

## The Measurement and Structure of Psychosocial Maturity

Ellen Greenberger,<sup>1</sup> Ruthellen Josselson,<sup>2</sup> Claramae Knerr,<sup>3</sup> and Bruce Knerr<sup>3</sup>

Received November 21, 1974

*The educational community lacks tools for assessing the nonacademic growth of students — their growth as persons and as social beings. This paper describes the development of an attitude inventory based on an interdisciplinary model of psychosocial maturity. The Psychosocial Maturity Inventory, a self-report instrument, is comprised of nine subscales and is suited for the assessment of youngsters in the approximate age range 11-18. Among the studies reviewed are ones which (1) specify at various age levels the internal consistency of the subscales, (2) report the association between the subscales and various measures of academic achievement, and (3) describe the relationship of the subscales to other measures of personality such as "faking good," anxiety, and self-esteem. Factor analyses of the Inventory provide an empirical base for testing the proposed theoretical structure of psychosocial maturity.*

Preparation of this paper was supported by funds from the National Institute of Education, Contract No. NE-C-00-3-0013.

<sup>1</sup> Principal Research Scientist, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, and director of a program of research investigating family, peer, and school influences on psychosocial development. Received Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Radcliffe College. Main interest: personality development from childhood through adolescence.

<sup>2</sup> Associate Research Scientist, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Received Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Michigan. Main research interests: the psychology of adolescence and the psychology of women.

<sup>3</sup> Statistical Consultant, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland. Received Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Maryland. Main interests: measurement theory and the measurement of human performance.

## INTRODUCTION

The potency of the school, especially the school peers, in molding children's attitudes, values, and personal dispositions is attested to by a substantial body of research (e.g. Andersson, 1969; Coleman, 1961; Kandel and Lesser, 1972; Lacey, 1970; McDill and Coleman, 1965). In a recent paper, however, Greenberger and Sørensen (1974) have observed that

except at the college level (Jacob, 1958; Newcomb, 1943; Sanford, 1962). . . assessment of the school experience has focused almost exclusively on academic achievement. The preeminent position of academic achievement in educational assessment is due less to a good theory of academic achievement than to the existence of standardized instruments to assess a wide range of achievement. Serious widespread concern for the impact of the school experience on children's personal and social growth awaits both a compelling formulation of . . . "nonacademic" development and the creation of [psychometric] devices that permit its assessment.

An interdisciplinary model of psychosocial development, based on the concept of psychosocial maturity, has been described by Greenberger and Sørensen (1974). Briefly, the model attempts to integrate goals of socialization (i.e., attributes of individuals required to make a society function smoothly) with goals of development (i.e., attributes which represent the optimal growth of the individual in his own right). Thus the concept of psychosocial maturity is concerned with the survival of both the person and the society. The model proposes that psychosocial maturity is reflected in three general capacities, which correspond to three general demands made by all societies on individuals. They are (1) the capacity to function effectively on one's own, or individual adequacy; (2) the capacity to interact adequately with others, or interpersonal adequacy; and (3) the capacity to contribute to social cohesion, or social adequacy. That is, in all societies "socialized" and "developed" individuals should be self-sufficient in some degree and take responsibility for their own survival, should be able to relate to others in stable and predictable ways, and should be able to meet threats to the integrity of the social group with efforts to restore social solidarity. In different societies, the specific attributes which serve as indicators of these general capacities may vary considerably. For this society, it has been argued that the nine attributes listed and described briefly in Table I are indicators of the three general capacities of mature individuals.

The major purpose of this paper is to report on the development of a Psychosocial Maturity Inventory based on the integrative concept of psychosocial maturity presented in Table I. With a view toward the eventual usefulness of these scales for research purposes, the objective has been to devise scales that are manageable in length as well as acceptable in psychometric properties. A second purpose of this paper is to test the theoretical relationships specified by our model of psychosocial maturity against empirical data concerning the relationships among subscales.

Table I. A Model of Psychosocial Maturity<sup>a</sup>Individual adequacy

- Self-reliance
  - Absence of excessive need for social validation
  - Sense of control
  - Initiative
- Identity
  - Clarity of self-concept
  - Consideration of life goals
  - Self-esteem
  - Internalized values
- Work orientation
  - Standards of competence
  - Pleasure in work
  - General work skills

Interpersonal adequacy

- Communication skills
  - Ability to encode messages
  - Ability to decode messages
  - Empathy
- Enlightened trust
  - Rational dependence
  - Rejection of simplistic views of human nature
  - Awareness of constraints on trustworthiness
- Knowledge of major roles
  - Role-appropriate behavior
  - Management of role conflict

Social adequacy

- Social commitment
  - Feelings of community
  - Willingness to work for social goals
  - Readiness to form alliances
  - Interest in long-term social goals
- Openness to sociopolitical change
  - General openness to change
  - Recognition of costs of status quo
  - Recognition of costs of change
- Tolerance of individual and cultural differences
  - Willingness to interact with people who differ from the norm
  - Sensitivity to the rights of people who differ from the norm
  - Awareness of costs and benefits of tolerance

<sup>a</sup>Reprinted from Greenberger and Sørensen (1974).

