Published in final edited form as:

Res Hum Dev. 2010 October 1; 7(4): 241–256. doi:10.1080/15427609.2010.526516.

Experience, Development, and Resilience: The Legacy of Stuart Hauser's Explorations of the Transition from Adolescence into Early Adulthood

Joseph P. Allen
University of Virginia

Abstract

The legacy of Stuart Hauser's research into the developmental transformation that takes place from the adolescent living within his or her family to the young adult functioning independently is assessed. Four major themes are identified in this work: the interplay between the intrapsychic and the interpersonal; the need to understand the family in developmental context; the links between development and psychopathology; and the role of resilience in human psychological functioning. Hauser's broad, integrative, and fundamentally optimistic perspective on human nature is discussed as providing a roadmap to guide future research in this area.

From my fortunate vantage point as a collaborator with Stuart Hauser across more than two decades on a unique study of 146 normal and psychiatrically-hospitalized adolescents followed into early adulthood, I have been repeatedly struck by the remarkable prescience of the themes woven through Hauser's work during this period. Again and again, themes first touched on by Hauser have later moved, first to the cutting edge, and then into the mainstream of our current thinking about development and psychopathology. Understanding these themes, and in particular, the unique way in which they come together, provides a remarkably useful picture of the interplay between normative development and psychopathological processes during the critical transition from adolescence into early adulthood.

Perhaps the most important overarching theme is an integrationist perspective that consistently appears throughout the body of research emerging from this study—not simply integration of the biological and the psychological, but integration of multiple perspectives on understanding human behavior. If Stuart Hauser was one of the true Renaissance thinkers of our time, this was most apparent in his ability to hold in mind perspectives as diverse as psychoanalysis, latent growth curve analysis, attachment theory, ego development, and adolescent autonomy strivings. But the key was not just holding these perspectives in mind, but using each perspective to inform and enrich the others. The result is four key principles that could well serve as grounding for the next generation of lifespan psychologists. These include recognition of: the interplay of intrapsychic and interpersonal forces across the lifespan; the need to understand family interactions from a developmental perspective; the links between psychopathology and development; and the role of resilience in human psychological functioning.

The Interplay Of The Intrapsychic And The Interpersonal Across The Lifespan

Psychologists and observers, beginning well prior to Freud's time, have been fascinated with the links between social experience and later behavior. Stuart Hauser's unique contribution has been a laser-like focus on understanding just what was happening *within* the individual that might mediate this link, particularly in adolescence (Hauser, Safyer, Cicchetti, & Cohen, 1995). This work began with Hauser's adoption of Jane Loevinger's construct of ego development (Loevinger, 1976, 1979) as a central means of examining this fascinating question. Within Loevinger's model, individuals gradually develop an increasing capacity to integrate the needs of self and other, to modulate their impulses, and to view the social world in complex, integrated fashion. The construct itself, and its instantiation in the Sentence Completion Test, was a formidable contribution, and indeed the Sentence Completion Test has been related to a vast array of markers of psychosocial functioning in consistently robust ways (Hauser, 1993; Hauser & Safyer, 1994).

Recognizing the potential in this construct, Hauser used it as a jumping off point to examine the ways in which family interactions in adolescence could facilitate or hinder the adolescent's psychosocial development. The Constraining and Enabling Coding system was developed by Hauser as a way of capturing the separation individuation process of the adolescent within the family (Hauser et al., 1984). Built on the work of Stierlin (1974), this system examined the extent to which family discussions might constrain or enable the adolescent's developmental push for individuation.

This system in turn led directly to my collaborative work with Hauser in developing the Autonomy & Relatedness Coding System (Allen, Hauser, Bell, & O'Connor, 1994), which was essentially built upon Hauser's initial coding work as a modest extension and elaboration of it. The key theoretical notion here was that a central task of adolescent development is the adolescent's need to establish autonomy *while maintaining relationships* with parents. This system was also observed to predict adolescent ego development, and further to link to numerous functional measures of adolescent development going forward (Allen & Hauser, 1996; Allen, Hauser, Eickholt, Bell, & O'Connor, 1994; Allen, Hauser, O'Connor, Bell, & Eickholt, 1996). The task of understanding how social experiences influenced development in adolescence was progressing well.

