person or have the person out of her life. Lynette wishes she were strong enough to say I do not need you anymore and I am not going to let you do this to me anymore, or I do not have time for that. Instead of dealing with her own things, however, she feels bad for the person, or gives in or does what she wants to do later. She knows she needs to do certain things, but does not because she is being held back in a certain way. She feels she should be doing something but she does not because maybe someone needs her. She feels she should be there for people. She experiences this as being needy herself or dependent on them.

A person whose approach to interpersonal relations she admires, but does not know if it is the best approach, is strong in a way that she herself is weak. If someone does something wrong to this person, this person will close them off and it does not bother her.

Lynette evidences self-limitation in that autogenetically she limits what she wants to do in order to be attentive to someone else who might need her. She admires those who choose to limit their environment by closing people off with whom they are having problems. Choosing to limit the environment is one framework beyond self-limitation.

Choosing a Limited Environment (One Student)

Celestine reports her parents are wonderfully happy together, but there are huge chunks of each that they do not deal with. She sees everyone as in their own sort of world. In grammar school she dressed girly, was proper, conservative, listened to classical music, read all the great books, and was proud of it and liked her life. In high school she knew she was bright but played it down publicly to get along. She deliberately suppressed herself and deliberately put on a façade. She thinks it is curious that some people try to force their views on others. She thinks that is authoritarian and she avoids them. This is not a situation she wants to be in. She can recognize from prior experience that this is

not a good situation for her, that she will get upset or angry and does not want to.

The interpersonal behavior that has caught her attention and that she wishes she could do is go up to someone else and say, "Hi, how're you doing, my name is so-and-so, what're you doing here?" She usually characterizes these types of people superficially as sort of ditzy or random, running around, hyperactive.

Celestine evidences autogenetic limiting of her environment in that she knows what kinds of situations and people upset her and avoids them. She also sees everyone as in their own worlds. She would like to initiate superficial interaction with others, which may be categorized as manipulative, but certainly can be categorized as a first attempt at interaction, the initial category of engagement with others, into which manipulation falls. Manipulation is one framework beyond limiting the environment.

Manipulation (Two Students)

June reports being Korean and having overprotective parents. She went to school in Korea in first grade. Her mother is a teacher and she is very close to her and studies hard to please her. As a teacher's daughter she can do no wrong. Her mom instilled the work ethic. Her father has a bad temper and so does her mother and she cared about keeping peace in the family. She has a lot of ill feelings for her dad, but appreciates the immigrant sacrifices her parents have made for her. In high school she did not have very many friends because a lot of people disappoint her. She enjoyed her first year of college when she had two best friends. But now she has only one best friend, her boyfriend. In her relationships she struggles with dependency. She wants attention and strives to get it, but she does not want to lose herself or her independence. She takes on a club role because she likes to feel she is doing something important and she likes knowing what is going on. She is torn between continuing and quitting as a result of stress to be fully in control. She has been in turmoil about all of her relationships for her final 3 years of college. She does not believe in friends forever anymore because it seems circumstances get in the way, but she still hopes for that. She reports having no values anymore. She feels her life used to be pretty set. But the American dream scares her, it is like a formula.

She feels guilt about a guy she is not very close to, but she wants to put him on the council next year because he has a car and she could really use it.

What would be of interest to her in an interpersonal approach is having an older sibling or someone older to push her burdens off on. People she has counted on for bigger roles have let her down. She is learning not to expect so much from people and that you cannot change them.

June evidences struggling with dependency and her disappointment with others characteristic of functioning within the autogenetic framework of manipulation. She provides an example of conscious manipulation toward someone with a car to which she would like access. She is beginning to recognize she cannot change people which is necessary to view relationships opportunistically and be receptive to the opportunities they may present. Opportunism is one framework beyond manipulation.

Leon reports his mother being a librarian. He blames his parents for not letting him play in the high school band, but eventually accepted it. He wrote poems to deal with how he felt let down by his parents. He once punched his dad for trying to take a vest off him that his dad did not want him to wear. His parents finally backed off. In his teen years he became more idealistic, loved everyone, and tried to help everyone out. He read books, watched TV, and tried out different personalities and found ones that people responded well to. He became a conglomeration of sayings of literary and TV characters. He began to realize he had to take care of himself and not be so generous. He is disappointed with friends who are not trustworthy, who do not come through on their word. He does not deserve this and takes it personally. And he does not like when people ramble on when they are talking to him when he obviously is not paying attention to them. And he hates general things like racism and homophobia. He has two or three close friends. Their actions determine the type of actions from him. He used to try to change people but it takes a lot of energy. Finding people who did not give 2 cents for him brought him to this feeling.

The interpersonal approach he has noticed and that has an appeal took place a couple of weeks ago. He was shy and he thought people he was attracted to would get some kind of clue and come up to him and introduce themselves

and he would not have to worry about anything, things would go fine. It did not happen so he decided he was going to have to go out and get what he wants.

Leon evidences the characteristics of autogenetic manipulation of being disappointed by others and wanting to change them. He has begun to realize that he needs to take care of himself and go out and get what he wants. He will then be in the position of not needing help from others and as such he will begin to be able to experience help from a position of opportunism. Opportunism is representative of one framework beyond manipulation.