## METHOD

### Scale Construction

#### *Form A*

Three hundred forty-nine items were written by the first author to assess nine aspects of psychosocial maturity.<sup>4</sup> This set of items is referred to as Form A of the Psychosocial Maturity (PSM) Inventory. The "correct" direction of response was determined *a priori*, in accordance with the theory of psychosocial maturity sketched in Table I. Each item was answered on a 4-point scale, the intervals of which were labeled "strongly agree," "agree slightly," "disagree slightly," and "strongly disagree." The successive response intervals were subsequently scored 4, 3, 2, and 1, with the high score representing the most mature response.

A total of 2291 children distributed among grades 5, 8, and 11 and selected from a stratified random sample of South Carolina public schools responded to the original set of items on optically scannable answer sheets.<sup>5</sup> Item analyses on this data set resulted in Forms B and C of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.

#### *Form B*

Form B contains 188 items (compared to the original 349), distributed among nine subscales with an average length of 20.9 items. The objective of Form B was to create a *single* inventory of more practical length than the original inventory, for use at all grade levels from fifth through eleventh. The purpose of developing a single inventory for this entire age range was to facilitate the study of over-time change in the individual. Item-to-test correlations for the nine subscales were computed separately at each grade level. Inspection of these correlations indicated which items should be discarded in order to achieve a set of subscales characterized by the maximum mean internal consistency across the three grade levels. Any item eliminated from a subscale was cast out at all three grade levels, in order to preserve a single inventory with constant content.

Table II shows sample items from Form B of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory. Table III gives estimates of internal consistency for each subscale,

<sup>4</sup> A number of tests were examined for ideas and some items were adapted for use in the inventory. In addition, many tests form part of this author's apperceptive mass and undoubtedly influenced her inventions.

<sup>5</sup> Further details concerning this sample may be found in Greenberger *et al.* (1974).

Table II. Sample Items from Psychosocial Maturity Inventory<sup>a</sup>

Subscale	Item
Self-reliance	You are probably wrong if your friends are against what you decide. (–) Someone often has to tell me what to do. (–)
Work orientation	I believe in working only as hard as I have to. (–) If something more interesting comes along, I will usually stop anything I'm doing. (–)
Identity	I change the way I feel and act so often that I sometimes wonder who the "real" me is. (–) I have to struggle to keep my behavior what it ought to be. (–)
Communication skills	People find it hard to figure me out from what I say. (–) In a discussion, I often find it hard to understand what people are trying to say. (–)
Roles	Teachers should not expect as much homework from athletes who have to spend a lot of time at practice. (–) If you're upset with someone at home, you can't be expected to be nice to people at school. (–)
Enlightened trust	If people are picked in a fair way to be on a trial jury, they are sure to reach a fair decision. (–) I find it hard to ask even my good friends for help. (–)
Social commitment	It's not really my problem if my neighbors are in trouble and need help. (–) Why work for something others will enjoy if you won't be alive to enjoy it too? (–)
Tolerance	If I had a choice, I would prefer a blood transfusion from a person of the same skin color as mine. (–) I feel a little sorry for people whose ideas about God are different from mine. (–)
Openness to change	If everyone is to be really equal, some people will have fewer advantages than they have now. (+) Women should not be elected to top government positions. (–)

<sup>a</sup>A minus sign following an item indicates that the "mature" response lies in the direction of disagreement; a plus sign indicates that the "mature" response lies in the direction of agreement with the item.

based on Kuder-Richardson formula 8.<sup>6</sup> Estimates of internal consistency are given for the original South Carolina sample and for various replication samples. Inspection of the figures given for Form B in Table III indicates that subscale homogeneity is very adequate in all but a few cases at the lowest grade level and that such homogeneity can be reproduced with samples other than those originally used to construct the subscales.

<sup>6</sup>This measure entails fewer assumptions than the more commonly used formulas 20 and 21. Specifically, KR 8 assumes only that the item intercorrelation matrix has a rank of 1, i.e., that the subscale measures only one factor, while KR 20 and KR 21 assume in addition that all item intercorrelations and standard deviations are equal. (If these additional assumptions are met, KR 8 and KR 20 will produce identical reliability estimates. If they are not met, KR 8 will produce higher reliability estimates than KR 20.)