As this work developed and allowed even more refined notions of family interaction processes to be explored, Hauser also circled back repeatedly to the intrapsychic aspect of the equation. With an unerring sense for breakthrough developments in the field, Hauser was one of the first adolescent researchers to recognize the importance of emerging work in the study of adult attachment. In particular, as Hauser was developing his work relating ego development to family interactions, Mary Main was developing a method for capturing critical features of the ways in which individuals represented and discussed their prior attachment experiences. With its remarkable concordances to the Strange Situation attachment behavior of the infant offspring of adult parents (Main, Kaplan, & Cassidy, 1985), the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI) had just been introduced and was ready to open up the field of adult attachment research, and Hauser recognized this from the outset.

The key insight was recognizing that adult attachment security and ego development shared a great deal in common. The analogue to infant security in adulthood was a state of mind described as "Autonomous, Yet Valuing of Attachment," a formulation that bore a great deal of similarity to the emphasis on balancing the needs of self and other at the higher stages of ego development (Loevinger, 1976, 1979). The similarities went deeper, however. The Autonomous state of mind in the AAI is recognized in part by the individual's success in

taking other's perspectives and remaining coherent and balanced, even when recounting memories with strong emotional components (Main, Goldwyn, & Hesse, 2002). This process appeared quite closely linked to the impulse control and modulation aspects of the higher levels of ego development. Thus, it was not surprising to find the two constructs were linked, not just in theory, but empirically as well (Hauser, Gerber, & Allen, 1998).

The far more important contribution however, was recognizing that just as the two constructs were linked concurrently, they might also share common roots in the family interaction patterns that the Constraining and Enabling Coding System and Autonomy and Relatedness Coding System had been increasingly successful in capturing. This recognition gave rise to research that provides some of our best understanding of the nature of the development of attachment representations in adolescence.

The key notion is, as Bowlby has long noted (Bowlby, 1969/1982, 1980), that the attachment system exists in an ongoing transactional interplay with other systems competing for the attention of the organism. In particular, when the attachment system is functioning smoothly, its functioning is often in the background, allowing other systems, and in particular, the exploratory system to come to the fore. In infancy, this pattern is observed in the Strange Situation, in which the secure infant is able to explore his or her environment from the secure base of the relationship with a primary caregiver (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978).

In adolescence, the linkages observed between the AAI and Ego Development on the one hand, and the two family interaction coding systems that had been developed, suggested a related mechanism. Whereas the infant explores the physical environment, able to roam free of the parent given trust in the parent's ultimate availability as a secure base, in adolescence a similar process unfolds in cognitive and emotional terms. In well-functioning families, the secure adolescent should be in a position to explore his or her cognitive and emotional independence from parents, with trust that the secure base of the relationship will remain intact. And this is precisely what was found when examining the relationship between patterns of autonomy and relatedness within adolescent family interactions and the Autonomous state in the AAI (Allen & Hauser, 1996). Even more impressive is that in this case attachment representations were examined in young adulthood, nearly a decade after these interactions occurred (for the AAI did not even exist when the family interactions were first being recorded). This work then gave rise to later studies that examined autonomy processes in other relationships (e.g., with peers) as also linked to the secure/autonomous state of mind with respect to attachment (Allen, Porter, McFarland, McElhaney, & Marsh, 2007). The notion that family interactions have their long-term influence by changing critical aspects of the individual's intrapsychic development was thus established in adolescence, to a degree that it had not been previously, and in a way that shows the tremendous value of an approach that examines how social experience can influence intrapsychic development.

More recently, efforts have been made to understand the construct of adult attachment more fully, and these have ultimately circled back to the notion of a high degree of conceptual overlap between what the AAI measures, and the notions Hauser first outlined in discussing convergence between the AAI and Ego Development assessments. In particular, this has involved a shift from thinking of the AAI as simply capturing the adolescent or adult's internal representations of past attachment experiences, to recognizing that past experiences are also likely to shape the individual's overall patterns (and capacity) for processing affect in charged situations. In essence, the initial work linking the AAI to Ego Development set the stage for a conceptualization of attachment in adulthood in terms far broader, and potentially even more useful, than the highly successful theoretical development of the

construct in infancy (Allen, 2007, April, 2008; Allen & Miga, 2009; Mikulincer & Shaver, 2007).

Understanding Families in Developmental Context

A notion which runs implicitly beneath the discussion above, but which is critical to understanding not only the family interaction precursors of ego development and attachment states of mind, but also family interactions more broadly, is Stuart Hauser's consistent recognition of the need to understand family interactions *in developmental context* (Hauser, 1991; Hauser, Borman, Jacobson, Powers, & Noam, 1991).