Opportunism (One Student)

Katrina grew up in a military family which was called a gypsy family because the two parents and four kids were very disorganized, always arriving an hour late. She has lied to her parents to keep from rocking the boat, but never been deceitful. And when they found out that she lied, they were not mad, which surprised her. She stopped lying when on one occasion she felt her parents no longer trusted her, which blew her away. Phoniness bothers her. Being a friend is something more than hanging out together. Phoniness is just not being honest to certain degrees. Trying to present yourself in a way that you really are not. It is like trying to figure out could I be that kind of person. You have to get out and make an effort to find friends. She has had a best friend in her home town since seventh grade. In high school she had several really close friends. She did not have to work on it. She reports having two friends in college who are in serious relationships as is she. They are graduating this year and are discussing whether to carry the relationships over past graduation or not. Maybe there is something better out there, she thinks. In all her relationships there are more questions than answers. This is true for her parental relationship as well, whether to go home or get a job where she is. She is waiting for divine inspiration to come down and tell her what she should be doing. She wishes she could be a student forever without having to do the work, just doing the living thing.

The interpersonal approach that catches her attention is her mom's approach. She wants to be like her mom who remains herself with

whomever she deals, is always true and honest with herself, and does not compromise herself in order to make things easier for people. She never sinks down to people's level, whereas Katrina compromises herself rather than make an issue.

Katrina evidences opportunism in her thoughts regarding decisions about her future such as there might be something better in the way of a relationship than the one she has now and waiting for divine inspiration to tell her what to do. She dismisses and expresses a thorough distaste for the previous autogenetic framework manipulation, taken as dishonesty in representing yourself. What appeals to her autogenetically is involvement with others in which she is solidly herself and does not compromise herself, a feature indicative of the framework of maintaining a single-handed effort in partnerships which is one framework beyond opportunism.

Single-Handed Effort in Partnership (Two Students)

Janie reports [first part of tape could not be transcribed] being picked on a lot when little. She went to private school until fourth grade when she went to public school because she wanted to know people in her neighborhood. Being picked on did not bother her because she had a best friend beginning around first grade who was two or three grades ahead of her who gave her good advice. When she went to public school she had a cousin in the same grade who helped. She always had someone older in the wings to say everything was ok. She had a little brother whom she loved as a baby and loves younger children in general. Later she intimidated him and manipulated him. She has trouble saying what she intends to say to people. With her previous boyfriend she did not talk to him to much. She talked to him about problems, but never about problems between the two of them. She is working on this.

Going forward Janie reports one of the major things that she is trying to work on in herself is expressing herself better.

Janie gives evidence of a single-handed effort in partnership with her boyfriend, whereby she does not speak up, and of working on speaking up, which is indicative of managing partnership.

Managing partnership is one framework beyond single-handed partnership.

Jeanie reports being really mad at her parents for a long time and blaming them for a lot. She is not angry anymore and does not get mad at them anymore. She used to think her parents owed her for what they put her through. Her father called the shots while her mother passively brought in the money by owning a pharmacy. She has a sister 4 years younger. She has broken up with her boyfriend because the relationship is not equal, and somebody is expected to give more or less. She says she tends to get into relationships like that. It comes from her father who dominated the family. She is very accommodating. She does her own thing and goes along. She takes on the other person's goals as her goals. She fixes things. She thinks she should get a little bit her way. Feels one person should not decide what that person and the other likes. She sees herself progressing in setting limits. She feels you have to have communication.

An approach that has caught her attention is that of a friend who is very confrontational. She is very outspoken. Jeanie is awful at confrontation and finds it scary to attempt. She envies her friend not being afraid to say what she is thinking to the other person.

Jeanie evidences autogenetically single-handed effort in partnership in that she does her own thing, goes along, takes on the other person's goals, and fixes things. She admires being able to speak up, which is indicative of managing partnership. Managing partnership is one framework beyond single-handed effort in partnership.

Balanced Partnership (One Student)

May reports her mother and father became divorced and she spent most of her childhood with her mother and did what she was supposed to do. She has gotten to know her father in college and feels in a way that she had been brainwashed as a child. She no longer wants to take sides in a situation with anyone. Now she wants to get the full picture before she makes a judgment. Her brother was thought to be perfect. So she did everything the opposite to him. She also tried to sidetrack him from studying to get him to play with her, sometimes by threatening to disorder his belongings. When he went

away to boarding school she found she liked having him around and began to do the kinds of responsible things that he did. She used to be a good girl but realized that people liked her for the wrong reason so gave that up. In high school she thought she had the right to be self-centered because she had to go through so much trouble in life. In college she volunteered with handicapped people and realized that her family was not perfect but she did not get kicked down stairs and ceased to be self-centered. It bothers her that professors demand a paper on short notice and will not accept late papers and then do not grade it for weeks. If they expect her to do this, she expects them to do that. She also thinks it is important how hard you go about something. She expresses concern that relationships between professors and students and coaches and athletes not be of a master–servant type. She notes regarding a relationship she is in with a friend that she wants it to be understood that she has her stuff and priorities and needs to be appreciated. She sees the world not as a whole, giant tree, but more like a garden.