**Table III.** Kuder-Richardson Formula 8 Estimates of Internal Consistency for the Nine Subscales of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory: Forms B, C, and D

PSM subscale	Form	S.C. sample <sup>a</sup> grade 5 ( <i>n</i> = 729)	S.C. sample <sup>a</sup> grade 8 ( <i>n</i> = 925)	S.C. sample <sup>a</sup> grade 11 ( <i>n</i> = 637)	S.C. sample <sup>b</sup> grade 6 ( <i>n</i> = 438)	S.C. sample <sup>b</sup> grade 9 ( <i>n</i> = 546)	Pa. sample <sup>c</sup> grade 11 ( <i>n</i> = 2605)
Self-reliance	B	0.73	0.78	0.82	0.75	0.79	—
	C	0.71	0.76	0.79	0.69	0.78	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.82
Work orientation	B	0.74	0.81	0.81	0.79	0.82	—
	C	0.71	0.76	0.79	0.71	0.80	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.81
Identity	B	0.78	0.83	0.85	0.78	0.85	—
	C	0.78	0.81	0.83	0.77	0.80	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.85
Communication skills	B	0.62	0.75	0.80	0.68	0.80	—
	C	0.72	0.79	0.78	0.73	0.76	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.75
Roles	B	0.73	0.78	0.76	0.76	0.78	—
	C	0.73	0.78	0.77	0.76	0.77	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.82
Enlightened trust	B	0.66	0.71	0.75	0.68	0.68	—
	C	0.67	0.66	0.72	0.65	0.65	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.74
Social commitment	B	0.72	0.83	0.82	0.79	0.82	—
	C	0.73	0.81	0.81	0.76	0.77	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.86
Tolerance	B	0.62	0.76	0.78	0.69	0.80	—
	C	0.65	0.72	0.75	0.67	0.75	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.84
Openness to change	B	0.58	0.70	0.72	0.63	0.75	—
	C	0.61	0.67	0.71	0.65	0.74	—
	D	—	—	—	—	—	0.82

<sup>a</sup>Test construction sample for Forms B and C, South Carolina.<sup>b</sup>Retest of South Carolina students 1 year later.<sup>c</sup>All eleventh graders in 11 Pennsylvania schools.

### Form C

The objective of creating Form C of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory was to provide a good approximation to Form B which could be used when test administration time was limited. Item-to-test correlations for Form B were examined at each grade level and items discarded in order to maximize the internal consistency at each grade level (instead of maximizing the average internal consistency for the three grade levels, as in Form B). Consequently, Form C has somewhat different content at grades 5, 8, and 11. The total number of items in Form C varies from 89 to 93, and average subscale length is about 10 items. A final version of Form C, known as Form D, differs only slightly: a few changes of wording have been made and three items on the Trust subscale have been replaced.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>7</sup> Forms B and C of this subscale contain items reflecting both "enlightened trust" — sensitivity to factors that limit people's trustworthiness — and "rational dependence" — willingness to accept help from others when necessary. The Form D Trust subscale contains only items reflecting enlightened trust.

Correlations of Form C with Form B are high, indicating that the short inventory closely approximates the longer one. For the South Carolina sample, the average correlations between Form B and Form C subscales are 0.91, 0.89, and 0.86 for grades 5, 8, and 11, respectively. For the same samples retested 1 year later, the average correlations are 0.91, 0.90, and 0.86 for grades 6, 9, and 12, respectively. For samples of students in Pennsylvania and a small Massachusetts college, comparable figures are 0.91 and 0.94. Table III also gives KR 8 estimates of internal consistency for the Form C and Form D subscales for the test construction sample and a representative selection of replication samples. It is clear that the short subscales have a high degree of homogeneity.

### Validation Studies

A number of studies have been carried out to date in order to validate the construct of psychosocial maturity and to explore the divergent and concurrent validity of individual subscales. These studies are summarized briefly below.

Because psychosocial maturity is conceived of as a developmental phenomenon, it was anticipated that mean scores on the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory would increase as children grew older. Cross-sectional data from the South Carolina sample, for whom Form B and Form C PSM scores were available, are consistent with this expectation. With two exceptions, 54 paired comparisons of mean subscale scores between grade levels (5th vs. 8th, 8th vs. 11th, and 5th vs. 11th) yielded values of  $t$  significant at the 0.05 level or better, the older children scoring higher on each subscale than the younger children (Greenberger *et al.*, 1974).<sup>8</sup> Longitudinal data on this sample are now being analyzed and will yield more definitive findings on over-time growth in psychosocial maturity.

Two investigations are pertinent to the divergent validity of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory. The first of these examined the relationship of psychosocial maturity scores to scores on a short but reliable version of the Crowne-Marlowe social desirability scale (Greenberger *et al.*, 1974). The questions of the study were as follows: Do high psychosocial maturity scores merely reflect an awareness of the socially desirable point of view? Are high scores, therefore, contaminated by a tendency to "fake good"? Data from all three grade levels in the South Carolina sample supported an answer of no to these questions. Correlations between the nine psychosocial maturity subscales and social desirability ranged from -0.30 to 0.26. The highest positive associations of social desirability were with Work Orientation and Communication Skills; the highest negative associations were with Enlightened Trust and Openness to Sociopolitical Change. Additional evidence for the lack of overlap between the

<sup>8</sup> The two exceptions were on the Work Orientation subscale. The mean scores on this subscale did not increase significantly between grades 8 and 11 on Form B and between grades 5 and 8 on Form C. This finding is as likely to reveal a reality of adolescent development as a flaw in the Work subscale.

concepts of psychosocial maturity and social desirability comes from the observation that while mean PSM scores rise significantly between grades 5 and 11, social desirability scores decline significantly (Greenberger *et al.*, 1974). The latter result replicates a finding based on an early and partial set of psychosocial maturity subscales (Greenberger, 1972).