In the years leading up to Hauser's work on the Constraining and Enabling Coding System, most assessments of family interaction had been focused more on the overall positivity or negativity of these interactions, assessing constructs such as the amount of anger expressed within families (Hahlweg et al., 1989). A major breakthrough, the implications of which are continuing to filter gradually into mainstream research in this area, is that one can better understand family interaction characteristics and their implications for adolescents living in those families if these interactions are viewed through the lens of the developmental needs of those adolescents.

This approach led to increased understanding of adolescents' behavior both within and beyond the family. One major advance in this regard is in the realm of adolescent hostility. Although the straightforward notion that parental hostility toward an adolescent might beget adolescent hostility was found to indeed hold (Allen, Hauser, Eickholt et al., 1994; Allen, Hauser, O'Connor et al., 1996), a more developmentally-nuanced picture has also emerged. Specifically, an even more potent predictor of adolescents' developing hostility has been identified in family behaviors that threaten the adolescent's progress in the core task of developing their autonomy. This effect has been observed repeatedly and in multiple domains. Initial studies simply found that difficulties establishing autonomy predicted higher levels of adolescent negative affect going forward (Allen, Hauser, Eickholt et al., 1994). Next, however, these difficulties also were found to predict adolescents becoming *increasingly* hostile over time within the family (Allen, Hauser, O'Connor et al., 1996). This has been interpreted as a 'blasting out' effect: Adolescents who were unable to establish autonomy *within* relationships appear to then take a secondary route to establishing their autonomy by actively undermining their relationship with their parents.

A second interpretation of these findings is that familial struggles around autonomy issues impair adolescents' overall psychosocial development in ways that lead to hostile behavior in the future. This interpretation is obviously consistent with the findings discussed above regarding the relation of family interaction patterns to adolescent ego development and attachment states of mind. It is also consistent with specific findings that observation of interparental hostility, in which parents unintentionally model for the adolescent hostile behavior in their interactions with one another, is associated with adolescents' difficulties tolerating negative affect and modulating emotional expression, all of which may eventually lead to hostile behavior (Schulz, Waldinger, Hauser, & Allen, 2005). Schulz' collaborative study with Hauser also contained a finding that suggests a more developmentally-oriented, and more hopeful, perspective on hostility within the family: Covariation in hostile and dysfunctional behavior between parents and adolescents decreased over time. This is consistent with the notion that as the adolescent develops, he or she becomes less dependent upon and entwined with dysfunctional patterns of family interaction, perhaps as he or she begins to shift emotional energy into the peer world. Notably, other long-term research based on Hauser's sample found that those adolescents least able to establish their autonomy

were also most likely to remain closely entwined with their parents in young adulthood (O'Connor, Allen, Bell, & Hauser, 1996).

Unfortunately, strong evidence exists that as the adolescent transfers energy into the peer world, problematic patterns of interaction learned within the family are transferred as well. The best evidence of this unfortunate effect comes in the long-term follow-up of the sample that Stuart Hauser began following at age 14, and continued following into adulthood. In that sample, adolescents who experienced autonomy undermining behavior at the hands of their parents (and particularly, their fathers), displayed strikingly high levels of hostility, *as reported by a close peer, 10 years later* (Allen, Hauser, O'Connor, & Bell, 2002)! The overall correlation between experiencing autonomy struggles in adolescence and being viewed by a close peer as hostile was $r = .50$, and this correlation was observed even after accounting for the effects of baseline levels of adolescent hostility and after accounting for the group differences between the previously psychiatrically hospitalized and non-hospitalized groups that comprised the overall sample for the study. Notably, these predictions were even stronger than predictions from adolescents' displayed hostility in the initial assessment window. Further, these predictions to future hostility from autonomy struggles were also stronger than predictions from parents' hostile behavior toward the adolescent.

These findings makes the point particularly strongly about the importance of examining family interactions in developmental context. What was most strongly observed was not simple continuity of dysfunctional behavior (although this also existed), but rather a clear developmental pattern, in which frustration of a central developmental task was associated with more dysfunctional behavior much later in development and in new contexts. The size of the relation of observed—given that it was found across different types of social relationships (family vs. peer), different raters (observers vs. close friends), and different developmental epochs (age 16 vs. age 25)—is in itself rather remarkable and indicates just how valuable and essential the developmental perspective suggested by Hauser is in understanding how families have their effects on their offspring.