May is not attracted to a person evidencing a particular interpersonal approach. She thinks in terms of biological/ecological thinking where you look at the whole ecology and see how things play against each other. She does not like hierarchical models. She is interested in models that are more inclusive of culture. She would like to think of how to put her view of interpersonal development into some kind of model and it would be complex.

May evidences the autogenetic framework of managing balance in partnership in her expression of reciprocity in student/professor and athlete/coach relationships and in letting her friend know that it needs to be understood that she has priorities and she needs to be appreciated. She indicates a desire to determine system constituents in developing a model of interpersonal development, which is one framework beyond balanced or managed partnerships.

Constituents of System (One Student)

Earnest reports having a fraternal twin brother and going to different schools for the first time during college. They are best friends and the person he gets along best with in his family. They are very competitive with each other, his brother in sports and he in academics, but there is no ill will. He can tell him anything. His parents have been really good to them and they have had a pretty easy life. He has a sister 3 years older with whom he is not that close. He tells her things he wants her to break gently to his parents. He came to respect her as an intelligent person after she graduated cum laude from a good college and got into law school there. He thought she was just having fun in college. He wished he had known how intelligent she was earlier. The siblings are aloof from their father, a doctor. They have lived in the same house and neighborhood for 18 years during which time the father has worked as a psychiatrist at the same place. His father works all the time and his mother started working when he went to a private high school. He does not really know his parents, but knows what to expect from them and what they expect from him. He respects his parents. They lived 45 min from his parents' work and his school in the "boondocks" with no one around them. They had no neighbors or community around them. They did not go to church. They had each other which he has no problems with. He is the president of the Korean Undergraduate Club. The club has helped fill in the area of his Korean American identity. He tries to educate the members. However, the first-year members ask much harder questions than he asked and that he did not know existed. There are as many as 20 he talks to and most of the time he has not a clue regarding their thought process. He does not see himself as their mentor or himself as their apprentice, but they ask him questions or to set them in the right direction for which he does not know the answers. It is confusing. He constantly worries about these relationships. He does not know how to respond and he wants to know how and does not like it that he cannot. He asks others, finds no books on the topics, mulls the problems over, and tries to write about them and analyze them to no avail. He has a girlfriend he has been dating for 3 years and they are serious. He and his friends have been evaluating interpersonal relations and he thinks they are pretty healthy. He described a number of different categories of friendship.

The person who has caught his attention is his sister. He sees her as fiercely independent and as trying to guide him, which he appreciates but does not always understand.

Earnest evidences determining system constituents in his interpersonal engagement related to being president of the Korean Club in which there are a multiplicity of issues and needs he is unable to understand or address despite his attempts to do so. He admires autogenetic independence and directing dependents which his sister exhibits that is two frameworks beyond determining system constituents. One framework beyond determining system constituents is managing system constituents, which is not evidenced.

Managing System Constituents (One Student)

Sharon reports having had very good relations with people and lots of friends until 2 years ago when while at a college in New York City she got recruited into a cult. She is now at this college and in therapy. She was very open to new people and ideas. The cult took her idealism and openness and manipulated her equivalent to rape. It was a hierarchy of who was higher or lower and she is now sensitive to someone trying to control her or to who has the upper hand. She is bipolar and they had her stop taking her medication. Her dad went to a lot of people and she got out, but not many people do. They gave two lectures on family and morality at this college and she let the campus minister know about them. They get your phone numbers and then flatter you and take you to dinners and movies and seem normal and say they are international students and say nothing about religion for about 6 weeks. They talk about deeper relations with others which attracted her. They complemented her long hair and eventually she had to shave her head. She got 3 hr sleep a night and was hallucinating. She had to given them all her jewelry and clothes and $3,000 and sleep with eight others in a van. She suffered traumatic stress and panic attacks afterward. She is living with her parents and was full time at an art institute the previous semester. She used to manipulate her dad. She had also been a little rebellious in terms of her family and doing what she wanted to do. In adolescence their relationship became one of friendship. She is very close to her brother but despite arguments with her parents as a result of living with them, they get along pretty well. Her relationship with her brother is on different levels on different days as a result of her assessment of herself and him that day that informs the course

she takes. Her reaction toward people now is analytic instead of natural. She is realizing the different levels of friendship and not everything is black and white. She used to be more of an impulsive person, and now she is very logical, systematic, and structured in her thinking about everything. Her mother is emotional and impulsive and manipulative. Her father is more like if you have a problem, let's solve it. She reports becoming more similar to her dad.

Sharon evidences the autogenetic framework of management of system constituents in her relations with her brother, thinks in terms of levels of friendship with her friends, and generally takes a systematic approach to everything. She indicates attention to the framework of independence and informing dependents demonstrated by her advisor in her respectful behavior toward her daughter. Independence and informing dependents is two frameworks beyond managing system constituents. She also sees herself as becoming more similar to her father who evidences problem solving, a characteristic of the framework of independent and informing dependents.

Table 2 provides quotes reflective of each student's current autogenetic functioning and anticipated functioning.

Findings

Table 3 confirms the previously indicated observation regarding the autogenetic frameworks the 16 students are identified as utilizing. The frameworks and paradigms utilized do not cover the entire range of autogenetic frameworks as would be expected across a range, that if developmental, extends into adulthood. The students function from uninvolved autogenetically through the system paradigm. No students are identified as currently functioning in the independence and dependents paradigm or as integrated autogenetically.