The second investigation of divergent validity concerns the relationship between psychosocial maturity and various measures of intellectual ability. Achievement in school, like psychosocial maturity, reflects the adoption of culturally sanctioned values. The questions of these studies, therefore, were the following: Does variation in psychosocial maturity merely reflect variation in intellectual achievement? Are maturity scores heavily contaminated by a youngster's brightness?<sup>9</sup>

Recent standardized achievement test scores were available for several subsamples of the South Carolina sample: 153 fifth graders, Iowa Test of Basic Skills; 281 eighth graders, Iowa Test of Basic Skills; and 305 eighth graders, California Test of Basic Skills. For the fifth and eighth graders who took the Iowa test, correlations of the reading total with PSM scores were quite similar and fell in the range of 0.07-0.38. The lowest *r* in both samples was in relation to the Communication Skills subscale; the highest *r* was in relation to the Openness to Sociopolitical Change subscale. Arithmetic totals showed correlations of the same order of magnitude as reading totals in grade 5, but were considerably lower in grade 8, with a range of 0.01-0.20. For the sample of eighth graders who took the California test, both sets of correlations were higher. Correlations of PSM scores with reading totals ranged from 0.39 to 0.57 (the low and high *rs* relating to the same two subscales noted above); correlations of PSM scores with arithmetic totals were substantially lower than with reading totals, ranging from 0.16 to 0.26.

In an effort to obtain uniform achievement test data on a sizable sample of individuals, a 15-min test of verbal achievement, "Level of Previous Learning," was administered to a sample of approximately 2000 Pennsylvania eleventh graders. Scores on this test, prepared by Educational Testing Service, yielded correlations very much like those for the reading total in the last sample described (i.e., eighth graders, California test). Correlations ranged from a low of 0.13 with Work Orientation to a high of 0.34 with Openness to Change. (The average correlation with the three individual adequacy subscales, see Table I, was 0.18; with the three Social Adequacy subscales, it was 0.29.) The same respondents also reported their grade-point averages. Self-reports of average grades obtained in school likewise yielded significant but low levels of association with PSM scores, from a low of 0.13 with Tolerance to a high of 0.29 with Work Orientation. There was little difference in the relationship of the Individual and Social

<sup>9</sup> These questions also arise because the Inventory is a complex verbal stimulus, responses to which require that the child read and understand the meaning of the items.



Adequacy scales to reported grades. *Actual* grade-point averages were obtained for 101 tenth grade students in Oregon. GPA correlated significantly with all PSM subscale scores (Form B). Values of  $r$  ranged from a low of 0.22 with Identity to a high of 0.42 with Work Orientation.<sup>10</sup>

Taken together, the evidence from these studies suggests the following: (1) the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory is not merely a measure of intellectual ability; (2) however, various measures of intellectual ability and performance are, as expected, moderately, positively, and in most cases significantly associated with psychosocial maturity scores; (3) verbal achievement scores appear to be more highly correlated with psychosocial maturity than quantitative achievement scores, by grade 8; and (4) different measures of verbal achievement across the school years produce a range of associations with the nine PSM scores, in no case, however, explaining more than 33% of the variance in any PSM subscale.

We turn now to studies of concurrent validity. In two studies (Josselson *et al.*, 1974a,b), teachers' evaluations of traits expressive of psychosocial maturity (e.g., Self-reliance, Work Orientation) were related to youngsters' PSM scores. In the first of these studies, each of the nine psychosocial maturity subscales was translated into a single behavioral description. Seven hundred twenty-nine fifth graders (the South Carolina sample) were rated on a 4-point scale labeled "very much like child" through "very much unlike child." No training of raters was carried out. Before data analysis, subjects were pooled into three groups for each trait — those rated "very much like" a psychosocially mature trait description, those rated "very much unlike" the same, and those placed in the two middle categories. The mean PSM scores on Form B of children rated very much like a psychosocially mature trait were then compared with the mean PSM scores of all others; subsequently, the mean PSM scores of children rated very much unlike a psychosocially mature trait were contrasted with the scores of children in the remaining groups. Students rated *high* on a trait scored significantly higher on the corresponding PSM subscale than all other students in every case except on the Trust subscale. Students rated low on a trait scored lower than all other students on the corresponding PSM subscale in only two of nine cases: the Change and Social Commitment subscales. Two interpretations of why the subscales are less sensitive to the relative lack of psychosocially mature traits than to their presence are offered by Josselson *et al.* (1974a).