The Long-term Implications of Adolescent Development

The findings about family predictors of hostility both within and beyond the family are just one example of another primary interest of Stuart Hauser: understanding the long-term implications of development. Given Hauser's parallel career as a psychoanalyst, this interest in how formative social interactions can have long-term implications for development and functioning in diverse areas should not be surprising. It has, however, been incredibly valuable and generative (Hauser, 2002, 2003). One domain in which this generativity is seen lies in efforts to understand functioning outside of the family. Utilizing data collected by Hauser on his long-term follow-up study, Bell and colleagues examined predictors of long-term patterns of educational attainment and occupational prestige (Bell, Allen, Hauser, & O'Connor, 1996). Several findings are striking and fit with Hauser's long-term developmental perspective. First, Bell found that young people who manage autonomy and relatedness challenges well within the family in adolescence took on more prestigious occupations over time. In part, this is consistent with long-recognized sociological research suggesting that higher-level occupations typically require and reward more autonomous behavior on the part of those in them (Kohn, 1977). However, the findings weren't just limited to occupational success. Bell also found that adolescent autonomy within the family predicted educational attainment as well. As with findings regarding predictors of peer hostility, somewhat stronger predictions were obtained from adolescents' interactions with their fathers than with their mothers.

Further, Bell reported that autonomy processes within the *marital* interactions in the adolescent's family of origin were predictive of occupational prestige. This implies either that family systems dynamics were operating, such that adolescents were affected by difficulties within the marital subsystem, and/or that autonomy struggles may be an issue well past adolescence for some individuals, in which case those individuals may struggle to model appropriate ways of handling autonomy issues for their offspring.

In exploring about long-term patterns of development, one of the simplest and most widely used approaches has been to look at predictors of outcomes at a given point in time, perhaps covarying baseline levels of those outcomes. Until recent developments in growth curve methodologies, this appeared to be one of the only ways to utilize longitudinal data. Hauser, however, recognized early on just how much was lost when repeated measures obtained over the course of a significant part of the lifespan were thrown out, leaving only two endpoints, with no sense of what had taken place in between. The approach he developed, anticipating much of the future statistical work in this area, emphasized the importance of *trajectories* of development over time (Hauser et al., 1992; Hauser, Powers, & Noam, 1991). Applying this notion to the construct of ego development, Hauser recognized differences between adolescents who began at low levels of ego development and steadily progressed, those who were consistently observed at high levels over time, those who were profoundly arrested in their ego development (Hauser, Borman, Powers, Jacobson, & Noam, 1990; Hauser et al., 1992).

This notion of trajectories of developmental change has continued to influence the thinking of Hauser's colleagues and others, even as these teens moved into young adulthood (Billings, Hauser, & Allen, 2008; Hennighausen, Hauser, Billings, Schultz, & Allen, 2004). For example, Hennighausen and colleagues found that assessing *whether* a person reaches higher levels of ego development was far more important in understanding ability to function in social interactions than the particular timing of this development. Thus, those individuals who began adolescence at lower levels of ego development were not necessarily at all doomed to future social difficulties. Many at some point surged developmentally and caught up with their faster maturing peers. By assessing and understanding not just endpoints of development, but the different pathways by which those end points could be reached, it becomes possible to recognize when developmental immaturity in adolescence may or may not be particularly meaningful. Although modern statistical methods have now provided alternative means for examining repeated waves of developmental data, Hauser's approach—carefully identifying a theoretically delineated pattern of developmental change—is one that still potentially can yield great dividends, and which also happens to be applicable even with samples far smaller than most modern growth curve and latent class analyses methods can support.

Development and Psychopathology

The contributions and theoretical insights described thus far would be more than enough to fill out an outstanding career. However, these insights and findings only set the stage for what was undoubtedly Stuart Hauser's greatest passion and greatest area of accomplishment: his recognition of critical developmental factors that give rise to psychopathology and problems in functioning across the lifespan. This effort revisits each of the threads described thus far, and adds an important new element as well.

Hauser's recognition of the importance of attachment representations as internalized markers of developmental experiences stands out as one of his major contributions in this area. Although the Adult Attachment Interview did not exist at the time participants in the Adolescent Families Development Project began, it did by the time they were followed up at

age 25, and Hauser became one of the first to apply this construct to understanding the sequelae of severe psychopathology. What was learned was striking and sobering. Virtually all of the adolescents who had been psychiatrically hospitalized at age 14 (for any of a variety of reasons, excluding signs of thought disorder) were insecure in their states of mind regarding attachment at age 25 (Allen, Hauser, & Borman-Spurrell, 1996). In particular, previously hospitalized adolescents, now interviewed as young adults, were particularly likely to be insecure in a certain way: to display a lack of resolution with respect to traumatic events they had previously experienced.