The interviews for each student were analyzed for current autogenetic framework and anticipated framework to examine to what extent currently utilized frameworks and anticipated frameworks provide evidence of being closely related autogenetically and, if so, whether the relationship of the anticipated framework to the current framework is in the hypothesized direction forward in the sequence of frameworks.

Table 2
Examples of Student Autogenetic Reponses of Current and Anticipated Functioning

Uninvolved	
SEAN—"I've become very, very solitary, and I actually enjoy it, and you know, it's really reinforced me and made me a lot better and, and, you know, I don't, I don't blame anybody for it . . . I don't make very many friends . . . I never disagree with . . . any one of my friends . . . they will be my friends for life . . . I will go to almost any length to help them . . . out . . . I expect nothing of them nothing of them . . . I don't rely on anybody except myself . . . everybody I meet's just my friend."	
SEAN—Did not complete the quarter. His advisor reported that this was the result of personal problems to which he succumbed.	

Acceptance	Rebellion
TRUDY— "I function on my own a lot. I'm one of those people who has a lot of acquaintances . . . I like to be nice to everyone . . . and I have a small group of really close friends . . . I know that these are the people that will be there for me . . . it seems like people who I'm becoming very close friends with, it just sort of happens."	*TRUDY—"So I mean, sometimes I do feel rebellious and I like that feeling. It feels good to be rebellious sometimes . . . I guess it just makes me feel a little more confident about myself. The fact that I can rebel and, and get away with it, and then I guess it boosts my confidence a little maybe*
DAVID—"but, what I would prefer is more, like, helping, I guess. . . . Like, I'm gonna try to do, like, accept my, like, future life? But I mean, yeah."	*DAVID—"I don't know, maybe I'm a like, feeling, like repressed. I'll like, I don't know, lash out . . . but, I guess like, in the future when I'm thinking about is being repressed by maybe if I'm repressed my wife or my job, I guess. Maybe by a person. Maybe if my dad's still around. Even like, family or something. But. I don't know."*

Conforming by necessity	Escape
SALLY—"So I don't know if it's that they're not doing what they SHOULD do . . . I do what I have to do. . . . But I want to . . . It's not something that I like to look at as a choice, but it's not something that I hate either. "	*SALLY—"Sometimes, you know, you have your 'Bio homework. You don't want to do your Bio homework. You would much rather go dancing. But, you know, but you do it. Because— or at least, I do it . . . whereas she would just go ahead and go dancing and then beat herself up about it later. So, it's a different way of life."*
JOHN—"I never really had a say in part like a lot of times I was doing stuff that my dad wanted me to do . . . I was feeling all these, like, frustrations, I guess. Had all these expectations . . . I now try to do the things that he expects me to do because it is the right thing to do."	*JOHN—"I don't know how to say it, but if you ever read like. On the Road by Jack Kerouac, um, the character was Neal Cassidy. People like that, you know, they just, they're just into life."*
	MATTHEW—"What they don' t want me to do is actually what I want to and dream of, is I basically just need to drive around the country a little while . . . I don't think it's as big of a trauma as my friends believe, it seems—some of them will say, 'No, I don't want to go with you. You're going on one of your little escapist jaunts.'"

(table continues)

Table 2 (*continued*)

Choosing to self-limit/stinting	Choosing a limited environment
MATTHEW—*"I envy her like, like mad, but she's gonna go to law school next fall. And that just, that just gleams, well, it's sort of success, you know, and stuff and nice things. She, but she's so, she doesn't want to go through the motions. She likes the idea that she's in law school, but she's not really sure that she wants to, what she wants will be in law school."*	
LYNETTE—"I guess I compromise a lot? . . . I kinda just, sometimes blow it off, compromise, and try and work things out and try not to make it so that there's a lot of tension, I guess? . . . so I kind of compromise, I guess, my feelings . . . I don't hate doing it, but sometimes it does disturb me . . . "	LYNETTE—*"And, um, I don't know if it's the best way to approach things, but sometimes I, I kind of admire her for, um, being kind of strong and set in her ways. And I see, sometimes I see myself as being very weak, 1 like I give in a lot? And I get—she's the type of person that, if someone does something wrong to her, or she'll just, like, close them off and it doesn't really affect her."*
	CELESTINE—"This is not a situation I want to be in. I can recognize that this is not, I mean, I have prior experience. This is not a good situation for me. I will get upset or angry, and I don't want to.