The skewed character of the distribution of teacher ratings in the study just reported — twice as many children were rated in the extreme high category as in the extreme low category — suggested that future studies would benefit from imposing a fixed distribution on the raters. Consequently, in a later study of 192 eleventh graders, teachers were asked to name only the highest (most mature) and lowest (least mature) students on behavioral descriptions relevant to

<sup>10</sup> We are grateful to Dr. Thomas Owens, Northwest Regional Laboratories, for sharing these data with us.

four PSM traits: Self-reliance, Work Orientation, Social Commitment, and Tolerance. The appropriate trait-related PSM scores on Form C of students nominated "high" by one or more of their teachers were compared with the scores of student *not* nominated, and the appropriate subscale scores of students nominated "low" by one or more teachers were likewise compared with the scores of students not so nominated. The group of youngsters rated "high" by their teachers obtained significantly higher mean scores than the comparison group on three of the four PSM subscales. (The exception was Self-reliance.) The group of youngsters rated "low" obtained significantly lower scores than the comparison group on three of the four subscales. (The exception was Tolerance.)

Considering the difficulties inherent in studies that rely on teacher ratings of behavior, and the compression of meaning involved in reducing a complex trait to a one-line behavioral description, the two studies indicate that scores on the psychosocial maturity scales correspond moderately well with teachers' perceptions of students.

Psychosocial maturity scores have also been studied in relation to measures of self-esteem, anxiety, and neuroticism (Josselson *et al.*, 1975). The hypotheses of the study were that the three Individual Adequacy subscales would be positively and significantly associated with self-esteem and negatively (and significantly) related to anxiety and neuroticism, and that the remaining scales, in contrast, would show comparatively weak associations with these measures. The two samples comprising this study were 68 freshmen enrolled in an experimental, early admissions college in Massachusetts, and 192 eleventh grade students in a small suburban Baltimore high school.<sup>11</sup>

The measures of self-esteem reported are the "TP" score from the Tennessee Self Concept scale and Rosenberg's (1965) self-esteem scale. The measure of neuroticism is the "N" scale from the Tennessee Self Concept scale. The measure of anxiety is Welsh's (1956) scale. Table IV displays the obtained correlations between these measures and scores on the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.

Table IV shows that both hypotheses are well supported: i.e., the relationships of scores on Self-reliance, Work Orientation, and Identity to the three variables investigated are uniformly in the expected direction and generally significant, while the remaining PSM scores — those presumably tapping Interpersonal and Social Adequacy rather than the adequacy of the individual in his own right — typically have negligible and nonsignificant relationships with self-esteem, neuroticism, and anxiety.<sup>12</sup> Thus the data provide convincing evidence of construct validity for the Individual Adequacy subscales and for their divergence

<sup>11</sup> We are grateful to Dr. Nancy Goldberger, Simon's Rock College, for sharing the college level data with us.

<sup>12</sup> There are a few exceptions to the finding that subscales other than those in the Individual Adequacy scale have "negligible" relationships to self-esteem, neuroticism, and anxiety. Most notably, Table IV reveals that Communication Skills functions much like an Individual Adequacy subscale.

Table IV. Correlations of Self-esteem, Neuroticism, and Anxiety with PSM Scores<sup>a</sup>

	Self-esteem ( <i>n</i> = 68) <sup>b</sup> (Tennessee Self Concept scale "TP")	Self-esteem ( <i>n</i> = 192) <sup>c</sup> (Rosenberg)	Neuroticism ( <i>n</i> = 68) <sup>b</sup> (Tennessee Self Concept scale "N")	Anxiety ( <i>n</i> = 192) <sup>c</sup> (Welsh Anxiety scale)
Self-reliance	0.22 <sup>d</sup>	0.29 <sup>f</sup>	-0.21 <sup>d</sup>	-0.24 <sup>e</sup>
Work orientation	0.36 <sup>e</sup>	0.22 <sup>e</sup>	-0.38 <sup>e</sup>	-0.32 <sup>f</sup>
Identity	0.50 <sup>f</sup>	0.53 <sup>f</sup>	-0.52 <sup>f</sup>	-0.40 <sup>f</sup>
Communication skills	0.30 <sup>d</sup>	0.38 <sup>f</sup>	-0.29 <sup>d</sup>	-0.18 <sup>d</sup>
Roles	0.15	0.08	-0.21 <sup>d</sup>	-0.01
Enlightened trust	0.10	0.29 <sup>f</sup>	-0.13	0.04
Social commitment	0.07	-0.05	-0.08	-0.03
Tolerance	0.09	0.10	-0.08	0.05
Openness to change	0.06	0.19 <sup>d</sup>	-0.06	-0.02

<sup>a</sup> All scales have been scored so that a high score means a high level of the disposition assessed by the scale.

<sup>b</sup> These data came from the Simon's Rock College sample, who took Form B of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.

<sup>c</sup> These data came from the Baltimore suburban high school sample, who took Form C of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory.

<sup>d</sup>  $p < 0.05$ .

<sup>e</sup>  $p < 0.01$ .