This finding suggests the profound degree of overlap between the experience of high levels of psychopathology (both intrapsychically and within the family) and of insecure states of mind regarding attachment. This link is particularly striking given the long period of time between the display of the pathology and the assessment of attachment states of mind. Further, attachment states of mind were also found to be concurrently related to both criminal behavior and hard drug use, even *after* accounting for prior psychiatric hospitalization. In essence, this study suggested that attachment states of mind in adulthood not only served as a remarkably robust marker of prior extreme psychopathology, it also predicted such pathology going forward.

Unfortunately, attachment was not the only domain in which significant impairment was detected from prior psychopathology. As this remarkable sample was followed over time, decrements in high school completion, and in educational attainment for those previously hospitalized adolescents who completed high school, were also observed (Best, Hauser, Gralinski-Bakker, Allen, & Crowell, 2004). Significant long-term patterns of emotional distress, even as much as twenty-years after hospitalization were also observed, providing some of the best evidence to date of the long-term sequelae of severe adolescent psychopathology. Of greatest concern, such psychopathology was also found to be significantly related to mortality over this same period. More than 5% of the previously hospitalized sample was deceased at 18-year follow-up, vs. none of those in the comparison group. All deaths had significant behavioral components (e.g., accidents, suicide, etc.). Taken together, these results indicate the grave severity of the adolescent-era psychopathology Stuart Hauser had begun studying in the late 1970's, and are one of the few extant sources of data to address the long-term sequelae of such psychopathology.

Stuart Hauser's colleague Marc Schulz carried this thread of the long-term implications of adolescent-era psychopathology forward in a paper examining the ways in which current and lifetime episodes of psychopathology might influence adaptive functioning in early adulthood (Schulz et al., 2000). This work picked up directly upon Hauser's consistent interest in long-term trajectories of development and applied this trajectory approach to understanding changing patterns of psychopathology across the lifespan. This effort began with the psychometric task of determining whether in fact individuals could accurately make retrospective reports regarding their histories of psychopathology. Using the unique longitudinal data set that Hauser collected, it was possible to establish that these retrospective reports did indeed possess a high degree of reliability and validity.

This research then went on to identify specific *pathways* or courses of psychopathology across the lifespan, including: persistent psychopathology, adult recovery, adult onset pathways, and continuously adaptive (i.e., non-psychopathological) pathways from adolescence into adulthood. This taxonomy was then applied to understanding both mood and disruptive behavior disordered forms of psychopathology.

Striking findings were obtained in terms of understanding both self-esteem and current functioning. Although those groups experiencing continuous psychopathology were,

somewhat unsurprisingly, found to experience greater concurrent difficulties than those in continuously adaptive pathways, other findings were unexpected. For example, the group with highest self-esteem was not the group that had never experienced a mood disorder, but the group that had experienced and recovered from such a disorder (Schulz et al., 2000). This finding presaged Hauser's later work on resilience among individuals with a history of psychopathology in important ways.

Resilience

Each of the findings of Hauser's work regarding this remarkable sample is compelling in its own right, but one of Stuart Hauser's most noteworthy qualities was his integrative and wholistic approach to thinking about the human condition. A second quality was his innate optimism. Just as in his academic life, Hauser would state that he rarely encountered setbacks, only challenges, he took the same approach to examining even the bleak circumstances of the psychiatrically-hospitalized sample he followed for the last 30 years of his life.

These two qualities came together in one of Hauser's culminating works, his book: *Out of the Woods: Tales of Resilient Teens*, published in 2006 by Harvard University Press (Hauser, Allen, & Golden, 2006). In this book, Hauser began with the recognition that even severe forms of psychopathology in adolescence, for all of the negative outcomes they presaged for the sample as a whole, still left room for considerable individual variability. Most remarkably, when assessed ten years after the period of psychiatric hospitalization at age 14, Hauser was able to identify a cluster of young people who were functioning at a consistently above average level, even relative to the normative sample to which this group had originally been compared. The overarching question that was critical not only for understanding the sequelae of severe psychopathology, but also for understanding the very nature of the construct of resilience in mental health was: Why?