Manipulation	Opportunism
CELESTINE—*Um, you know what I think is really, really wonderful and I wish, I wish I could do? . . . When someone will just go up to someone else and say, "Hi, how're you doing, my name is so-and-so, what're you doing here?" I think that's great. I really do. I wish I could do that. But I'm, I'm kind of, I'm kinda not quite up to that yet."*	
JUNE—"Um, and um, there's this one friend I kinda exploit 'cause we had this strange relationship, you know? Like, it cannot, we're not very close, that's why it doesn't mean a lot, like, I don't think about it as much? But I, I want to kind of put him on the Council next year because he has a car. And I could really use it."	JUNE—*"It's like, it's, it's, I am hopeful, but if things don't go the way I want, I think, I think I have enough, I've realized that, you know, that I shouldn't expect so much from people. . . . It's something I've learned, like, recently . . . See what I've also learned is that you can't change anyone."*
LEON—"When it comes to personal relationships. And um, and, and it takes a lot of energy and it took a lot of energy to try ta, I don't know, to try ta' um, ahhh, this would, I don't know, bring people around to a certain way of acting that, that's nice and that wouldn't hurt other people or whatever. And that usually falls on deaf ears, you know, 'cause experience is the best teacher, blah blah blah. . . . And I guess that wore off with people letting me down."	LEON—*"About 2 weeks ago . . . I thought that people I was attracted to somehow—oh, I don't know if I thought that, but—I thought they would get some kind of clue, they would come up to me and introduce themselves and I wouldn't have to worry about anything, things would go fine."*
	KATRINA—"I mean, there's something better out there— we're just going out with people cause we happened to meet them on campus and we're here for four years altogether, things like that. But now maybe in this big, wide world which we're about to enter there's, there's like a perfect person?"

Single-handed effort in partnership	Managing balance in partnership
KATRINA—*"I see her remaining true and honest to herself and doesn't compromise herself in order ta' make things easier for people, which is something I see my self as doing. Like, I'll say 'oh it's no big deal, you can do whatever,' even though it would bother me just because I feel if it's not important enough to make an issue, or I don wana."*	

Table 2 (*continued*)

JANIE— "I talked to him about problems, but never about problems between the two of us. And I could never, and no matter what, I would just be like, it would never come out of my mouth, no matter how hard. I'd even get there and say, I need to talk to you and nothing, and so it was very frustrating,"	*JANIE—" . . . one of the major things that I'm trying to work on in myself is expressing myself better."*
JEANIE— "sometimes I tend to lose track of myself a little bit? Cause I tend to accommodate too much."	*JEANIE—I have a friend that I always think, I always think that I could never do this, I mean I can do it sort of, but not really. She's very confrontational. I always think it's very interesting and I wish I could do it more. Because she's very good at confrontation. . . . But she tends to push it a little bit much. . . . But she's very upfront about things."*
	MAY—"there're certain things that she's doing right now that I understand, um, but I also want to be understood that I have my stuff too and my priorities? And um, to be appreciated.
Determining system constituents	Managing system constituents
MAY—"I think I'm more drawn towards the . . . biology/ ecology type thing where if we look at the whole ecology, we see how they play against each other."	
EARNEST—"I'm not saying I'm like, their mentor and they're my apprentice, but they ask me questions that they expect me to know the answers to. . . . And um, it's confusing. I don't know what to do and I um, I try to talk to them as much as possible . . . those relationships are something I constantly worry about. . . . And I haven't a clue as on how to make it better . . . I don't know how to reply, and I want to know how I can."	SHARON— "I can have many different levels of friendship . . . I, I find myself becoming very logical, systematic . . . structured . . . kind of thinking about everything."
Independent—directing dependents	Independent—informing dependents
EARNEST—"my sister, she's fiercely independent, which is something I didn't really see in her before . . . her position now is someplace where I wouldn't mind being when I'm her age . . . and she tries to guide me. Which I appreciate. I don't always understand, but I do appreciate. I have the support.	*SHARON—"Um, I don't know if I can put it in words. She's just, uh, kind of simple in a way. She's just kind of not complex, really . . . cares about people, and I don't know, she's a very nice person . . . she always talks about her daughter. She just really talks about her as just, respecting her as a person and how they're just friend, and she is really nice.*
	Independent and responsive to others

Note. Anticipated framework is noted in italics.

The current autogenetic framework and the anticipated framework for 14 of the 16 students are within one framework of each other with the anticipated framework being one framework beyond the current framework in the autogenetic sequence of frameworks. For 2 of the 16 students the anticipated framework was two frameworks beyond the current framework in the autogenetic sequence of frameworks. These students were functioning in the upper end of the frameworks produced by the 16 students. Table 4 provides a schematic of these outcomes.

The hypothesized relationship that the autogenetic frameworks are related developmentally in terms of the autogenetic sequence is evidenced. In 14 of the 16 cases the interviewee presents an example of the next complexity point (Noam, 1990) in framing interpersonal relations as is expected of stage developmental theories. In the two remaining cases the interviewees suggest aspiration to interpersonal agency two frameworks beyond the framework in which they are identified as functioning. These findings which account for three fourths of the developmental sequence, as might be expected for young adults, provides consideration for a sequence of interpersonal frameworks whereby in succeeding paradigms individuals over their lifetimes inte-

Table 3
Summary of Student Current Autogenetic Functioning

Framework		Paradigm		Category	
Uninvolved				Isolation[a]	1
Framework		Paradigm			
		Paradigm 1	2	Reaction[a]	7
Acceptance	2				
Rebellion	0				
		Paradigm 2	3		
Conforming/necessity	2				
escape	1				
		Paradigm 3	2		
Choosing to limit self, stinting	1				
Choosing a limited environment	1				
		Paradigm 4	3	Interaction[a]	6
Manipulation	2				
Opportunism	1				
		Paradigm 5	3		
Unbalanced partnership, single-handed effort	2				
Balancing partnership, speaking out	1				
		Paradigm 6	2	Proaction[a]	2
Determining system constituents	1				
Managing system constituents	1				
		Paradigm 7	0		
Independent/limiting dependents' activities/directing	0				
Independent/specifying one's activities for dependents/informing	0				
Independent and responsive				Integration[a]	0

[a] Category of famework engagement of self with others.

grate a sense of autonomy and relatedness in interpersonal agentic functioning.