<sup>f</sup>  $p < 0.001$ .

or distinctiveness from the Social Adequacy and Interpersonal Adequacy subscales.

Finally, Bond *et al.* (1974) examined the relationship of the three Social Adequacy subscales to students' participation in social action projects. A criterion group of college students was identified who displayed "real life" behavior attributes consistent with Social Commitment (see Table I)—and, implicitly, attributes consistent with Tolerance and Openness to Sociopolitical Change. These 71 students were involved in one of two volunteer programs sponsored by The Johns Hopkins University Chaplain's Office, both of which required a substantial investment of personal time and effort. (One program involved weekly one-to-one tutoring of inner-city elementary school children; the other involved systematic study and fieldwork with individual juvenile delinquents.)

PSM scores of the volunteers were compared with those of a control group of 44 students at the same university who had never participated in social action projects. The volunteers scored higher on each of the three PSM subscales than the control group (*ts* for Social Commitment, Tolerance, and Change were 3.99, 3.90, and 2.09, respectively, the former two significant at  $p < 0.001$ , the latter at  $p < 0.05$ ). To determine the degree to which the group scores actually differed, Tilton's (1937) overlap statistic was computed. The computed *O* values for the three scales, in the order just cited, indicated distribution overlap of 70%, 71%, and 85%, respectively. Dunnette (1966) suggests that overlap percentages between 75% and 50% "may generally be taken as indicating moderately good relationships between a measure and a dichotomous behavior classification" (p. 147). The Social Commitment subscale, which was initially hypothesized to be most relevant to participation in social action projects, falls within the range specified by Dunnette, as does the Tolerance subscale.

### The Structure of Psychosocial Maturity: Construct Validity

Table V indicates that the nine PSM subscales are, with one exception, significantly intercorrelated at all grade levels. This finding is consistent with the use of a unifying construct (psychosocial maturity) to describe the nine dimensions assessed. As in the case of subscale homogeneity (see Table III), correlations among subscales increase with advancing grade level, especially between grades 5 and 8.

The question of the studies which follow was whether the empirical data lend support to the model of psychosocial maturity proposed in Table I. That is, can we find evidence for three dimensions of psychosocial maturity — Individual Adequacy, Interpersonal Adequacy, and Social Adequacy — each subsuming a

**Table V.** Intercorrelations Among PSM Subscales (Form B) at Three Grade Levels: South Carolina Sample<sup>a,b</sup>

Self-reliance	Work orientation	Identity	Communication skills	Roles	Enlightened trust	Social commitment	Tolerance	Openness to change
Self-reliance	0.51	0.64	0.26	0.54	0.60	0.42	0.34	0.24
	0.62	0.71	0.50	0.64	0.54	0.56	0.50	0.45
	0.59	0.71	0.52	0.63	0.58	0.51	0.54	0.44
Work orientation		0.61	0.32	0.55	0.35	0.50	0.39	0.30
		0.66	0.53	0.57	0.35	0.57	0.43	0.34
		0.67	0.53	0.52	0.36	0.51	0.38	0.32
Identity			0.42	0.49	0.44	0.40	0.30	0.27
			0.61	0.52	0.44	0.45	0.39	0.36
			0.61	0.54	0.46	0.46	0.43	0.33
Communication skills				0.11	0.06 <sup>b</sup>	0.17	0.09	0.17
				0.23	0.17	0.30	0.30	0.26
				0.25	0.20	0.33	0.38	0.33
Roles					0.51	0.46	0.38	0.27
					0.54	0.64	0.50	0.45
					0.54	0.61	0.50	0.45
Enlightened trust						0.28	0.15	0.11
						0.37	0.31	0.27
						0.35	0.36	0.31
Social commitment							0.53	0.41
							0.64	0.54
							0.58	0.51
Tolerance								0.44
								0.57
								0.58
Openness to change								

<sup>a</sup>The first line of figures in each cell is for grade 5 ( $n = 729$ ), the second line of figures is for grade 8 ( $n = 925$ ), and the third line of figures is for grade 11 ( $n = 639$ ).

<sup>b</sup>All correlations are significant at or beyond the 5% level unless marked by superscript "b."

specific set of three traits? The structure of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory has been examined by means of a hierarchical factor analysis of the items and a principal components analysis of the nine subscale scores.

### *Hierarchical Factor Analysis*

The items of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory, Form B, were subjected to analysis by the Wherry-Wherry hierarchical factor analysis computer program.<sup>13</sup> This computer program applies a principal factor and minres (Harman and Jones, 1966) combination solution to decompose the zero-order correlation matrix. Kaiser's (1958) varimax criterion is imposed in the factor rotation, and the varimax factors are further analyzed to produce a hierarchical factor solution. The eleventh grade data from the South Carolina sample were selected for factorization. A precise correspondence of the hierarchical solution to the theoretical model would yield one specific (first-order) factor for each of the nine PSM subscales; additionally, the nine first-order factors would combine, in the manner depicted by the model, into three higher-order factors, each representing one of the three major categories of psychosocial maturity (Individual Adequacy, Interpersonal Adequacy, and Social Adequacy). Details of the three analyses carried out, each allowing a different number of factors to emerge in the first-order analysis, are reported in Greenberger *et al.* (1974).<sup>14</sup> An overview is given here of the structure obtained when the number of first-order factors was left virtually unlimited and factorization was terminated by the minimum residual criterion.