To address this question, Hauser focused not on large samples and statistical analyses, but rather conducted in-depth explorations of how this remarkable group of resilient individuals differed from their less fortunate counterparts. This work drew upon Hauser's psychoanalytic roots as well as his long-standing interest in the role of personal narratives in explaining, and shaping, the life course (Hauser & Allen, 2006; Hauser, Golden, & Allen, 2006). After carefully reviewing hundreds of pages of transcripts, reflecting many hours of interviews with each study participant, Hauser compared the themes that emerged in these transcripts with more objective data on the performance of each of the individuals he studied. The results offered provocative and enduring conclusions about the role of resilience in mental health.

One conclusion was as to the profound importance of the drive to mastery exhibited uniformly across the resilient individuals described in the book. Even when this drive took maladaptive forms (for example leading to violent outbursts against abusive parents), it could be seen as serving the individual's overriding goal of learning about and ultimately mastering the reward contingencies within his or her environment. In many instances, even the psychopathology which led to the initial hospitalization could be recast to some extent as reflecting this drive. In many respects this drive resembles the emphasis upon autonomy and ego development that appear repeatedly elsewhere in Hauser's work. A central question going forward then becomes, what is the source of such a drive? In launching a 3-generation study, following the offspring of the adolescents he first interviewed in 1978, Hauser began this effort, although he tragically will not be able to see it come to fruition.

Similarly, Hauser also observed the importance of an inward focus—a degree of self-awareness—present in the resilient young people he observed. There was not so much a high

degree of self-awareness (which would have been largely inconsistent with the severe psychopathology displayed), as there was a high degree of interest in inner processes. Indeed, some of these resilient young people displayed remarkably little self-understanding at the outset of Hauser's interviews with them at age 14 (many of which he conducted himself). Even at this age, however, they were interested, indeed fascinated, by the task of trying to understand their own thinking processes. This inner focus then served them well as they gradually learned more about their emotional lives, and in so doing, gained an important measure of control and insight regarding their behavior.

Finally, and bringing Hauser's work full circle, he identified a drive to relate as core to the resilience he observed. The desire for connection, for attachment, for relationships in which the needs of self and other could be integrated, as is seen at the highest levels of ego development, was remarkably strong among the resilient adolescents. Again, this desire did not equate, at least in adolescence, to *success* in relating well to others. Rather, it was a continuous striving for improvement in such relationships—often starting from very low levels of functioning—that marked these resilient young people.

What was perhaps most striking about this study and about Hauser's articulation of each of these qualities was his care in precisely conceptualizing the construct of resilience. These enumerated qualities were not competencies that were present but simply not observable in adolescence (i.e., 'resilience' that exists only because we lack knowledge or ability to see competence that was present all along). Nor did these qualities prevent the individuals involved from experiencing great dysfunction and great pain. Rather, these qualities were in some ways like nagging urges, consistently pushing individuals in a given direction that allowed them to overcome their prior difficulties. A strong analogy exists in this work to Hauser's own career efforts in providing the tools that constantly pushed (and continue to push) the field to overcome past limitations and move on to new advances.

Putting Things Together

Taken as a whole, what we see in the collected works of Stuart Hauser, covering this one period from adolescence into early adulthood and this one remarkable sample, is a *tour de force* of integrative theoretical reasoning regarding development. We see numerous advances that serve as solid building blocks for the field going forward:

- The notion that development reflects a *process* that unfolds across varying trajectories across the lifespan;
- The idea that family experiences must be understood not via arbitrary notions regarding what appears pleasant vs. unpleasant or even helpful vs. not, but rather based on an understanding of how they tie in to the developmental challenges faced by the individual;
- The critical recognition that these familial experiences in adolescence must become internalized in order to have their effects carried forward, combined with the recognition that attachment representations and ego development can serve as powerful reflections of this internalization process;
- Recognition of the long-term implications of adolescent-era psychopathology.

Finally, most importantly, and most consistently with Stuart Hauser's own resilience and indefatigable optimism and faith in the human enterprise, we see the hopeful message that even under the most adverse circumstances, individuals can find ways to grow and thrive. This is a legacy with implications important not only for future research, but for future researchers and for the broader public as well.

Acknowledgments

This study and its write-up were supported by grants from the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development and the National Institute of Mental Health (9R01 HD058305-11A1 & R01-MH58066).