Discussion

Several considerations are in order. First, the autogenetic sequence of frameworks may be viewed not as representing developmental transformations of interpersonal agency, but as individual categories of interpersonal agency. However, in many of the interviews there were examples of past behavior and experiences accounted for by autogenetic frameworks prior to the one currently being used. There were no instances of past behavior or experiences accounted for by autogenetic frameworks beyond the one currently being used. This pattern is consistent with the experience of progressive development and with the nature of change identified in developmental models. The student interviews demonstrate that the frameworks in which the students are functioning and the ones in which they are showing an interest are closely related. This suggests the possibility of change of a developmental nature for which an accounting is required.

Second, it could be said that the frameworks reflect behavior consistent with the context in which functioning occurs, such as that of the particular family, school, social class, or community. In other words, expressions of autogenesis may be a reflection of context or setting and their transformations do not represent logically unfolding frameworks as individual sequential elaborations of agency in a complex interpersonal environment, but as individual serial responses to the possibilities inherent in changes in context or setting. Nonetheless, contemporary theories across many aspects of human functioning hold that individual development occurs and it does so not solely in terms of single or isolated internal or external events, but through individual elaboration consistent with numerous bio-psycho-sociohistorical elements and their interrelations (Ammaniti, 2014; Bowers, 2012; Kim & Sankey, 2009; Lerner & Benson, 2013; Lerner, Jacobs, &

Table 4
Student Framework Shifts From Current to Anticipated Functioning

Uninvolved	
SEAN ↓	
SEAN	
Acceptance	**Rebellion**
TRUDY →	*TRUDY*
DAVID →	*DAVID*
Conforming By Necessity	**Escape**
SALLY →	*SALLY*
JOHN →	*JOHN*
	MATTHEW ↵
Choosing To Limit Oneself—Stint	**Choosing A Limited Environment**
MATTHEW	
LYNETTE →	*LYNETTE*
	CELESTINE ↵
Manipulation	**Opportunism**
CELESTINE	
JUNE→	*JUNE*
LEON →	*LEON*
	KATRINA ↵
Single-Handed Effort In Partnership	**Managing Balance In Partnership**
KATRINA	
JANIE →	*JANIE*
JEANIE →	*JEANIE*
	MAY ↵
Determining System Constituents	**Managing System Constituents**
MAY	
EARNEST ↓	SHARON ↓
Independent And Directing Dependents	**Independent And Informing Dependents**
EARNEST	*SHARON*
	Independent And Responsive To Others

[a] Anticipated framework noted in italics.

Wertlieb, 2003; Lerner, Johnson, & Buckingham, 2015; Marcus & Hamedani, 2007; Martí & Rodríguez, 2012; Narváez, 2012; Zelazo, 2013).

The autogenetic model of development as a means of accounting for changes in interpersonal agency across a lifetime is not meant to be construed as universal. The tensions to be resolved between self and other in operating as an interpersonal agent were observed in interviews of college age through older U.S. citizens of varying ethnic and educational backgrounds (Nordmann, 2014). Autogenetic interviews have not been conducted with individuals in cultures outside the United States.

From a Western cultural perspective, autogenesis reflects the opposing ideas of interpersonal agency as a form of independent functioning and interpersonal agency as a form of communal functioning. In Western culture independent functioning as a social agent is viewed as an enhancement of the self that brings satisfaction and functioning communally as a social agent is viewed as a limitation of the self that frustrates satisfaction. The autogenetic sequence can be seen in this light as a sequence of paradigms that through incremental expansion of interpersonal engagement and consequent transformations of the engagement provide a resolution of the tension between independence and communality the Western self experiences. Autogenetic interviews of U.S. individuals describe this as possible.

From a philosophical perspective the idea of the development of interpersonal agency is somewhat teleological. Its endpoint represents an inevitable possibility given expectable biological and cultural constraints and affordances. From a psychological perspective autogenesis can be seen as a description of possible paths through Western U. S. socialization whereby one incorporates the values of the culture and elaborates them to accommodate conflicts that arise.

References

Ammaniti, M. (2014). *The birth of intersubjectivity: Psychodynamics, neurobiology, and the self*. New York, NY: Norton.

Angyal, A. (1941). *Foundations for a science of personality*. New York, NY: Commonwealth Fund.

Angyal, A. (1951). A theoretical model for personality studies. *Journal of Personality, 20,* 131–142. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6494.1951.tb01517.x

Bakan, D. (1966). *The duality of human existence*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Bakan, D. (1968). *Disease, pain, and sacrifice*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bakan, D. (1971). *Slaughter of the innocents*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Borst, S. R., Noam, G. G., & Bartok, J. A. (1991). Adolescent suicidality: A clinical-developmental approach. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 30,* 796–803.

Bowers, C. A. (2012). Questioning the idea of the individual as an autonomous moral agent. *Journal of Moral Education, 41,* 301–310. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057240.2012.691626

Freud, S. (1963). *Civilization and its discontents.* London, UK: Hogarth Press.