Briefly, the structure of the data best supported the Individual Adequacy and Social Adequacy scales of the theoretical model. The ideal structure was clearest in the factorial representation of the Social Adequacy scale, for which both the three first-order subscale factors (Social Commitment, Tolerance, and Change) and a higher-order Social Adequacy factor subsuming items from these subscales were obtained. The Communication subscale, however, also contributed substantially to the factor variance. For the Individual Adequacy factor, there were no first-order factors reflecting the separate subscales (Self-reliance, Work Orientation, and Identity), but a higher-order factor emerged which was comprised chiefly of items from these three subscales and, once again, the Communication subscale. The "migration" of the Communication items into the Individual Adequacy scale could well have been anticipated from the high correlation of the Communication subscale with the three Individual Adequacy sub-

<sup>13</sup> This program is available from the Ohio State University Department of Psychology computer program library.

<sup>14</sup> The high degree of correlation among the subscales prevented the emergence of nine first-order factors, as specified in the first analysis, and yielded a factor structure which could not be interpreted readily. Since this "failed" analysis suggested that fewer dimensions existed, the second analysis specified six first-order factors. The resulting factor structure was no more interpretable than the first.

scales (Table V) and from the common pattern of relationships to measures of self-esteem, neuroticism, and anxiety exhibited by the Communication Skills subscale and Individual Adequacy scale.

The Interpersonal Adequacy category was least well represented in this analysis. The fate of the Communication Skills subscale has just been described. The Roles subscale did not have a recognizable specific factor nor did it have a strong influence on any higher-order factor. The Trust subscale was represented by a specific factor and was related to a higher-order factor which portrayed an amalgam of Interpersonal and Social Adequacy (i.e., the major variance of this factor was contributed by the three subscales in the former category and by two subscales in the latter).

### *Principal Components Analysis*

PSM subscale scores (not item scores, as in the hierarchical analysis) were subjected to a principal components analysis on two sets of data: the South Carolina sample, grade 11, Form B of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory; and the Pennsylvania sample, Form D of the Inventory. In both analyses, a two-factor solution was obtained and subsequently rotated by the Varimax procedure. In the South Carolina data, the first factor was defined by the three Individual Adequacy subscales, Self-reliance, Work Orientation, and Identity, with loadings between 0.66 and 0.84; additionally, the Communication subscale made a strong appearance (0.81) on Factor 1. The second factor was most clearly defined by the Social Adequacy subscales: Social Commitment, Tolerance, and Change, each with loadings of 0.75 or more on the factor. The Roles subscale also showed a substantial loading (0.73) on Factor 2. The Pennsylvania data, which are based on the short scales, yielded a highly similar factor structure. Factor 1, the Individual Adequacy factor, was best represented by the three Individual Adequacy subscales (loadings between 0.55 and 0.86); additionally, the Communication subscale again loaded on this factor (0.67), as did Trust (0.54). The second factor, Social Adequacy, was clearly defined by the three subscales denoted in the model, with loadings between 0.62 and 0.68. Additionally, the Roles subscale again emerged (0.59) on Factor 2.

### *Comparison and Implications*

All three factor analyses lend most support to the distinctiveness and integrity of the Individual and Social Adequacy categories, as defined in Table I. None of the analyses was able to identify a clear-cut Interpersonal Adequacy factor. It appears that the subscales in this category are saturated with both Individual and Social Adequacy components. Whether this overlap represents a flaw in the scales (i.e., in the operationalization of the Interpersonal Adequacy construct) or reveals accurately the complex of traits that comprise interpersonal competence needs to be determined through future research.

A major purpose of these investigations of the structure of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory was to determine whether there was justification for grouping the nine individual subscale scores into composite scores reflecting the more general dimensions of the model. The factor analyses tell us that a composite score for Interpersonal Adequacy cannot be formed from the three subscales composing the theoretical subset, because these subscales do not cohere. The results of these analyses also indicate, however, that the subscales composing the theoretical subsets of Individual and Social Adequacy *do* cohere, and summary scores can justifiably be formed.

Although the factor structure of the Inventory yields somewhat more complex versions of the Individual and Social Adequacy dimensions than the model, our decision was to form summary scores which would serve as indicators of the theoretical constructs of Individual and Social Adequacy. Hence, in accordance with the model, each summary score was derived from a simple addition of scores based on the three subscales representing Individual Adequacy and the three representing Social Adequacy. Such scores have now been assigned to subjects in the studies reported earlier. Individual and Social Adequacy summary scores correlate on the order of 0.44-0.60 for various samples, increase significantly between grades 5 and 8 and between grades 8 and 11, and, necessarily, produce correlations with other variables that reflect in magnitude the relationships previously cited for their component subscales.