References

- Ainsworth, MDS.; Blehar, MC.; Waters, E.; Wall, S. Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the strange situation. Erlbaum; Hillsdale, NJ: 1978.
- Allen, JP. A Transformational Perspective on the Attachment System in Adolescence. Biennial Meetings of the Society for Research in Child Development; Boston, MA. April. 2007
- Allen, JP. The attachment system in adolescence. In: Cassidy, J.; Shaver, PR., editors. Handbook of attachment: Theory, research and clinical applications. 2nd ed.. Guilford; New York: 2008. p. 419-435.
- Allen JP, Hauser ST. Autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-family interactions as predictors of young adults' states of mind regarding attachment. *Development & Psychopathology*. 1996; 8:793–809.
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, Bell KL, O'Connor TG. Longitudinal assessment of autonomy and relatedness in adolescent-family interactions as predictors of adolescent ego development and self-esteem. *Child Development*. 1994; 65:179–194. [PubMed: 8131646]
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, Borman-Spurrell E. Attachment theory as a framework for understanding sequelae of severe adolescent psychopathology: An 11-year follow-up study. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*. 1996; 64:254–263. [PubMed: 8871409]
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, Eickholt C, Bell KL, O'Connor TG. Autonomy and relatedness in family interactions as predictors of expressions of negative adolescent affect. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*. 1994; 4:535–552.
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, O'Connor TG, Bell KL. Prediction of peer-rated adult hostility from autonomy struggles in adolescent-family interactions. *Development and Psychopathology*. 2002; 14:123–137.
- Allen JP, Hauser ST, O'Connor TG, Bell KL, Eickholt C. The connection of observed hostile family conflict to adolescents' developing autonomy and relatedness with parents. *Development & Psychopathology*. 1996; 8:425–442.
- Allen JP, Miga EM. Attachment in adolescence: A move to the level of emotion regulation. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. 2009; 27:181–190. [PubMed: 20431705]
- Allen JP, Porter MR, McFarland FC, McElhaney KB, Marsh PA. The Relation of Attachment Security to Adolescents' Paternal and Peer Relationships, Depression, and Externalizing Behavior. *Child Development*. 2007; 78:1222–1239. [PubMed: 17650135]
- Bell, KL.; Allen, JP.; Hauser, ST.; O'Connor, TG. Family factors and young adult transitions: Educational attainment and occupational prestige. In: Graber, JA.; Brooks-Gunn, J., editors. *Transitions through adolescence: Interpersonal domains and context*. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Incorporated; Mahwah, NJ, USA: 1996. p. 345-366.
- Best KM, Hauser ST, Gralinski-Bakker JH, Allen JP, Crowell JA. Adolescents Hospitalized for Psychiatric Disorders Experience More Emotional Distress in Adulthood. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*. 2004; 158:749–752. [PubMed: 15289246]
- Billings RL, Hauser ST, Allen JP. Continuity and change from adolescence to emerging adulthood: Adolescence-limited vs. Life-course-persistent profound ego development arrests. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*. 2008; 37:1178–1192.
- Bowlby, J. Attachment and loss. Vol. Vol. 1. Basic Books; New York: 1969/1982.
- Bowlby, J. Attachment and loss: Vol. 3: Loss, sadness and depression. Basic Books; New York: 1980.
- Hahlweg K, Goldstein MJ, Nuechterline KH, Magaña AB, Mintz J, Doane JA, et al. Expressed emotion and patient-relative interaction in families of recent onset schizophrenics. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*. 1989; 57:11–18. [PubMed: 2925960]
- Hauser, ST. Adolescents and their families: Paths of ego development. Free Press; New York, NY US: 1991.

- Hauser ST. Loevinger's model and measure of ego development: A critical review: II. Psychological Inquiry. 1993; 4:23–30.
- Hauser ST. The future of psychoanalytic research: Turning points and new opportunities. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association. 2002; 50:395–405. [PubMed: 12206537]
- Hauser ST. The contemporary psychoanalyst at work: Research-continuing dialogues. Journal of the American Psychoanalytic Association. 2003; 51:19–24.
- Hauser ST, Allen JP. Overcoming adversity in adolescence: Narratives of resilience. Psychoanalytic Inquiry. 2006; 26:549–576.
- Hauser, ST.; Allen, JP.; Golden, E. Out of the woods: Tales of resilient teens. Harvard University Press; Cambridge, MA US: 2006.
- Hauser ST, Borman EH, Jacobson AM, Powers SI, Noam GG. Understanding family contexts of adolescent coping: A study of parental ego development and adolescent coping strategies. Journal of Early Adolescence. 1991; 11:96–124.
- Hauser ST, Borman EH, Powers SI, Jacobson AM, Noam GC. Paths of adolescent ego development links with family life and individual adjustment. Psychiatric clinics of North America. 1990; 13:489–510. [PubMed: 2235696]
- Hauser, ST.; Gerber, EB.; Allen, JP. Ego development and attachment: Converging platforms for understanding close relationships. In: Westenberg, PM.; Blasi, A., editors. Personality development: Theoretical, empirical, and clinical investigations of Loevinger's conception of ego development. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc., Publishers; Mahwah, NJ, USA: 1998. p. 203-217.
- Hauser ST, Golden E, Allen JP. Narrative in the Study of Resilience. The Psychoanalytic Study of the Child. 2006; 61:205–227. [PubMed: 17370461]
- Hauser, ST.; Jacobson, AM.; Milley, J.; Wertlieb, D.; Wolfsdorf, J.; Herskowitz, RD., et al. Emotion, cognition, health, and development in children and adolescents. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.; Hillsdale, NJ England: 1992. Ego development paths and adjustment to diabetes: Longitudinal studies of preadolescents and adolescents with insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus; p. 133-152.
- Hauser, ST.; Powers, SI.; Noam, GG. Adolescents and their families: Paths of ego development. Free Press; New York: 1991.
- Hauser ST, Powers SI, Noam GG, Jacobson AM, Weiss B, Follansbee DJ. Familial contexts of adolescent ego development. Child Development. 1984; 55:195–213. [PubMed: 6705622]
- Hauser ST, Safyer AW. Ego development and adolescent emotions. Journal of Research on Adolescence. 1994; 4:487–502.
- Hauser, ST.; Safyer, AW.; Cicchetti, D.; Cohen, DJ. Developmental psychopathology, Vol. 1: Theory and methods. John Wiley & Sons; Oxford England: 1995. The contributions of ego psychology to developmental psychopathology; p. 555-580.
- Hennighausen KH, Hauser ST, Billings RL, Schultz LH, Allen JP. Adolescent Ego-Development Trajectories and Young Adult Relationship Outcomes. Journal of Early Adolescence. 2004; 24:29–44. [PubMed: 17404603]
- Kohn, ML. Class and conformity: A study in values. 2nd ed.. University of Chicago Press; Chicago, IL: 1977.
- Loevinger, J. Ego development. Jossey Bass; San Francisco: 1976.
- Loevinger J. Construct validity of the ego development test. Applied Psychological Measurement. 1979; 3:281–311.
- Main, M.; Goldwyn, R.; Hesse, E. Adult attachment scoring and classification systems. Version 7.1. University of California; Berkeley: 2002. Unpublished manuscript, Unpublished Manuscript
- Main, M.; Kaplan, N.; Cassidy, J. Security in infancy, childhood, and adulthood: A move to the level of representation. In: Bretherton, I.; Waters, E., editors. Growing points in attachment theory and research, Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development. Vol. Vol. 50. 1985. p. 66-104. Serial No. 209
- Mikulincer, M.; Shaver, PR. Attachment in adulthood: Structure, dynamics, and change. Guilford Press; New York: 2007.

- O'Connor, TG.; Allen, JP.; Bell, KL.; Hauser, ST. Adolescent-parent relationships and leaving home in young adulthood. In: Graber, JA.; Dubas, JS., editors. Leaving home: Understanding the transition to adulthood. New directions for child development, No. 71. Jossey-Bass Inc, Publishers; San Francisco, CA, USA: 1996. p. 39-52.
- Schulz, MS.; Hauser, ST.; Allen, JP.; Crowell, JA.; Gralinski-Bakker, JH.; Hladek, D., et al. Psychopathology and Development: Trajectories of psychopathology from early adolescence through young adulthood. Biennial Meetings of the Society for Research on Adolescence; Chicago, IL. 2000.
- Schulz MS, Waldinger RJ, Hauser ST, Allen JP. Adolescents' behavior in the presence of interparental hostility: Developmental and emotion regulatory influences. *Development & Psychopathology*. 2005; 17:489–507. [PubMed: 16761555]
- Stierlin, H. Separating parents and adolescents. Jason Aronson; New York: 1974.