Hauser, S. T. (1976). Loevinger's model and measure of ego development: A critical review. *Psychological Bulletin, 83,* 928–955. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.83.5.928

Hy, L. X. (1996). *Measuring ego development* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Kim, M., & Sankey, D. (2009). Towards a dynamic systems approach to moral development and moral education: A response to the JME Special Issue, September 2008. *Journal of Moral Education, 38,* 283–298. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03057240903101499

Kitayama, S., & Cohen, D. (Eds.). (2007). *Handbook of cultural psychology.* New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive–developmental approach to socialization. In D. Goslin (Ed.), *Handbook of socialization theory and research* (pp. 347–480). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.

Leary, T. (1957). *Interpersonal diagnosis of personality: A functional theory and methodology for personality evaluation.* New York, NY: Ronald Press.

Lerner, R. M., & Benson, J. B. (Eds.). (2013). *Embodiment and epigenesis: Theoretical and methodological issues in understanding the role of biology within the relational developmental system. Part B: Ontogenetic dimensions.* Amsterdam, the Netherlands: Academic Press.

Lerner, R. M., Jacobs, F., & Wertlieb, D. (2003). *Handbook of applied developmental science: Promoting positive child, adolescent, and family development through research, policies, and programs.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lerner, R. M., Johnson, S. K., & Buckingham, M. H. (2015). Relational developmental systems-based theories and the study of children and families: Lerner and Spanier (1978) revisited. *Journal of Family Theory & Review, 7,* 83–104. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/jftr.12067

Loevinger, J. (1976). *Ego development: Conceptions and theories.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Marcus, H., & Hamedani, M. (2007). Sociocultural psychology: The dynamic interdependence among self systems and social systems. In S. Kitayama & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of cultural psychology* (pp. 3–39). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98,* 224–253. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.98.2.224

Martí, E., & Rodríguez, C. (2012). *After Piaget.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Narváez, D. (2012). *Evolution, early experience and human development: From research to practice and policy.* Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199755059.001.0001

Neugarten, B. L., Havighurst, R. J., & Tobin, S. S. (1961). The measurement of life satisfaction. *Journal of Gerontology, 16,* 134–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/geronj/16.2.134

Noam, G. (1990). Beyond Freud and Piaget: Biographical worlds—Interpersonal self. In T. E. Wren, W. Edelstein, & G. Nunner-Winkler (Eds.), *The moral domain: Essays in the ongoing discussion between philosophy and the social sciences* (pp. 360–399). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Nordmann, N. (2014). An analysis of life interviews selected for ratings of life satisfaction correlated with ratings of dominance. *Behavioral Development Bulletin, 19,* 135–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0101089

Nordmann, N. (2016). Criterion validation of autogenetic frameworks of interpersonal agency. *Behavioral Development Bulletin, 21,* 88–103. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/bdb0000013

Rank, O. (1929). *The trauma of birth.* New York, NY: Harcourt Brace.

Rank, O. (1945). *Will therapy and truth and reality.* New York, NY: Knopf.

Triandis, H. C. (2001). Individualism-collectivism and personality. *Journal of Personality, 69,* 907–924. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-6494.696169

Wren, T. E., Edelstein, W., & Nunner-Winkler, G. (Eds.). (1990). *The moral domain: Essays in the ongoing discussion between philosophy and the social sciences.* Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Yeates, K. O., Schultz, L. H., & Selman, R. L. (1991). The development of interpersonal negotiation strategies in thought and action: A social-cognitive link to behavioral adjustment and social status. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 37,* 369–405.

Zelazo, P. D. (2013). *The Oxford handbook of developmental psychology.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

(*Appendix follows*)

Appendix

Autogenetic Coding

General Notes Regarding Overall Interview

In Terms of General Category Placement

Is there an upbeat or downbeat feel to the interview?

Is there energy, direction, and momentum expressed or depression, sobriety, or restraint?

Is there interpersonal success or limited or failed interpersonal interaction?

The general focus to attend to is the person's interpersonal attitudes, functioning, and orientation.

Sometimes variations in expression leave some interviews more subtle than salient with regard to category characteristics.

General Points

1. Sometimes interviewees give very clear descriptions of how they use to be. They may retain limited instances of a previous type of behavior. This information, if classifiable, can give a clue to where they are presently functioning (beyond the earlier functioning). Such information can help to confirm or lend confidence to the assessment of where they are now functioning.

2. By the same token an individual may philosophy on lightly, or use in passing, approximations to a category beyond his or her own. These thoughts may be less well formed than thoughts deriving from his or her primary category or previous category. They will seem a subject of fascination to the interviewee. The category in which the interviewee is thought to primarily function can be determined with more confidence, if the interviewee expresses some fascination with a category above the one to which he or she is classified as belonging.

3. The interviewee may also exhibit the practice of limited instances of a category above his or her own. When people exhibit split protocols, rate them at the higher category as long as the higher statements are statements of fact or strong opinion and not fascination only.

Autogenetic Categories

1. Uninvolved

The person expresses a desire not to be bothered and not to have to be concerned with others, not to have to tell them what to do in the sense of take responsibility for them. He is not successful in actualizing the desire not to be bothered or have to bother. Most of his positive relationships are fantasized ones. He is idealistic about relationships. He talks about his problems, oververbalizes.

2. Accepting

The person takes an accepting view of life. He has few expectations of others. He is not particular. He thinks in terms of having gotten what he should get in terms of what he deserved or expected, when he did not expect much. He views the world in terms of security, being good, and getting taken care of by others. He may have been disappointed by this view.

3. Rebellious

The person resists expectations placed upon him. He feels that nobody is going to tell him what to do. He mouths off.

(Appendix continues)

4. Necessity. Obligation. Responsibility. Conforming

The person sees his activities in terms of doing what he has to do or must do. He may hate this or regret this but sees no choice or alternative. He speaks of responsibilities and/or experiences them in a negative way as onerous. He hates the activity, job, and so forth but keeps going though he does not want to do so. He is insecure about the consequences of not doing so. He sees himself as having obligations to others and few rights himself.

5. Escapism

The person flees a situation when he is imposed on, when it is not going to his liking, when he is bossed around, or not treated right. He does not choose his next situation any more carefully. He flees to another situation and stays as long as it is all right. His images are of escape.

6. Self-Limitation. Stinting

The person limits his own natural level of activity or outlets of activity rather than rock the boat. He would not mind, he would even like to work harder, but stints if that is what the situation requires rather than jeopardize himself. He is concerned with greed. In this regard, he sees and holds self-limitation in the sphere of wants and material goods as a positive value. He limits himself in that he chooses not to do certain things one might normally be expected to choose to do.

7. Limiting the Environment

The person chooses an environment where he does not have to limit a self-directed sense of activity. He chooses jobs, spouse, or schedule carefully so he can be himself, be his own boss or the boss of his group, and not be threatened, bothered, or have to defend himself or be on his guard. The emphasis is on choosing or the realization of a choice in terms of an undisturbed or interpersonally intimate and secure and enclosed environment. Retirement can represent such a realized situation.

8. Manipulation

The person has an unresolved dependency on his parents. He complains about the quantity or quality of assistance they gave him as a child. He still regrets it or wishes it righted. He may have other sorts of dependence other than parental with which he is struggling. He may be interested in changing people to suit a situation from which he feels others, including himself, may benefit. He is often disappointed that others fail to perform as he thinks most desirable. He talks a lot about his condition, ororverbalizes. He does as much or more talking as doing. He may claim independence or to be concerned with independence while exhibiting forms of dependence in a situation.

9. Opportunism

The person can provide for himself and makes that clear but is not above accepting gifts, benefits, or returns from others.

10. Single-Handed Effort in Partnership

The person is involved in partnership undertakings in which he puts forth more effort than the partner. He is active in his involvement and aware of the deficiency of the other with whom he is involved, but perseveres in his own activity, recognizing and accepting the attitude of the other. He can judge the other person objectively but does not try to speak out or change him, does not let his evaluation of the negative (perhaps) other affect, that is inhibit, his own effort and activity. He suffers the other person's inabilities. He continues in his part because he wants to or thinks it is right.

11. Manage Balance in Partnership

The person is involved in a partnership or group endeavor, and sees the necessity of holding his own, speaking up for himself, keeping the other person from running over him. He actively speaks out and corrects the partner when he is infringed upon by him and/or holds that as a value. By the same token he believes in not taking advantage as well as in not being taken advantage of. Balance, cooperative individual endeavor, helping is the key to this individual's functioning.

12. Determining System Constituents

The person perceives himself as functioning in a complex system of individuals and needs. He is not fully adept in functioning within the system. He is struggling to determine the essential elements of the system, their relations, and how to use this information effectively.

13. Managing System Constituents

The person sees himself as part of some system or other, understands it, can function in it, but is aware of its limitations. He sees a need to actively and realistically wait, retrench, or otherwise seek aid in the sphere he is in. He has not given up hope but his past approach is not working for him or has evidenced a problem. The person verbalizes a lot.

14. Independent—Limiting Dependent's Activities (Directing Dependents)

The person feels no particular encumbrance. He is doing or does what he wants to do. His interpersonal concerns center around defining standards or conditions for those with whom he deals. He does not necessarily expect to be able to make others perform, but they must behave in certain ways if they wish to interact with him. He also may take advantage of others if his situation or position allows, realizing though, that he probably should not, or it would not work elsewhere or under different conditions. He feels a little guilty or some misgivings about the applicability of taking advantage. He sees life in terms of successful problem solving.

15. Independent—Specifying One's Activities Regarding Dependents (Informing Dependents)

The person feels no particular encumbrance. He is doing what he wants to do. He is involved with his dependents and concerned about them. He makes clear what he will and will not do with regard to his dependents without expectations as to their behavior. He limits what he will do, or conversely and more positively, specifies what he will do, and not what they must do or must not do. What the person decides to do for a dependent, may help the dependent but may not necessarily be what the dependent may have in mind. He is not as yet responsive though he is concerned. He sees life in terms of successful problem solving.

16. Independent and Responsive to Others

The person expresses a high degree of effectiveness and self-initiated and self-directed activity. He loves challenges. He works with people with relish and sees himself as a problem solver in terms of people type problems. He has come to accept psychological causation for others' behavior. He says that in his everyday life he does not look for things. He has to have them pointed out to him. He is then very responsive.