## DISCUSSION

The educational community has expressed growing interest over the past several years in the assessment of children's personal and social development. The construction of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory is pertinent to this objective. A strength of the inventory is its derivation from an explicit model of maturity which integrates desired end products of socialization with goals of human development.

Various forms of the Inventory have been devised in order to accommodate different research needs. The "long" form, Form B, is the standard version of the instrument, but good approximations to Form B which require less administration time have also been developed. Because Form B is suitable for all grade levels from fifth through eleventh, and Forms C and D are close approximations to the standard version, the Inventory can be used to document the course of psychosocial development over the school years and to study youngsters of different ages using essentially the same measures.<sup>15</sup>

With a few exceptions, the nine subscales of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory have adequate internal consistency at all grade levels in the range cited

<sup>15</sup> Among the investigations now under way in which the Inventory is being used are a large-scale survey examining peer, family, and school influences on psychosocial maturity and a clinical study of "high mature" and "low mature" adolescents.

above. The degree of homogeneity within scales makes them appropriate for use in studying (or comparing) groups of individuals, but not for analysis or diagnosis at the level of the single individual. Validity evidence to date is promising, particularly concerning the subscales representing Individual and Social Adequacy.

A theoretical model of psychosocial maturity was discussed in an earlier paper (Greenberger and Sørensen, 1974) and is outlined in Table I. This model has been empirically tested in the studies described in this paper. At the most general level, evidence from the intercorrelations among the nine subscales and from the factor analyses of items and scales supports the use of the unifying construct of Psychosocial Maturity to describe the nine attributes that the subscales assess. At the same time, evidence from both the validity studies and the factor analyses supports the distinctiveness and meaningfulness of the Individual and Social Adequacy dimensions of the model.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge the contributions of Rosemary Hollick, Joan Bitner Brown, and Marie Makurath, who carried out the data management and computer work for the many projects described in this paper.

### REFERENCES

- Andersson, B.-E. (1969). *Studies in Adolescent Behaviour*, Almqvist and Wiksells, Uppsala.
- Bond, L., Josselson, R., Greenberger, E., and McConochie, D. (1974). On the Validity of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory: The Social Adequacy Subscales and Social Action, Report No. 177, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Coleman, J. S. (1961). *The Adolescent Society*, Free Press, New York.
- Dunnette, M. D. (1966). *Personnel Selection and Placement*, Wadsworth, Belmont, Calif.
- Greenberger, E. (1972). Psychosocial Maturity or Social Desirability, Report No. 131, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Greenberger, E., and Sørensen, A. B. (1974). Toward a concept of psychosocial maturity. *J. Youth Adolesc.* 3: 329-358.
- Greenberger, E., Knerr, C., Knerr, B., and Brown, J. B. (1974). The Measurement and Structure of Psychosocial Maturity, Report No. 170, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Harman, H. H., and Jones, W. H. (1966). Factor analysis by minimizing residuals (minres). *Psychometrika* 31: 351-368.
- Jacob, P. (1958). *Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of the Impact of College Teaching*, Harper, New York.
- Josselson, R., Greenberger, E., and McConochie, D. (1974a). On the Validity of the Psychosocial Maturity Scales: Relationship to Teacher Ratings, Report No. 171, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Josselson, R., Greenberger, E., and McConochie, D. (1974b). On the Validity of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory: Relationship to Teacher Nominations, Report No. 183, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.



- Josselson, R., Greenberger, E., and McConochie, D. (1975). On the Validity of the Psychosocial Maturity Inventory: Relationship to Measures of Personal Well-being, Report No. 186, Center for Social Organization of Schools, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore.
- Kaiser, H. F. (1958). The varimax criterion for analytic rotation in factor analyses. *Psychometrika* 23: 187-200.
- Kandel, D. B., and Lesser, G. S. (1972). *Youth in Two Worlds*, Jossey-Bass, San Francisco.
- Kuder, G. F., and Richardson, M. W. (1937). The theory of the estimation of test reliability. *Psychometrika* 2: 151-160.
- Lacey, C. (1970). *Hightown Grammar: The School as a Social System*, The University Press, Manchester, England.
- McDill, E., and Coleman, J. S. (1965). Family and peer influences on college plans of high school students. *Sociol. Educ.* 38: 112-126.
- Newcomb, T. (1943). *Personality and Social Change*, Holt, Rinehart and Winston, New York.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the Adolescent Self-image*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J.
- Sanford, R. N. (ed.) (1962). *The American College*, Wiley, New York.
- Tilton, J. W. (1937). The measurement of overlapping. *J. Educ. Psychol.* 28: 656-662.
- Welsh, G. S. (1956). Factor dimensions A and R. In Welsh, G. S. and Dahlstrom, W. G. (eds.), *Basic Readings on the MMPI in Psychology and Medicine*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis.